

ADOPTION

Prel. Doc. No 1
Doc. prélim. No 1

July / juillet 2014



**20 YEARS, 20 QUESTIONS: A QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE IMPACT OF THE
HAGUE CONVENTION OF 29 MAY 1993 ON PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AND
CO-OPERATION IN RESPECT OF INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION
ON LAWS AND PRACTICES RELATING TO INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION
AND THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN**

drawn up by the Permanent Bureau

* * *

**20 ANS, 20 QUESTIONS : QUESTIONNAIRE RELATIF À L'IMPACT DE LA
CONVENTION DE LA HAYE DU 29 MAI 1993 SUR LA PROTECTION DES ENFANTS ET
LA COOPÉRATION EN MATIÈRE D'ADOPTION INTERNATIONALE
SUR LE DROIT ET LA PRATIQUE EN MATIÈRE D'ADOPTION INTERNATIONALE ET DE
PROTECTION DES ENFANTS**

établi par le Bureau Permanent

*Preliminary Document No 1 of July 2014 for the attention of the
Special Commission of June 2015 on the practical operation of the
Hague Convention of 29 May 1993 on Protection of Children and
Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption*

*Document préliminaire No 1 de juillet 2014 à l'intention de la
Commission spéciale de juin 2015 sur le fonctionnement pratique de la
Convention de La Haye du 29 mai 1993 sur la protection des enfants et
la coopération en matière d'adoption internationale*

INTRODUCTION

The Fourth Meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1993 Hague Convention¹ will commence with a special day on “20 years of the 1993 Hague Convention” (the Convention was concluded on 29 May 1993 and entered into force on 1 May 1995).

This special day will be an opportunity to reflect upon and discuss the implementation and operation of the Convention over the 20 years it has been in force and to analyse what its impact has been on laws and practices relating to intercountry adoption, as well as child protection systems more generally. It will provide an occasion to assess the improvements which the Convention has brought about, as well as the challenges which remain concerning its implementation and operation.

The responses to this Questionnaire will assist the Permanent Bureau with preparing the discussions for this special day. They will form the basis for the Preliminary Document on this topic, to be drawn up by the Permanent Bureau. This Preliminary Document will outline key questions for States for discussion during the special day.

Please send your response to this Questionnaire to secretariat@hcch.net, for the attention of Laura Martínez-Mora (Principal Legal Officer) and Hannah Baker (Senior Legal Officer) **by no later than 10 October 2014**. The Permanent Bureau will place responses online on the Hague Conference website (< www.hcch.net >) unless expressly requested not to do so.

Please note: if information provided in your State’s Country Profile for the 1993 Hague Convention (sent to States for completion at the same time as this Questionnaire) assists with your answer to any question herein, please cross-refer to your Country Profile. There is no need to repeat information.

Thank you for your kind co-operation as the Permanent Bureau prepares for this next Special Commission meeting.

¹ Full title: *Hague Convention of 29 May 1993 on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption* (hereinafter, “1993 Hague Intercountry Adoption Convention”, “1993 Hague Convention”, “1993 Convention” or simply “the Convention”).

NAME OF STATE: Republic of Moldova

DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE OF 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION IN YOUR STATE:² 01 august 1998

Information for follow-up purposes

Name and title of contact person: Corneliu Tarus, Deputy Head of Family and Child Rights Protection Policies Department

Name of Authority / Office: Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family

Telephone number: +373 22 26 93 40:+373 6960 5255;

E-mail address: corneliu.tarus@mmpsf.gov.md

A. THE IMPACT OF THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION ON LAWS AND PRACTICES RELATING TO INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION IN YOUR STATE

1. Was the legislation in your State concerning intercountry adoption revised, or was new legislation enacted, as a result of, or in preparation for, implementation of the 1993 Convention? If so, please describe the main changes in practice which the revision / new legislation brought about.

During the years 1998-2010 in the Republic of Moldova, international adoption procedure was regulated in Family Code nr. 1316 XIV of October 26, 2000 and in Code of Civil Procedure nr. 225 of May 30, 2003. A key change in the procedure of international adoption was accomplished when Law number 99 of May 28, 2010 concerning the legal regime of adoption came into force, and which aims to provide the implementation of Hague Convention. At the same time, there were elaborated and approved a number of normative acts for its implementation. The implementation of new legislation lead to the change of perception and attitude towards international adoption both from behalf of the population as well as from the responsible professionals for child protection. Particularly it was realized that if the Convention provisions are effectively applied, child international adoption can be protected and accomplished only in the best interest of the child.

2. What changes, if any, did your State make to the identity and functions of the authorities and bodies involved in intercountry adoption as a result of the 1993 Convention requirements (*e.g.*, the creation / designation of new authorities / adoption bodies, different assignment of tasks)? How, if at all, have these changes affected intercountry adoption procedures in your State?

Enacted national legislation for Convention implementation transposed step by step the requests imposed to contracting states namely: there have been appointed authorities with responsibilities in the international adoption field and there were described their tasks; there were established the requirements in order to comply with the principle of subsidiarity, there was regulated the authorization procedure of foreign organizations with responsibilities in the adoption filed; there were comprehensively regulated the requirements towards PAPs as well as the steps and deadlines of international adoption procedure.

3. (a) Please indicate the number of intercountry adoptions which took place from and / or to³ your State:

- (i) in the three years prior to the entry into force of the 1993 Convention in your State

Number of intercountry adoptions *from* your State (State of origin): 199

² This information is available on the "Status Table" for the 1993 Hague Intercountry Adoption Convention, accessible via the "Intercountry Adoption Section" of the Hague Conference website, < www.hcch.net >.

³ Depending upon whether your State is a State of origin, receiving State or both.

Number of intercountry adoptions *to* your State (receiving State):

(ii) in the three years following the entry into force of the 1993 Convention
in your State

Number of intercountry adoptions *from* your State (State of origin): 350

Number of intercountry adoptions *to* your State (receiving State):

If precise figures are not available, please provide an estimate, indicating
clearly that it is an estimate.

- (b) Taking into account the figures provided in Question 3(a) above, please comment upon whether implementation of the 1993 Convention in your State has had an impact on the number of intercountry adoptions undertaken from and / or to your State. If so, please indicate, if possible, which of the principles or procedures of the 1993 Convention appear to have had a bearing on the number of intercountry adoptions undertaken (e.g., implementation of the Convention's principle of subsidiarity,⁴ increase / decrease in the number of States with which your State partners on intercountry adoption).

It is hard to say if Convention had a direct impact on the number of the international adoptions, taking into consideration that on this number had a direct impact both: demographic decline of children number in the Republic of Moldova and the number of complementary reforms in child protection field, focused especially on the prevention of abandonment and child separation from family environment and on making efforts for the reintegration of children separated from their parents in biological or extended family. Surely, it can be stated that the implementation of Convention has increased considerably the quality of procedures applied for international adoption of children.

4. In your State, has implementation of the 1993 Convention had an impact on:
- (a) The costs⁵ of intercountry adoption, including the transparency of these costs? If so, please provide details;
Please see Country Profile question 33.
- and / or
- (b) Contributions, co-operation projects and donations,⁶ including their transparency? If so, please provide details.
Please see Country Profile question 34
5. How, if at all, has implementation of the 1993 Convention in your State affected the average *time* which it takes to complete an intercountry adoption?

Please specify the causes of any change in timeframes, including whether these changes are attributable to a particular aspect of the intercountry adoption procedure and, if so, whether this aspect of the procedure takes place in your State or in other States.

Please see Country Profile question 28. The new national legal framework imposes clear terms for the realisation of all stages in the process of adoption set by the Convention, and the only problem is the duration, often exaggerated, of initiating proceedings, examination and pronouncing the decision of Courts concerning approval of adoption.

6. How, if at all, has implementation of the 1993 Convention in your State affected the processing of *non*-Convention intercountry adoptions (*i.e.*, intercountry adoptions to which the 1993 Convention does not apply)?

Practically, the children from the Republic of Moldova can be adopted internationally only by PAPs from the contracting states of Convention, fact that brought extra safety and guarantee in the process of international adoption. Please see Country Profile question 40. Even if there exists a bilateral agreement in the filed of legal cooperation with states member of the Commonwealth of Independent States, almost all these states are states of origin and not receiving state, at least concerning adoptable children from the Republic of Moldova.

⁴ See Art. 4 b) of the Convention and the *Guide to Good Practice No 1 on the implementation and operation of the 1993 Hague Intercountry Adoption Convention* at Chapter 2.1.1, available on the specialised "Intercountry Adoption Section" of the Hague Conference website < www.hcch.net >.

⁵ For a definition of the term "costs", please see the harmonised *Terminology on the financial aspects of intercountry adoption*, available on the Hague Conference website < www.hcch.net > under "Intercountry Adoption Section" then "Expert Group on the Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption".

⁶ For definitions of the terms "contributions", "co-operation projects" and "donations", please see the harmonised *Terminology on the financial aspects of intercountry adoption (ibid)*.

State of origin questions

7. (a) Have the main reasons for children becoming adoptable (whether domestically or intercountry) changed following implementation of the 1993 Convention in your State? If so, please identify those changes.

No.

- (b) Has the general profile of children in need of *intercountry* adoption in your State changed following implementation of the 1993 Convention? If so, please specify the main reasons for any change.

Yes. In the last years, due to more efficient application of subsidiarity principle and reforms promoted in the system of child protection and in the healthcare system, the rate of child abandonment decreased considerably. In the same time, due to the increase of infertility rate, the request in the filed of national adoptions which aims especially young children without special needs has increased among population. In this context, currently, the profile of children that can be adopted internationally is formed exclusively of children with special needs. Please see Country Profile question 13. In the same time we can state that there were restricted practices concerning abusive separation of brothers by national and international adoption.

- (c) Has implementation of the 1993 Convention changed the following aspects of the intercountry adoption procedure in your State?

(i) The establishment of the child's adoptability including, where appropriate, how consents are obtained from the birth parents / family / child and how consideration is given to the child's wishes and opinions: Please see Country Profile questions 10 and 11. Especially, we mention that in the same time with the application of new legislation for the implementation of Convention there were imposed barriers in order not to allow the "facilitation" of obtaining the consent for the adoption from biological parents or members of extended family.

(ii) The information provided to, and the counselling and preparation of, an adoptable child: Please see Country Profile question 14. Although, the new national legislation designed to provide the implementation of the Convention stipulates that on obtaining the consent to adoption of a child, he "must benefit from counseling from territorial authority concerning the adoption's consequences, the future adopters and he must be informed about all aspects of adoption", currently there is no methodology that could support the efficient implementation of this legal requirement.

(iii) The provision of information concerning the child to prospective adoptive parents ("PAPs") (*i.e.*, under the 1993 Convention, the preparation of the report on the child): Please see Country Profile question 20. The new legislation for the implementation of Convention ensured that the depersonalized list of adoptable children by the procedure of international adoption, being indicated the age, gender and health condition (diagnosis) of the child is available on the website of Central Authority. Currently there are elaborated reports concerning child's condition for all adoptable children but in some cases there are necessary additional actions in order to get more detailed information concerning the health condition and diagnosis of the child (especially on PAPs' requirements). The reports concerning the condition of the child are sent to PAP only after the prior matching with the adoptable child.

(iv) The matching of the child and PAPs: Please see Country Profile question 22. It is very important to mention that the new legislation for the implementation of Convention provided the establishment of a formal and transparent procedure of prior matching of PAP with the adoptable child, which excluded the possibility of promoting the interests of some foreign organization (before the approval of new legislation, there existed a situation very difficult to explain, in which of 15 foreign accredited organizations, the majority didn't perform adoptions or they performed 1-2 adoptions, while two foreign organizations, performed each more than 20 adoptions, in conditions where PAPs files were similar). Further, we need to develop an unique methodology concerning physical matching of PAP

with the child, in order for the decision of local authorities of child protection to be motivated under some well defined criteria.

- (v) The entrustment of the child to the PAPs: Please see Country Profile question 25. Once with the approval of new legal framework for the implementation of Convention there was partially removed the possibility to decide arbitrarily on time that PAP must spend with the child during the matching period. Nevertheless it is need to be developed criteria under which local authorities of child protection will set precisely the duration of stay of PAP in our state during the matching, taking into consideration the fact that current legislation provides this period to be from 30 to 90 days.
- (vi) The making of the final adoption decision: Please see Country Profile question 27. Unlike the previous legislation, the new one provides that in order to approve international adoption in court, it is compulsory to submit to the file the agreement for the continuation of international adoption procedure issued by the Central Authority which is an additional measure to safeguard the adoption.
- (vii) The transfer of the child to the receiving State: Please see Country Profile question 26.
- (viii) The post-adoption services provided (*e.g.*, when and how an adoptee may access information concerning his / her origins): Please see Country Profile question 31.
- (ix) Other, please specify: .

Receiving State questions

8. (a) How, if at all, has your State's counselling, selection and preparation of PAPs wishing to adopt *intercountry* changed following: (i) implementation of the 1993 Convention in your State; and / or (ii) if applicable, the changed profile of children in need of intercountry adoption in the States of origin with which your State partners?
- (i)
 - (ii)
- (b) Has implementation of the 1993 Convention changed the following aspects of the intercountry adoption procedure in your State?
- (i) How PAPs apply for intercountry adoption:
 - (ii) The provision of information concerning the PAPs to the State of origin (*i.e.*, under the 1993 Convention, the preparation of the report on the PAPs):
 - (iii) The procedure to accept a proposed match:
 - (iv) The migration procedures for the child:
 - (v) The post-adoption services provided:
 - (vi) Other, please specify: .

B. THE IMPACT OF THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION ON CO-OPERATION BETWEEN CONTRACTING STATES

9. Has implementation of the 1993 Convention had any influence on the choice of States with which your State "partners" in intercountry adoption (*e.g.*, due to the fact that your State has limited the number of States with which it partners or has ended co-operation with *non*-Contracting States)? If so, have these changes affected intercountry adoption procedures in your State?

Please see Country Profile question 40. The new legislation for the implementation of Convention stipulates not only cooperation with contracting states of Convention but more than that, only with those contracting states that have specialized accredited organizations that can offer assistance to PAP and children till, during and after adoption.

10. In your State's experience:

- (a) What are the most significant changes to co-operation between Contracting States brought about by the 1993 Convention? Have any of these changes led to the safeguards of the Convention being more effectively respected (see Art. 1 *b*)? If so, please provide examples.

During the last years (taking into consideration the number of achieved adoptions), it was set an efficient cooperation with the competent authorities of the USA, in the result of which there were clarified a number of issues connected to legal and institutional framework in the field of international adoption in the USA. In the same time, there were solved some problems relating to the issuance of agreement for the continuation of adoption procedure by authorities from the USA, aspect that is regulated differently in the legislation of the two countries.

- (b) What are the most significant *challenges* which remain concerning co-operation between Contracting States to the 1993 Convention?

No significant challenges.

C. THE IMPACT OF THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION OF THE ABDUCTION, SALE OF AND TRAFFIC IN CHILDREN AND OTHER ILLICIT PRACTICES⁷

11. In general, has implementation of the 1993 Convention led to more effective prevention of the abduction, sale of, or traffic in children and other illicit practices within / from / to your State in the context of intercountry adoption?

If so, please provide specific examples of measures which have been introduced in your State as a result of the 1993 Convention and their effect.

The very development of new legislative and normative framework in the field of adoption for the implementation of Convention, represents a number of important measures in order to prevent children abduction, sale and trafficking or other illegal actions. Thus, in order to secure the adoption procedure, the legislation regulates clearly the duties of competent authorities in the field of adoption, authorization in the Republic of Moldova of foreign organizations in the field of international adoption accredited in the receiving states, conditions of determining child's adoptability, PAPs' evaluation, issuance of agreements for the continuation of adoption procedure, approval of adoption only by the Court, issuance of Certificate of Conformity according to the art. 23 of Convention, issuance conditions of ID documents for adopted children, conditions to leave the country for adopted child, registration of adopted children at the diplomatic missions of the Republic of Moldova, post-adoption monitoring of children for a period of 5 years.

12. In particular, *prior to* implementation of the 1993 Convention, did your State experience, whether in your State or in other States with which your State co-operated, any of the following problems in the intercountry adoption context:

- (a) Improper payments to family members, intermediaries, officials or others;
- (b) Other improper inducements of the consent of birth parents / family to adoption;
- (c) Fraud, such as misrepresentation of identity or false promises (e.g., misrepresenting to birth parents the reason for a child's removal from his / her home);

⁷ "Illicit practices" in this Questionnaire refers to situations where a child is adopted without respect for the rights of the child or for the safeguards now contained within the 1993 Hague Convention. "Such situations may arise where an individual or body has, directly or indirectly, misrepresented information to the biological parents, falsified documents about the child's origins, engaged in the abduction, sale or trafficking of a child for the purpose of intercountry adoption, or otherwise used fraudulent methods to facilitate an adoption, regardless of the benefit obtained (financial gain or other)" (from p. 1 of the *Discussion Paper: Co-operation between Central Authorities to develop a common approach to preventing and addressing illicit practices in intercountry adoption cases*, available on the "Intercountry Adoption Section" of the Hague Conference website < www.hcch.net >).

- (d) Forgery / falsification of documents;
- (e) Abduction of children for the purposes of intercountry adoption;
- (f) Abuse of guardianship orders (*e.g.*, using such orders to remove children from a State of origin to circumvent intercountry adoption procedures);
- (g) Bypassing the matching system of a State of origin (*i.e.*, undertaking matching independently in the State of origin, without the involvement of the appropriate authorities);
- (h) Any other illicit practices?

If so, in your State's experience, has implementation of the 1993 Convention in your State *or in other States* had an impact upon the incidence and / or nature of these problems?

No above mentioned problems, but even after the ratification of the Convention, before the approval of new legislation in the field of adoption, there existed high possibility of corruption in this field considering that the representatives of foreign organizations that worked on the territory of the Republic of Moldova could have free access to protection services where were placed adoptable children taking photos and making movies with them. Also, the mentioned representatives could get in touch with the biological parents or members of extended families of children with risk of separation from the parents and children without parental care, in this way existing the risk to influence the obtaining of the consent for adoption.

D. THE IMPACT OF THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION OF INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTIONS IN YOUR STATE

13. In your State's experience:

- (a) Has the automatic recognition of adoptions made in accordance with the Convention (see Art. 1 *c*) and Chapter V) led to significant improvements for children adopted intercountry and their families?

Yes

- (b) What challenges remain regarding the automatic recognition of adoptions made in accordance with the Convention? There were not received such applications.

In particular, please specify whether either (i) your State, or (ii) any other Contracting State with which your State co-operates, requires an *additional* procedure (*e.g.*, a registration procedure or court proceeding) to be completed in order to recognise an adoption made in accordance with the Convention.

E. THE IMPACT OF THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION ON *DOMESTIC* ADOPTION AND *OTHER* MEASURES OF ALTERNATIVE CARE FOR CHILDREN IN YOUR STATE

Domestic adoption

- 14. (a) Please provide precise figures regarding the number of *domestic* adoptions which took place in your State: (i) in the three years prior to the entry into force of the 1993 Convention in your State; and (ii) in the three years following this date. If precise figures are not available, please provide an estimate, indicating clearly that it is an estimate.

- (i) No data

(ii) No data

- (b) Taking into account the figures provided in Question 14(a) above, please comment upon whether implementation of the 1993 Convention has had an impact on the number of domestic adoptions undertaken in your State. If so, please indicate, if possible, which of the principles or procedures of the 1993 Convention appear to have had a bearing on the number of domestic adoptions undertaken (*e.g.*, implementation of the Convention's principle of subsidiarity⁸ including promotion of domestic adoption, or a decrease in the number of intercountry adoptions has caused PAPs to turn to domestic adoption).

There cannot be concluded any impact of Convention implementation on the number of national adoptions, considering that the national adopters are willing to accept for adoption only very young children without health problems, while via international adoption procedure there were and are adopted children with special needs.

- (c) Has implementation of the 1993 Convention had an impact on domestic adoption *procedures* in your State? If so, please explain how the 1993 Convention brought about these changes.

The new legislation in the field of adoption provides similar procedures both for international adoption as well as for national one. Thus, the implementation of Convention and the process of reforming the system of child protection in the Republic of Moldova has lead to the fact that within the procedures of national adoption it is applied the principle of subsidiarity, it is performed the preparation and evaluation of PAPs, it is monitored post-adoption situation of the child, it is provided information exchange between competent authorities in the filed of adoption nationwide.

⁸ See Art. 4 *b*) of the Convention.

Other measures of alternative care for children

15. (a) Is there any evidence that implementation of the 1993 Convention has had an impact on the *number* of children: (i) living in institutions; or (ii) living in alternative permanent family care (other than adoption) in your State?

(i) Yes.

(ii) Yes.

If so, please set out that evidence and indicate, if possible, which of the principles or procedures of the 1993 Convention appear to have had a bearing on the number of children living in these situations (*e.g.*, the promotion of family preservation or reunification measures;⁹ in-State alternative permanent family care promotion in revised / new legislation in preference to institutionalisation).

In the new legislation in the field of adoption it is regulated a limit term for the establishment of child's adoptability and in the same time, the competent authorities are asked to comply with the principle of celerity while fulfilling any actions connected to adoption procedure.

- (b) How, if at all, has implementation of the 1993 Convention changed the *quality* of other alternative permanent family care measures available in your State for children who are deprived of parental care or at risk of being so deprived?

It is difficult to identify a direct impact of Convention implementation on quality of alternative childcare services, but definitely it can be mentioned an integrated approach within the system of child protection considering that the elaboration and implementation of new legislation in the field of adoption is performed by the same department within the Central Authority which is responsible of development and monitoring of both family type alternative care services and services of preventing child separation.

16. How, if at all, has implementation of the 1993 Convention affected your State's approach to developing and implementing measures of family preservation and / or reunification?

The new legislation for the implementation of Convention provides that determining the status of child adoptability is performed only for children who were assigned the status of child without parental care, which at its turn must be assigned to children separated from their parents no later than 6 months from the moment of taking separation decision, period during which protection authorities must take all measures for integration (reintegration) of the child into biological family or extended family. Thus, the implementation of Convention has contributed to the stimulation of the activities of authorities responsible for child protection, framing them into time limits.

F. VIEWS ON THE IMPROVEMENTS BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION AND THE CHALLENGES WHICH REMAIN

In your State

17. In your State's view:

- (a) What are the most significant *improvements* in intercountry adoption and / or child protection more generally in your State which have resulted from implementation of the 1993 Convention?

The implementation of Convention and new national legislation in the field of adoption has led to the increase of quality, transparency and security of adoption procedure,

⁹ *I.e.*, implementation of the 1993 Convention's principle of subsidiarity (Art. 4 *b*) of the Convention).

focusing of adoption on the best interest of the child, prevention of illegal practices and in the same time, wider acceptance among general population of the fact that international adoption is a feasible alternative for the protection of children without parental care.

- (b) Has implementation of the 1993 Convention had any *adverse effect(s)* on intercountry adoption and / or child protection more generally in your State?

No.

- (c) What are the most significant *challenges* which remain in your State in relation to the proper implementation and operation of the 1993 Convention?

In order to improve the quality and efficiency of implementing provisions of Convention in the Republic of Moldova, there are need to be taken the following measures:

- developing a methodology for the preparation of children for the adoption;
- developing a methodology for the physical matching of PAP with adoptable child;
- developing a methodology for the examination of opportunity of sibling separation by adoption;
- improving the quality of reports' content concerning the situation of adoptable child;
- decreasing the term of review in court of applications concerning adoption approval;
- strengthening the capacities of professionals involved in the process of adoption in order provide its quality and uniformity;
- developing international cooperation in order to facilitate the adoption of children with special needs.

Globally

18. In your State's view, *at a global level*:

- (a) What are the most significant *improvements* in intercountry adoption and / or child protection more generally which have taken place as a result of the entry into force of the 1993 Convention and its implementation in an increasing number of Contracting States over the last 20 years?

In our opinion the implementation of Convention in contracting countries has lead to practical implementation of provisions of art. 21 of UN Convention on children rights. We want to stress that a special importance and helpfulness for ensuring efficiency of Convention implementation are support tools developed by the Permanent Bureau.

- (b) Has the entry into force of the 1993 Convention and its implementation in an increasing number of Contracting States over the last 20 years had *any adverse effect(s)* on intercountry adoption and / or child protection more generally?

No.

- (c) What are the most significant *challenges* which remain today in relation to the implementation and operation of the 1993 Convention? Have these challenges changed / evolved over the past 20 years?

We consider that currently the biggest challenge is to provide uniformity in Convention application in contracting states, especially concerning the quality and content of applied tools and procedures.

G. MONITORING AND REVIEWING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF THE 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION

19. In your State's view, are the current mechanisms used to monitor and review the implementation and operation of the 1993 Convention satisfactory (*e.g.*, periodic Special Commission meetings, the development of tools to promote consistent interpretation and good practices)? Would your State consider any additional monitoring and / or review mechanisms useful?

Yes. Satisfactory. The work on tools and good practices should continue and intensified.

20. (a) Has your State benefitted from the services or assistance of the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference in relation to implementation and / or operation of the 1993 Convention? If so, please explain what service or assistance was provided and how it benefitted your State.

The Permanent Bureau has provided participation of representatives of Central Authority of the Republic of Moldova at two international conferences organized in cooperation with IRZ concerning support in international cooperation through Hague Conventions. Also, the Permanent Bureau has provided participation of representatives of Central Authority at the sessions of Special Commission aiming to strenghten significantly the knowledge of representatives of Central Authority in the field of subtleties related to the implementation of the Convention. In the same time, the experts within the Secretary of Permanent Bureau were always receptive on our non formal requests for the clarification and explanation of some specific issues related to application and implementation of Convention.

- (b) Resources permitting, what *additional* services or assistance could the Permanent Bureau provide to facilitate the proper implementation and operation of the 1993 Convention?

If your State has any other comments concerning "20 years of the 1993 Hague Convention", please provide them in the space below:

No additional comments.