

ADOPTION

Prel. Doc. No 1
Doc. préel. 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: Socialist Republic of Viet Nam

DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE OF 1993 HAGUE CONVENTION IN YOUR STATE:² 1st February, 2012.

Information for follow-up purposes

Name and title of contact person: Mr. Dang Tran Anh Tuan

Name of Authority / Office: Deputy General Director - The Department of Adoption - The Ministry of Justice.

Telephone number: +84-4-62739696

E-mail address: tuandta@moj.gov.vn

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.

In preparation for and in implementation of the 1993 Convention, Vietnam enacted a number of new pieces of legislation, e.g. the Law on Adoption 2010; Decree 19/2011/ND-CP guiding the implementation of a number of articles in the Law on Adoption.

The new legislations have brought about the following main changes in practice:

- Best interest of the child is further guaranteed, e.g. the right to live in original family of the child; intercountry adoption is allowed only when no domestic substitute family can be found.
- Illicit acts, such as obtaining illegal profit from adoption or adoption-related labor exploitation, sexual abuse or trafficking in children, are strictly prohibited.
- Financial transparency.

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?

Vietnam enacted a new statutory instrument, namely Decree 22 stipulating, among other things, that the Ministry of Justice is the Central Authority of Vietnam and its functions in the adoption area. Under Decision No. 3139 of the Justice Minister, the Department of Adoption is the body assisting the Minister in the implementation of duties of the Central Authority.

Such changes have established a focal point of intercountry adoption that facilitates intercountry settlements in Vietnam in the best interest of the child and in accordance with the 1993 Convention and the law of Vietnam.

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

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 *from* your State (State of origin):
approximately 2,479

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):
approximately 1,116

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).

There has been a sharp reduction of Vietnamese children adopted overseas since Vietnam acceded to the 1993 Convention. However, the number of overseas adopted Vietnamese children with special needs has increased significantly. Principle of subsidiarity under the 1993 Convention has, to a certain extent, affected the number of Vietnamese children adopted overseas.

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;

Yes. Under the adoption law of Vietnam, for each intercountry adoption, PAPs are required to pay VND 9,000,000 as registration fee for intercountry adoption and VND 50,000,000 as expenses for intercountry adoption settlement. Any individual or organization in connection with intercountry adoption is not allowed to pay or collect any costs or expenses other than the said fee and expenses.

and / or

- (b) Contributions, co-operation projects and donations,⁶ including their transparency? If so, please provide details.

Yes. Since the Law on Adoption and the 1993 Convention entered into force, humanitarian support has dropped down significantly. Most of licensed foreign adoption service providers no longer provide humanitarian support for Vietnamese children. Recently, few providers, such as those from Italia and Switzerland have provided humanitarian support. However, under the Law, there must be a clear cut between the support and intercountry adoption.

With regard to donation, post-adoption donation hasn't been provided by the law of Vietnam. However, general donation for the purposes of nurture, care for and education of children, especially children with special needs via programs, projects or other forms, is encouraged by the law of Vietnam.

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.

Yes. Completion of an intercountry adoption takes four to six times longer than before the implementation of the 1993 Convention (180 days for a normal child and 120 days for a child with special needs as compared with only 30 days before the implementation of the Convention).

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)*.

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)?

The implementation of the 1993 Hague Convention does not affect processing of non-Convention intercountry adoptions. However, non-Convention intercountry adoptions are processed in accordance with the law of Viet Nam, which also require certain standards as set forth in the Convention, and the law of the receiving states.

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.

Yes, they have. Such changes are:

- Many Vietnamese PAPs want to adopt Vietnamese children.
- The socio-economic situation has improved in Vietnam.
- Principle of subsidiarity is applied.
- Clear cut between humanitarian support and intercountry adoption

- (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. The main reasons for the change are:

- Domestic PAPs prefer healthy children.
- Intercountry adoption procedures applicable to children with special needs have been streamlined.
- Principle of subsidiarity is respected.

- (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: Adoption dossier is subjected to careful scrutiny/examination by competent authorities (with respect to, but not limited to, origin of the child, consent of the child's birth parents or guardian, the child's consent). Competent authority of the receiving state is informed of the matching result. Adoptability shall be established if consent from competent authority of the receiving state is made and informed.

(ii) The information provided to, and the counselling and preparation of, an adoptable child: An adoptable child is provided with certain counselling and preparation.

(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): personal information, health conditions, special notes if any, etc. on the child are included in the child report, which is sent to the authority of the receiving country and the PAPs.

(iv) The matching of the child and PAPs: The matching is required under the Law and in accordance with the 1993 Convention.

(v) The entrustment of the child to the PAPs: No change. Before the entry into force of the 1993 Convention to Vietnam, the entrustment was required.

(vi) The making of the final adoption decision: The final decision shall be issued if the authority of Viet Nam receives the written consent of the authority of the receiving State that the latter shall continue the procedure and permit the Vietnamese child to enter and reside permanently in that State. The final decision has legal effect as of the date it is recorded in the Adoption Register. The adoptive parents and the adopted child shall, as of the date of registration, have rights and obligations under their parental relationship in accordance with the Vietnamese law.

- (vii) The transfer of the child to the receiving State: No change. After the entrustment, the adoptive parents themselves shall transfer the child to the receiving State.
- (viii) The post-adoption services provided (*e.g.*, when and how an adoptee may access information concerning his / her origins): Viet Nam is now drafting a statutory instrument on monitoring of the development of overseas adopted Vietnamese children and protection of the children in case of necessity. Accordingly, adopted children will be provided with support to keep their cultural relationship with Viet Nam via Vietnamese cultural activities or events organized by the Department of Adoption, the Ministry of Justice in collaboration with foreign adoption service providers. In addition, adopters and adult adoptees may request for information of the origins of the adoptees. A request shall be sent to the Department of Adoption, the Ministry of Justice via a foreign adoption service provider or the Central Authority of the state where the adoptee has his/her domicile/habitual residence. The Department of Adoption shall also provide support and assistance to the adoptees if they want to visit Viet Nam at the request of the adopters or the adoptees.
- (ix) Other, please specify: The procedure to notify the matching result has changed. Upon making assessment on the matching result, which is conducted by the province-level Justice Department, the Department of Adoption shall send the matching result to the Central Authority of the receiving State. The Central Authority shall notify to the Department of Adoption the consent of the PAPs to the introduced child and verify that the child is allowed to enter and reside permanently in that State. After the consent of the Central Authority of the receiving State is made and sent to the Department of Adoption, the adoption procedure shall continue in Viet Nam.

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?

The implementation of the 1993 Convention hasn't had any influence on the choice of states with which Vietnam "partners" in intercountry adoption. For the best interest of the child, Vietnam does not limit the number of states that wish to establish intercountry cooperation with Vietnam, including non-Contracting states. All the states that have so far established such cooperation with are all Contracting States.

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.

The most significant change to cooperation between Contracting States brought about by the 1993 Convention is method to establish the cooperation, i.e. conclusion of bilateral agreements or exchange of notes to facilitate/improve the application of the 1993 Convention, instead of bilateral agreements on intercountry adoption cooperation. Such change has further guaranteed the best interest of the child and fought the child abduction and trafficking. For example, the bilateral agreement concluded between the Central Authority of Vietnam and the Central Authority of Québec on the application of administrative procedures in intercountry adoption has specified a close collaboration on the settlement of intercountry adoptions and the monitoring of development of the adopted children.

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

The most significant challenges are:

- Divergent intercountry adoption systems. For example, Australia does not have any adoption service provider accredited to operate in other countries while such providers play an important role in supporting PAPs and assisting the Central Authorities of states of origin and receiving states in the monitoring of development of adopted children.
- The number of children introduced for intercountry adoption is limited.

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.

Yes, it has. For example, before its accession to the 1993 Convention, Vietnam witnessed very few intercountry adoption cases where documents proving the origin of the child were falsified. Since the Convention came into force, this illicit practice has come to an end. Under the Law on Adoption, origin of the abandoned child introduced for adoption shall be subjected to verification by police.

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;

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 >).

- (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);
- (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?

Vietnam experienced very few cases of forgery/falsification of documents. However, the implementation of the 1993 Convention has resolved this problem.

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, it has. It helps streamlining the intercountry adoption procedures while the best interest of the child and the adoptive parents' rights are protected.

- (b) What challenges remain regarding the automatic recognition of adoptions made in accordance with the Convention? The automatic recognition of adoptions is a major step forward. However, due to divergent legal systems between contracting states, the adoption granted in the state of origin, though having the effect of terminating a pre-existing legal parent-child relationship, is still subject to the recognition procedure in the receiving state, which often takes time.

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) Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
(ii) Quantity	3054	2399	2023	2607	2665	2924

- (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).

The implementation of the Hague Convention 1993 hasn't impacted significantly to the number of domestic adoptions in Vietnam. Since the Hague Convention 1993 came into effect, the number of domestic adoptions in Vietnam has increased slightly, though the Law on adoption incorporated the principle of subsidiarity under the Convention.

- (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.

No, it hasn't.

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. Separation of humanitarian support from adoption has reduced the number of children living in institutions since such institutions do not have sufficient resources to take care of children.

(ii) living in alternative permanent family care: no evidence.

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).

- (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?

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?

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?

- Vietnam's adoption-related legislation has been much improved and close to be compatible with international standards on protection of the rights of the child;
- Automatic recognition of adoptions;
- A great number of Vietnamese children with special needs who have no chance to find alternative domestic families, have been adopted by foreign families and enjoyed advanced medical conditions;
- Intercountry adoption cooperation between Vietnam and other Contracting States strengthened in the best interest of the child.

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

The number of intercountry adoptions reduced at the beginning of the implementation of the Convention in Vietnam due to that stateholders did not fully catch up with new

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

legislative changes. Recently, the number of intercountry adoptions has increased gradually.

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

- Inadequate perception of the implementation of the 1993 Convention and the Law on Adoption.

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?

Vietnamese children have found the most suitable alternative families, and their rights and interest are well protected.

- (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?

The number of intercountry adoptions has decreased significantly.

- (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?

Inadequate perception of agencies, organizations, individuals involving the implementation of the 1993 Convention.

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, they are, especially Guide to Good Practice No. 1 and Guide to Good Practice No. 2.

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.

No, we haven't.

(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: