

ADOPTION

Prel. Doc. No 2  
Doc. préel. No 2

October / octobre 2014



**QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRACTICAL OPERATION  
OF THE 1993 HAGUE INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION CONVENTION**

*drawn up by the Permanent Bureau*

*Preliminary Document No 2 of October 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 2 de octobre 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*

Churchillplein 6b, 2517 JW The Hague - La Haye | The Netherlands - Pays-Bas  
☎ +31 (70) 363 3303 📠 +31 (70) 360 4867 | secretariat@hcch.net | www.hcch.net

Asia Pacific Regional Office - Bureau régional Asie-Pacifique | S.A.R. of Hong Kong - R.A.S. de Hong Kong | ☎ +852 2858 9912  
Latin American Regional Office - Bureau régional Amérique latine | Buenos Aires | Argentina – Argentine | ☎ +54 (11) 4310 8372

## INTRODUCTION

This Questionnaire is the second and last to be prepared for the purposes of the upcoming meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1993 Hague Convention.<sup>1</sup> The first Questionnaire (Prel. Doc. No 1 of July 2014) requested information from Contracting States concerning the impact which implementation of the 1993 Convention has had on laws and practices relating to intercountry adoption and child protection systems more generally over the past 20 years. That information was sought in order to inform the first day of the Special Commission meeting which will be dedicated to "20 years of the 1993 Convention". This second Questionnaire is the more usual questionnaire on the practical operation of the 1993 Convention. It seeks to elicit information from States concerning their current practices and any problems and / or challenges they may have faced in relation to the implementation and operation of the Convention.

This Questionnaire is addressed to Contracting States to the 1993 Convention. As a result, non-Contracting States (whether Members of the Hague Conference on Private International Law or not) should not feel bound to respond but may provide a response or any comment should they so wish. In addition, please note that questions are addressed to both States of origin and receiving States, save where a heading expressly provides otherwise.

Please send your response to this Questionnaire to [secretariat@hcch.net](mailto:secretariat@hcch.net), for the attention of Laura Martínez-Mora (Principal Legal Officer) and Hannah Baker (Senior Legal Officer) **by no later than 22 December 2014**. The Permanent Bureau will place all replies to this Questionnaire on the Hague Conference website < [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) > unless expressly asked not to do so.

Please note: if information provided by your State in response to the first Questionnaire (Prel. Doc. No 1) or your State's Country Profile for the 1993 Hague Convention assists with your answer to any question herein, please cross-refer to these other responses. There is no need to repeat information.

Thank you for your kind co-operation as the Permanent Bureau prepares for the next Special Commission meeting in June 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Fourth Meeting of the Special Commission will take place in June 2015. 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").

<b>Name of State:</b>	The Netherlands
<b>Date of entry into force of 1993</b>	1-X-1998
<b>Hague Convention in your State:</b>	
<b><u>Information for follow-up purposes</u></b>	
Name and title of contact person:	
Name of Authority / Office:	Central Authority International Children's Issues
Telephone number:	+31 70 3706252
E-mail address:	adoptie@minvenj.nl

## I. ADOPTABLE CHILDREN, ADOPTees AND PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE PARENTS<sup>2</sup>

### A. Adoptable children and adoptees

#### *The profile of children in need of intercountry adoption*

##### States of origin only

1. Please explain any *challenges* your State has encountered, and any *good practices*<sup>3</sup> it has developed, in relation to the compilation and provision of information to receiving States regarding the:

- (a) characteristics and needs of adoptable children in your State;<sup>4</sup> and
- (b) approximate number of children in need of intercountry adoption in your State.

Not applicable

##### Receiving States only

2. Please explain any challenges your State has encountered in ensuring that:
  - (a) the *nature* and *number* of applications for intercountry adoption which your State sends to States of origin appropriately match the profile of children in need of intercountry adoption in those States;<sup>5</sup> and
  - (b) the information provided by States of origin concerning the characteristics, needs and number of adoptable children is adequately taken into account in the counselling and preparation of prospective adoptive parents ("PAPs").<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Part I of this Questionnaire has been prepared in light of Conclusion and Recommendation No 10 from the 2010 Special Commission meeting which states: "The Special Commission recommended that the Permanent Bureau, in consultation with Contracting States and non-governmental organisations, collect information on the selection, counselling and preparation of prospective adoptive parents, with a view to the possible development of the Guide to Good Practice No 3. This may include a discussion on good practices in dealing with failed adoptions and the period of validity of the 'home study' report." Please note: hereinafter, Conclusions and Recommendations from past Special Commission meetings are referred to as "SC 20XX C&R No X". All Conclusions and Recommendations are available on the Hague Conference website < [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) > under "Intercountry Adoption Section" then "Special Commissions".

<sup>3</sup> In this Questionnaire, "good practices" should be given a broad meaning and should be taken to include any legislative reform, procedures or practices which your State might have implemented regarding the particular topic.

<sup>4</sup> See SC 2005 C&R No 12 which states: "[t]he Special Commission recognises the importance of States of origin sending information to receiving States on the needs of children to better identify prospective adoptive parents". Please note that the Country Profile for States of origin requests that States of origin provide information concerning the profile of adoptable children (at question 9) and thus it may be that your State has encountered challenges in responding to this question which you wish to describe here.

<sup>5</sup> See para. 553 of *Guide to Good Practice No 2 "Accreditation and Adoption Accredited Bodies: General Principles and Guide to Good Practice"* ("GGP No 2") which states that receiving States should respect "the requirements of States of origin regarding the profile and number of adoptable children, as well as the desired profile of prospective adoptive parents".

<sup>6</sup> See SC 2005 C&R No 13: "[t]he Special Commission recognises that as a matter of good practice, authorities in receiving States should co-operate with authorities in States of origin in order to better understand the needs of children in States of origin", and SC 2010 C&R No 8: "States of origin may assist receiving States in establishing their criteria for the selection of prospective adoptive parents by providing information about the

Please also share any good practices your State has developed in this regard.

(a) It is up to the Dutch accredited bodies to verify the nature and number of applications needed in the states of origin. The accredited bodies perform this duty in their contacts with their partner organizations and/or Centrale Authorities.

(b) Based on the information obtained from the States of origin, prospective adoptive parents (PAP's) are informed in general about the characteristics, needs and number of adoptable children by the Foundation Adoption Services in the Netherlands. Secondly the accredited bodies in the Netherlands inform the PAP's about the characteristics, needs and number of adoptable children in the State of origin PAP's wish to adopt from. For this reason the accredited bodies are in regular contact with the States of origin and inform the Foundation Adoption Services about the developments. This item is often subject of exchange of information during regular meetings with all partners in the adoption process.

## **Adoptability**

### Both States of origin and receiving States

3. (a) Please briefly describe any difficulties your State has encountered in relation to the decision regarding a child's adoptability, including the transparency of any such decision and the independence of the body taking this decision.<sup>7</sup>

It is a duty for the Dutch accredited bodies to check the decision made in the State of origin regarding the child's adoptability and the way in which the subsidiarity principle was taken into account. This also includes the transparency of the decision. The accredited body takes this into account when making a recommendation to the Dutch Central Authority with regard to whether or not to accept the matching proposal. When there are doubts with regard to the decision of the child's adoptability and the transparency of the process, it is up to the Central Authority to accept or reject the matching proposal. Occasionally it happens that a matching proposal is rejected.

- (b) Has your State encountered any particular difficulties with adoptability decisions in the context of *intra-family* intercountry adoptions? If so, please explain.

not applicable

## **Reports on children**

### Both States of origin and receiving States

4. Please explain any challenges your State has encountered in preparing (States of origin) or obtaining (receiving States) full, accurate and up-to-date reports, including medical reports, on adoptable children in accordance with Article 16(1) a).<sup>8</sup> Please specify any particular difficulties encountered in the case of children with "special needs".<sup>9</sup>

The information obtained from some States of origin is not always complete, accurate and up to date. It is then up to the Dutch accredited bodies to request additional information. When the information eventually gathered about adoptable children is not in compliance with the minimum standards as agreed upon by the Dutch accredited bodies and the Dutch Central Authority, a matching proposal will not be accepted. The aspect is the more important when it concerns information about children with special needs. It is both in the interest of the child and the PAP's when PAP's have the

---

characteristics and needs of adoptable children. This information will also contribute to the development of preparation materials on intercountry adoption directed to prospective adoptive parents, and to the management of their expectations."

<sup>7</sup> See SC 2010 C&R No 1 b).

<sup>8</sup> *E.g.*, concerning children's physical and psychological health, identity or social situation.

<sup>9</sup> You may wish to cross-refer to your State's Country Profile at question 13 (States of origin) and question 11 (receiving States) concerning your State's definition of children with "special needs".

opportunity to have a full picture of the needs of the child in order to take a responsible decision whether or not to adopt the child.

Receiving States only

5. (a) If reports on children appear deficient or incomplete, what measures, if any, does your State take to remedy or ameliorate the situation?

See the answer to question 4.

- (b) Please specify how, in your State's view, reports on children provided in accordance with Article 16(1) a) could be improved in general.

There should be a minimum standard that the reports on children are not older than one year and States of Origin should be encouraged to make use of the recommended model form for the medical report on the child.

**Matching**

Both States of origin and receiving States

6. Has your State had any experience of cases in which PAPs are declared eligible and suited to adopt a particular profile of child(ren) but are subsequently matched with a child or children with different needs? (*E.g.*, PAPs are declared eligible and suited to adopt a child under the age of 5 but are subsequently matched with siblings aged 7 and 9.) If so, please explain, in your State's experience, the reasons for this and how your State has dealt with such cases.

Yes. A reason may be that there is not a child adoptable that meets the profile for which PAP's are found eligible and suited. In such case, the matching proposal will be rejected. In case PAP's indicate that they are prepared to adopt a child with different needs, the Child Care and Protection Agency in the Netherlands is requested to judge the eligibility and suitability of the PAP's for a child with such different needs.

**Preparation and counselling of children**

Both States of origin and receiving States

7. Please share (a) any *challenges* encountered in your State or in other Contracting States, and (b) any *good practices* implemented in your State or in other Contracting States, regarding the preparation of children for intercountry adoption, including counselling and informing children and ensuring that, having regard to their age and degree of maturity, their wishes and opinions have been adequately heard and taken into account.

No such information available

**B. Prospective adoptive parents ("PAPs")**

***Selection of PAPs: eligibility and suitability to adopt intercountry***

Both States of origin and receiving States

8. Please explain any challenges your State has encountered, and any good practices it has developed, in relation to preparing (receiving States) or obtaining (States of origin) full, accurate and up-to-date reports on PAPs, as required by Article 15, including eligibility and suitability assessments of PAPs.

It is in the Netherlands a continuing process to follow the developments in the States of origin regarding characteristics and needs of adoptable children. This information is needed to develop

instruments with which the suitability and eligibility of PAP's can be judged to meet these characteristics and needs of adoptable children. It is up to the Dutch accredited bodies to gather such information and to share the information with the partners in the adoption process. According to Dutch legislation a home study report has a validity of four years, but an update can be provided on request of the State of origin.

States of origin only

9. (a) If reports on PAPs appear deficient or incomplete, what measures if any does your State take to remedy or ameliorate the situation?

Not applicable

- (b) Please specify how, in your State's view, reports on PAPs provided by receiving States in accordance with Article 15 could be improved in general.

Not applicable

***Counselling and preparation of PAPs***

States of origin only

10. (a) Has your State encountered any difficulties resulting from inadequate counselling and preparation of PAPs by receiving States? If so, please provide examples and explain what measures your State takes to remedy or ameliorate the situation in these cases.

Not applicable

- (b) In your State's experience, what could be done to improve the counselling and preparation of PAPs in general?

Not applicable

Receiving States only

11. What are the main challenges your State encounters when counselling and preparing PAPs for an intercountry adoption?<sup>10</sup> Please share any good practices your State has developed to address these challenges.

The main challenge is the fact that an increasing number of children available for intercountry adoption are children with special needs. As mentioned in response to question 8, it is up to the accredited bodies to follow the developments with regard to these special needs and to share this information with all parties in the adoption process. In spite of the efforts of the accredited bodies not all information about these special needs is available on beforehand. It regularly happens that, when meeting the child, the medical and/or psychosocial situation of the child differs from the information in the report. This knowledge is very helpful for the counselling and preparation of the PAP's to expect the unexpected.

---

<sup>10</sup> You may wish to refer to your State's response to the Country Profile at question 15. *E.g.*, managing their expectations concerning the profile of adoptable children or waiting times, ensuring preparation materials / courses adequately prepare PAPs for the specific needs of an adoptable child.

12. The Special Commission has previously emphasised “the need for country specific preparation and for prospective adoptive parents to have some knowledge of the culture of the child and his or her language in order to communicate with the child from the matching stage”.<sup>11</sup> How does your State ensure that this recommendation is complied with? Does your State have any good practices to recommend in this regard?

In this respect the Dutch accredited bodies are in the position to provide PAP's with country specific information, to encourage them to learn the language of the country they wish to adopt from and to prepare them for the adoption of a child from that specific State.

13. How does your State deal with the waiting time between:
- (a) the eligibility and suitability assessment of PAPs and the transmission of their application to the State of origin?

Since the number of PAP's wishing to adopt has decreased, there is in general not much waiting time anymore between assessment and the transmission of the application to the State of origin.

and

- (b) the transmission of the PAPs' application to the State of origin and the receipt of the proposed match from the State of origin?<sup>12</sup> (*E.g.*, does your State routinely update the reports on PAPs in this period?<sup>13</sup> Does your State, or the relevant adoption accredited body, engage in regular communication with the State of origin on this issue?)

During this waiting period the PAP's are regularly informed about the state of affairs by the accredited bodies.

#### **C. Intercountry adoptions involving children with special needs<sup>14</sup>**

##### Both States of origin and receiving States

14. (a) In your State's experience, what are the most common “special needs” of children adopted intercountry?

In general the major part of the children with special needs has een socio-emotional defect. Secondly a large part of children has a high medical risk, due to premature birth and/or malnutrition.

- (b) If possible, please specify approximately what percentage of children adopted intercountry from or to your State<sup>15</sup> have “special needs” (as defined by your State)?

In 2013: 61%, in 2014 75%.

- (c) What measures, if any, has your State taken to adapt intercountry adoption procedures in light of the needs of these children?

improve the counselling and preparation of PAP's as well as the judgement of their suitability and eligibility. Secondly improve the post-adoption support (see the response to question 14 (d)).

- (d) What are the main challenges which your State encounters in relation to the intercountry adoption of children with special needs? How does your State address those challenges?

<sup>11</sup> See SC 2010 C&R No 9.

<sup>12</sup> Your State may engage in a “reversal of the flow of files” with States of origin or other procedures such that waiting times are minimised: see further *Guide to Good Practice No 1 “The Implementation and Operation of the 1993 Intercountry Adoption Convention”* (“GGP No 1”) at Chapter 7.3.3, para. 394.

<sup>13</sup> You may wish to refer to your State's response to the Country Profile at question 17 d).

<sup>14</sup> See note 9 above regarding your State's definition of “special needs”.

<sup>15</sup> Depending upon whether your State is a State of origin or a receiving State.

As of 2015 a paediatrician will be involved to advise the accredited body about the medical and psychosocial situation of the child at the matching stage; the institutionalizing of a medical evaluation of the child shortly after its arrival in the Netherlands and a psychosocial evaluation of the child after six months to a year after its arrival in the Netherlands. These measures are meant to have an early picture of the development of the child and its attachment to the adoptive parents. In this way assistance at an early stage can be offered in order to prevent problems at a later stage.

#### Receiving States only

15. In relation to the intercountry adoption of children with special needs, how does your State ensure that:

- (a) the parenting abilities of PAPs and their ability to cope with the particular special needs are appropriately assessed?

By following the developments regarding the characteristics of the medical and psychosocial needs of the children and by constantly improving the counselling and preparation of the PAP's in this regard.

- (b) any PAPs selected are suitably prepared for such adoptions and for the specific needs of each child?

This is done by constantly evaluating and improving the way the homestudy is performed to judge the suitability and eligibility of the PAP's on the basis of the information mentioned under 15(a).

- (c) adoptive families are provided with appropriate post-adoption support in light of the child's special needs?

See the answer to question 14(d).

#### **D. Post-adoption services for adoptees and adoptive parents**

##### Both States of origin and receiving States

16. How, if at all, has your State implemented the recommendation of the 2010 Special Commission meeting that States should "provide different forms of assistance and counselling for different stages of the child's development to adulthood, including preparation for origin searches and reunions of the adoptees with members of their biological families"?<sup>16</sup>

As mentioned in response to question 14(d), a psychosocial evaluation of the child after six months to a year after its arrival in the Netherlands is introduced to obtain an early picture of the development of the child and its attachment to the adoptive parents. When needed, assistance at an early stage can be provided in order to prevent problems at a later stage. This service is offered by the Foundation Adoption Services. This Foundation is also responsible for further adoption aftercare whenever required and, in case it is needed, reference to specific experts. In the Netherlands origin searches and reunions of adoptees with members of their biological families are the responsibility of the accredited bodies.

##### Receiving States only

17. Please specify any challenges your State has encountered in ensuring that adequate support is in place for adoptive parents and adoptees following an intercountry adoption, including where parents have adopted a child with special needs.<sup>17</sup> Please also share any good practices your State has developed to overcome these

<sup>16</sup> SC 2010 C&R No 29.

<sup>17</sup> E.g., difficulties coping with an increased demand for post-adoption services or with a need for more specialised services, or difficulties in determining how services should be funded. You may wish to cross-refer to your State's response to the Country Profile at Part IX concerning the services and support which your State provides.

challenges.

See the responses to question 11.

## E. Breakdown of intercountry adoptions

### Both States of origin and receiving States

18. If your State has had experience of intercountry adoptions which have broken down subsequent to the adoption (sometimes referred to as "failed" or "disrupted" adoptions), please explain, in general terms:

- (a) what have been the main causes of the breakdowns in these cases (e.g., deficient reports on the child, including failure to identify specific physical or psychological health needs in the report, inadequate preparation of the child or PAPs, inadequate post-adoption support).

The Central Authority of the Netherlands has no concrete picture of the cases where adoptions have broken down. The impression is however that, apart from specific personal circumstances of the PAP's, disruptions may be the result of the situation that the real medical and psychosocial situation of the child differs from the information that was available in the report, on which basis the matching was performed.

- (b) how your State has *addressed* these situations. Does your State have any good practices to share in this regard?

See the response to question 14(d)

- (c) what steps, if any, your State has taken to try to *prevent* these situations occurring in future.

See the response to question 15(a).

## F. Open adoption

### Both States of origin and receiving States

19. Does the term "open adoption" (or similar) exist in your State's domestic legislation or rules? If so, please explain how it is defined. If not, please explain what is understood in your State by the term "open adoption" or "openness in adoption".

The term "open adoption" does not exist in Dutch domestic law. In the Netherlands open adoption can be seen as the possibility for the adoptee and adoptive parents to have contact with the biological parents.

20. Please specify what type of openness in intercountry adoption is: (a) permitted according to your State's domestic *legislation or rules*; and (b) promoted *in practice* in your State.<sup>18</sup>

As indicated in the response to question 19, the term "open adoption" does not exist in Dutch law. It is also not promoted or encouraged in practice.

21. If possible, please specify approximately what percentage of intercountry adoptions involving your State include some element of openness. Has this number increased in recent years and, if so, what, in your State's view, are the reasons for this? What challenges have arisen as a result and how has your State sought to address these challenges?

Not applicable

## G. Discussion at the upcoming Special Commission meeting

---

<sup>18</sup> E.g., disclosure of identities of biological and adoptive families, post-adoption contact.

Both States of origin and receiving States

22. Which topics / issues does your State consider are the most important to discuss at the Special Commission in relation to the counselling and preparation of children and the selection,<sup>19</sup> counselling and preparation of PAPs for intercountry adoption?

No specific topics

23. Does your State consider that there is any merit in developing a Guide to Good Practice on the selection, counselling and preparation of PAPs for intercountry adoption, as recommended by the last meeting of the Special Commission in 2010, and on the preparation and counselling of children?<sup>20</sup> If so, which particular issues would your State wish to see addressed in such a Guide?

For some States this may be helpful. The existing Guides to Good Practice however already provide in information about the topics mentioned.

## **II. SOME SPECIFIC ISSUES ARISING IN THE INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION PROCEDURE**

### **A. Article 17 agreements**

Both States of origin and receiving States

24. Please indicate any operational difficulties which your State has experienced, either in your State or in other Contracting States, in relation to obtaining the agreements required in Article 17 and, in particular, Article 17 c).<sup>21</sup>

No operational difficulties encountered

### **B. Recognition of adoptions made in accordance with the Convention (Chapter V)<sup>22</sup>**

Both States of origin and receiving States

25. (a) Previous Special Commission meetings<sup>23</sup> have repeatedly emphasised the importance of:

- clearly designating the authorities competent to issue Article 23 certificates and keeping this information updated;
- promptly issuing such certificates without delay following an adoption decision made in accordance with the Convention;

<sup>19</sup> The "selection" of PAPs in this context is taken to mean the assessment of the PAPs' eligibility and suitability to adopt intercountry.

<sup>20</sup> See SC 2010 C&R No 10 (*op. cit.* note 2).

<sup>21</sup> *E.g.*, lack of clarity concerning the body which should provide the Art. 17 c) agreement, breakdown of State-to-State communications concerning the agreement, lack of clarity concerning which State should provide its agreement first.

<sup>22</sup> When answering this section, you may wish to cross-refer to your State's response to question 13 of Questionnaire No 1.

<sup>23</sup> *E.g.*, see SC 2000 C&Rs Nos 17 to 19, SC 2005 C&R No 3 and SC 2010 C&Rs Nos 15 to 17.

- providing parents with a copy of the Article 23 certificate before they come to take the child;
- providing a copy of the certificate to the Central Authority in the receiving State;
- using the "Model Form for the Certificate of Conformity of Intercountry Adoption"<sup>24</sup> to promote consistent practice; and
- where an Article 23 certificate is incomplete or defective, co-operating to regularise the situation.

Despite the above recommendations, has your State continued to experience difficulties with the issuance or receipt of certificates of conformity under Article 23?<sup>25</sup> If so, please explain the difficulties encountered, including how your State has sought to remedy or ameliorate the situation.

No operational difficulties encountered.

- (b) Taking into account the previous recommendations made on this topic, does your State have any novel suggestions concerning how to improve practices regarding Article 23 certificates?<sup>26</sup>

No suggestion.

### C. Delays in intercountry adoption procedures

#### Both States of origin and receiving States

26. Does your State have any comments on the speed with which Convention adoptions are processed?<sup>27</sup> If your State has experienced any unnecessary delays, what has caused these delays and are they at a particular stage of the intercountry adoption procedure?

As mentioned in response to question 4, the information obtained from some States of origin about the situation of the child is not always complete, accurate and up to date. Gathering additional information causes delays, especially when the requested information is not available.

27. Does your State have any good practices to share or recommendations as to how delays in the intercountry adoption procedure might be minimised, whilst still ensuring that the safeguards of the Convention are respected?

No.

### D. Co-operation issues

#### Both States of origin and receiving States

28. In your State's experience, is the day-to-day co-operation with other Contracting States working well (*e.g.*, sending and receiving documents,<sup>28</sup> prompt responses to

<sup>24</sup> See GGP No 1, Annex 7.

<sup>25</sup> *E.g.*, deficient or no certificates issued, delays in sending certificates, confusion concerning which authorities should issue the certificate, confusion concerning to whom the certificates should be sent.

<sup>26</sup> *E.g.*, how to better promote the use of the Recommended Form, ensure designations under Art. 23.

<sup>27</sup> See SC 2005 C&R No 14: "[t]he Special Commission reminds States Parties to the Convention of their obligations under Article 35 to act expeditiously in the process of adoption, and notes in particular the need to avoid unnecessary delay in finding a permanent family for the child".

<sup>28</sup> *E.g.*, has your State encountered any difficulties due to other Contracting States requesting documents / information which your State is not permitted to provide according to your domestic legislation, or due to your State requesting documents / information from other Contracting States which they are not permitted to

enquiries and questions, openness to discussing problems and finding solutions)? Please specify any difficulties and concerns.

In some States the information about the children is not always complete, accurate and up to date. Requests for an update or for additional information are not promptly dealt with in the State of origin.

29. At the meeting of the Special Commission in 2000, “[t]he need for adequate resources and appropriately trained staff in Central Authorities was accepted, as well as the importance of ensuring a reasonable level of continuity in their operations.”<sup>29</sup> Has your State continued to encounter difficulties in this regard, whether in your State or in other Contracting States?

Occasionally the Central Authority of the Netherlands has encountered difficulties with the lack of continuity within the Central Authority of a State of origin or with the lack of a Central Authority in a State of origin.

30. Has your State made or received from other Central Authorities any “general evaluation reports” about experiences with intercountry adoption as specified in Article 9 d)?

If so, have these reports proved useful? Please explain to what use they have been put and the follow up undertaken.

If not, does your State consider that the preparation of such reports should be encouraged as helpful in promoting the regular review of practices and co-operation between States?

No. Providing such report may be helpful, but the provision of such reports does not have priority for the Netherlands.

What may be mentioned in this regard is, that the Central Authority of the Netherlands is regularly confronted with questions from other Central authorities about certain aspects of the operation of the convention.

### **III. SPECIFIC TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **A. The subsidiarity principle (Art. 4 b))**

##### Both States of origin and receiving States

31. Please describe the laws, procedures and practices in your State which seek to ensure that an appropriate balance is struck between providing sufficient support to biological families to enable the family to be preserved or reunified where possible, while at the same time preventing excessive delay in declaring a child adoptable and finding a suitable alternative permanent family for the child if necessary.

Not applicable

##### States of origin only

32. What are the main challenges in implementing and applying the subsidiarity principle in intercountry adoption cases in your State?

---

provide (such as identities of biological parents, statements of consent, judgments regarding the withdrawal of parental rights, medical reports on PAPs)?

<sup>29</sup> See SC 2000 C&R No 3.

Not applicable

33. In your State, is the subsidiarity principle applied in the same manner to:

- (i) *intra-family* intercountry adoptions; and
- (ii) intercountry adoptions concerning children with *special needs*?

If not, please describe any different procedures used and explain the reasons for the different procedures.

Not applicable

Receiving States only

34. (a) In accordance with the principle of co-responsibility,<sup>30</sup> what information, if any, does your State routinely request *in each intercountry adoption case* to ensure that the subsidiarity principle has been respected in the State of origin?

The information that is required in the Netherlands is how the subsidiarity principle was respected in the State of origin. In other words what has been done to keep the child in its own family environment or in its own State before intercountry adoption was considered.

- (b) Is it possible and / or common in your State for a proposed matching of child and PAPs to be rejected on the basis that the relevant competent authority / body is not satisfied that the subsidiarity principle has been respected in the particular case?

Yes.

35. In some States of origin, the child protection infrastructure necessary to implement the subsidiarity principle does not exist or is severely deficient, making proper implementation of the Convention in this respect challenging. Does your State undertake any programmes to assist States of origin with the development of their child protection systems<sup>31</sup> in order for them to better implement the subsidiarity principle either:

- (a) at State level (*e.g.*, in the form of development aid or technical assistance)?  
In such case the Netherlands promote technical assistance through ICATAP.

and / or

- (b) through other bodies such as non-governmental organisations (which are not adoption accredited bodies)?

No

If so, please specify how it is ensured that any such programmes do not compromise the integrity of intercountry adoption procedures and / or result in a dependence upon these forms of assistance:

For the Netherlands this is ensured by subventing ICATAP, such as was done in relation to

Haïti.

## **B. Mobility and globalisation**

### Both States of origin and receiving States

<sup>30</sup> See, *e.g.*, Chapter 12 of GGP No 2.

<sup>31</sup> See SC 2000 C&R No 10, which stated that "[r]eceiving countries are encouraged to support efforts in countries of origin to improve national child protection services... However, this support should not be offered or sought in a manner which compromises the integrity of the intercountry adoption process", as well as SC 2010 C&R No 6. See also para. 553 of GGP No 2 which states that receiving States have "an additional responsibility to assist States of origin to improve their child protection and adoption systems. This is essential if all of the Convention's safeguards are to be applied...".

36. How, if at all, does your State define "habitual residence" for the purposes of the Convention? What factors are considered when determining where persons are habitually resident for Convention purposes?

In the Netherlands the term "habitual residence" is not defined. The Dutch Act concerning the placement of foreign children with a view to adoption, contains however an article which states that the provisions of this act shall not be applicable if, during a period in which the PAP's had their ordinary place of residence abroad, the adoption came about in accordance with the Convention, which fact must appear from a written statement of the competent authority of the state where the adoption took place.

37. What are the most common scenarios in which your State has encountered difficulties in determining the "habitual residence" of PAPs and / or a child?

No difficulties encountered in this respect.

38. Please describe any restriction that your State places on individuals' ability to adopt intercountry based on their:

- (a) nationality; and / or
- (b) immigration status (*i.e.*, permission to reside in your State).

The person(s) should at least have his/their habitual residence in the Netherlands as long as the adoption procedure lasts.

39. How does your State deal with situations in which PAPs, habitually resident in one State, move to another Contracting State after initiating intercountry adoption proceedings (in accordance with Art. 14) but *while the adoption process is ongoing*? Does your State's response vary if the move is instead to a non-Contracting State?

This depends whether the procedure was started in the Netherlands or in another contracting State. When the procedure started in the Netherlands and the PAP's decide to move to another contracting State, the procedure stops. Documents involved in the procedure can be transferred to the competent authority in the other contracting State at request of the PAP's. When PAP's move from another contracting State to the Netherlands, PAP's can request to take over the procedure. The way this request can be dealt with depends on the stage and the quality of the procedure started in the other contracting State. The same is applicable in case of a non-contracting State.

40. How does your State deal with situations in which PAPs are either non-nationals living in your State, or nationals of your State living in another State, and:

- (a) your State does not consider the PAPs to be habitually resident in your State and the other State also does not consider them to be habitually resident in their State (*i.e.*, the PAPs are in a situation where they cannot make an application to adopt intercountry)?

No distinction is made between non-nationals living in the Netherlands and nationals living in the Netherlands, provided that these non-nationals have a permanent residence permit.

With respect to nationals having their habitual residence in another contracting State and this other State does not consider them to be habitual resident in that State, the Netherlands has experience with China. The problem was solved in good harmony.

or

- (b) both your State and the other State consider the PAPs to be habitually resident in their State?  
Not applicable.

*Example: PAPs are nationals of State A but, due to the nature of their work, have to move regularly to live in other countries for varying periods. Recently, they moved to State B for a one-year work contract. They now wish to adopt a child from State C.*

(a) *State A says these PAPs are not habitually resident in State A as they are not currently living there. State B also determines that they are not habitually resident in State B since they will leave the State at the end of one year.*

OR

(b) *State A says the PAPs are habitually resident in State A as they are abroad for a limited, finite period and State A is the only country in which they have the intention to reside long-term. State B also determines that these PAPs are habitually resident in State B as they are currently living in State B.*

Not applicable

41. How does your State deal with situations in which PAPs are nationals of your State, are habitually resident in another State and wish to adopt a child from a third State? What role, if any, does your State play in the intercountry adoption in this scenario (e.g., is your State involved in securing the nationality of your State for the child, any other role)?

In such case the Dutch Central Authority has no role.

### C. Use of modern technologies<sup>32</sup> in intercountry adoption<sup>33</sup>

#### *In general*

##### Both States of origin and receiving States

42. Please briefly describe any laws, regulations or policy guidelines which exist in your State concerning the use of modern technologies in the field of adoption.<sup>34</sup> Where possible, please provide a hyperlink to these laws, regulations or guidelines or provide a copy, with a translation into English or French.

There are no such specific laws, regulations or policy guidelines in the Netherlands

43. Does your State regularly use modern technologies in the field of intercountry adoption, both generally, as well as in individual intercountry adoption cases?<sup>35</sup>

If so, please describe which technologies are used, at what stage(s) of the intercountry adoption procedure and how the use of these technologies affects your daily work.

If not, please explain the reasons for this (e.g., no access to modern technologies due to resource constraints, infrastructure problems or an absence of training).

In case PAP's live on one of the islands in the Caribbean, which are part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe, the preparation and information of the PAP's will be performed by the Foundation Adoption Services in the Netherlands via skype.

44. In your State's experience, what (a) benefits<sup>36</sup> and (b) risks have modern technologies brought to the field of intercountry adoption? Please describe how your State attempts to manage any perceived risks.

<sup>32</sup> In this document "modern technologies" is taken to mean the Internet and modern communication methods, such as e-mail, video-conferencing and social media.

<sup>33</sup> If your State responded to the 2013 ISS/IRC Questionnaire on new technologies and adoption (ISS/IRC Circular No 118), you may wish to refer to this response in your answers to this section.

<sup>34</sup> E.g., legislation might concern data protection and rules concerning the online storage of data in adoption cases, the use of photo-listings, the use of the Internet in searching for origins or the use of DNA testing in adoption cases.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., Internet and websites, e-mail, video-conferencing facilities such as Skype, online posting of informational videos, social media, etc.

The benefits that can be mentioned are: quick and direct contact with Central authorities, public authorities or other authorities in other States, direct contact between accredited bodies and PAP's during their stay in States of origin during the adoption procedure in that State etc.

At the same time the risk can be mentioned that PAP's use the internet to circumvent legal procedures and seek direct contact with biological parents or adoption providers in order to obtain a child. To manage such risks it is important to have a good system of control on immigration.

45. Please briefly explain any specific courses, training or information which is / are provided on the use of modern technologies in the adoption process to:

- (a) the authorities and bodies involved in intercountry adoption in your State.<sup>37</sup>  
Not applicable

and / or

- (b) PAPs, biological families and adoptable children (or adoptees, if the information is provided subsequent to the adoption)<sup>38</sup> – e.g., are the risks of the use of these technologies part of the programmes of counselling and preparation of PAPs, adoptable children or biological families and is any post-adoption support provided in relation to these issues?<sup>39</sup>  
Not applicable

In either case, where possible, please provide hyperlinks to or copies of any information or training material provided (e.g., publications, leaflets, websites), along with a translation into English or French.

46. Does your State use and / or accept from other States scanned documents in intercountry adoption cases (e.g., scanned and e-mailed Art. 17 c) agreements, Art. 23 certificates)?

The use of scanned documents is very common nowadays. In this case it is not applicable, because certificates according to article 17c are issued on paper and sent by mail to the Dutch accredited bodies. Statements according to article 23 are received by the Dutch accredited bodies and/or adoptive parents. The accredited bodies have the duty to preserve these documents into their archives.

If so:

- (a) Please specify which documents are sent or accepted in scanned format:  
Not specified.
- (b) Are these scanned versions used or accepted *instead of* the original documents or *in addition to* the original versions (i.e., the original documents follow later by post)?  
Not specified.
- (c) Is any authentication of the scanned document required (e.g., legalisation or apostillisation)?<sup>40</sup>  
The original documents need to be authenticated (if required) before they are scanned.
- (d) How are scanned documents stored and how is the security of the information guaranteed?  
Not specified.

<sup>36</sup> E.g., websites for provision of information, fast sending of applications and reports, facilitation of contact between accredited bodies and PAPs during their stay abroad, facilitation of contact with representatives of accredited bodies, video-conferences to provide information concerning the health of children.

<sup>37</sup> E.g., in relation to its use by adoptees or families to search for origins, or in relation to the use of online databases of adoptable children.

<sup>38</sup> Depending upon whether your State is a receiving State or a State of origin (or both).

<sup>39</sup> E.g., concerning making contact via the Internet, posting confidential information on social media websites or using social media to search for origins.

<sup>40</sup> See the *Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents* (the "Apostille Convention", concluded 5 October 1961).

If not, please explain the reasons for this:  
See the response to question 46

***Using modern technologies to assist with finding a suitable family for a child***

Both States of origin and receiving States

47. Does your State use, or permit others to create and use, online “photo-listings”<sup>41</sup> of adoptable children?

No

If so, please explain:

(a) whether these listings include profiles of *all* adoptable children in your State or only certain categories of children (*e.g.*, children with special needs):

Not applicable

(b) which authorities or bodies create / operate these online listings in your State (*i.e.*, is this under State control or the control of other adoption actors?):

Not applicable

(c) who is permitted to access the listings:

Not applicable

(d) what safeguards have been implemented to protect the privacy of the children concerned (*e.g.* restricted access for Central Authorities and accredited bodies only):

Not applicable

(e) how it is ensured that the use of such listings is in conformity with the matching process set forth in the Convention (*i.e.*, matching by the competent authority in the State of origin after the suitability and eligibility of the PAPs has been determined):

Not applicable

***Using modern technologies to search for origins***

Both States of origin and receiving States

48. Do the relevant competent authorities in your State use social media (*e.g.*, Facebook, Twitter) to help adoptees search for their origins? If so, are there any guidelines or good practices regarding the use of social media by authorities / bodies for this purpose?

Assistance to adoptees in their search for their origins is not regulated in the Netherlands. Mostly the accredited bodies take this upon them or the adoptees are assisted by NGO's such as ISS. Whether social media are used is not known.

49. Has your State had any cases in which PAPs / adoptees and birth families have contacted each other via social media or other modern methods of communication after an adoption and without the involvement of professionals? If so, please specify the situations which have arisen, the challenges faced and how these challenges have been overcome.

This may have happened, but the Central Authority of the Netherlands is not familiar with

---

<sup>41</sup> In this document, “photo-listings” means databases which include photographs and descriptions of the background and characteristics of adoptable children. They often have limited, protected access (*e.g.*, for Central Authorities and accredited bodies only) and may be used to search for families for children who are hard to place.

specific cases.

#### **D. Illicit practices<sup>42</sup>**

##### ***In general***

###### Both States of origin and receiving States

50. Please describe the practices relating to the abduction, sale of or traffic in children or other illicit practices which your State has experienced most frequently in the context of intercountry adoption since the last Special Commission meeting (2010), regardless of whether these practices have taken place in your State or in another Contracting State.

The Central Authority of the Netherlands is confronted with a case where PAP's had applied for a permit to adopt. This application was rejected because the PAP's were not considered suitable and eligible to adopt. Because one of the PAP's was of Russian origin, this PAP traveled to Russia and adopted a child in a domestic adoption procedure. Subsequently this parent travelled with the child to the Netherlands

51. Please provide details of any specific examples in which your State has worked either alone or in co-operation with other Contracting States in order to prevent and / or address practices relating to the abduction, sale of or traffic in children or other illicit practices in the context of intercountry adoption. Was Article 33 ever relied upon in such cases? If so, please describe what measures were taken and the outcome.

In 2007 a case came up where there was a suspicion of child trade in India. A child, stolen from its parents, was assumed to have been brought into the regular intercountry adoption system and was placed in the Netherlands. A criminal investigation was launched in India in this case.

In 2009 the media in China reported about the possible involvement into the intercountry adoption circuit of children who were assumed to have been taken away from their parents. Some of these children were supposed to have been adopted by Dutch adoptive parents. Upon request the Chinese authorities investigated this case.

52. Has your State ever suspended or restricted its intercountry adoption programme (e.g., introducing a moratorium, refusing to work with a particular Contracting State) because of concerns about the risk of abduction, sale of or traffic in children or other illicit practices? If so, did the suspension or restriction assist with efforts to combat these practices? What challenges did your State encounter in seeking to resume intercountry adoptions or lift any restrictions once practices had been improved?

Yes, Adoption was suspended in the past from Guatemala, Cambodja, Nepal and more recently from Uganda. These suspensions are still in place.

#### **E. Other international placements of children which result in adoption**

##### ***Kafala resulting in adoption***

###### Receiving States only

---

<sup>42</sup> In this Questionnaire, the term "illicit practices" is used in the same sense as in the "Discussion Paper Co-operation between Central Authorities to develop a common approach to preventing and addressing illicit practices in intercountry adoption cases" (October 2012), available on the specialised "Intercountry Adoption Section" of the Hague Conference website: *i.e.*, it "refers to situations where a child has been adopted without respect for the rights of the child or for the safeguards of the 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)."

53. Are persons, habitually resident in your State who have a child placed into their care under kafala in another State, permitted to subsequently adopt the child in your State?<sup>43</sup>

*Example: a child, habitually resident in State A, is placed into the care of a couple under the regime of kafala by the court in State A. The couple habitually resides in State B (your State) and the understanding is that they will return immediately to State B to live with the child. Under your State's laws, are the couple permitted to subsequently adopt the child in your State, State B?*

The Netherlands is party to the 1996 convention since 2011. As a consequence Kafala is considered to fall under the scope of this convention. Due to this, a measure was taken in February 2013 to suspend the placement of children into families in the Netherlands with a purpose of later adoption. Before February 2013 the placement of children under Kafala with subsequent adoption was permitted under the condition that permission for a later adoption was given by the competent authority in the State of origin.

If so, please explain:

- (a) the reasons for this:  
See the response above
- (b) the procedure, including any involvement of the State of origin:  
See the response above  
and
- (c) whether this would be a "simple" or a "full" adoption:  
this were to be full adoptions.

#### ***Respite care abroad resulting in adoption***<sup>44</sup>

##### Both States of origin and receiving States

54. If your State is involved in respite care programmes<sup>45</sup> for children, please explain:
- (a) whether such programmes specifically aim to be a precursor to adoption for some children (*e.g.*, for children with special needs):  
No, this is not the case. Persons who grant the opportunity to children to stay with them for a short period, are informed on beforehand that the children are bound to return to the State of their habitual residence. Mostly this is a precondition by the authorities of such State.
  - (b) whether such programmes have, in fact, resulted in the adoption of children and, if so, approximately what percentage of children involved in the programmes are adopted:  
In the Netherlands such programmes have not resulted in adoption.  
and
  - (c) where a child is adopted following such a programme, how it is ensured that the safeguards of the Convention have been respected (bearing in mind that it is likely that the child remains "habitually resident" in his / her State of origin and thus the adoption falls within the scope of the Convention according to

<sup>43</sup> **N.B. the provision of care by kafala falls within the scope of the *Hague Convention of 19 October 1996 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children* (the "1996 Convention") (Art. 3 e) of the 1996 Convention) and thus kafala placements benefit from its unified rules on jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of measures between Contracting States. In addition, the 1996 Convention contains mandatory co-operation provisions with which Contracting States must comply when a cross-border kafala placement is contemplated between them (Art. 33 of the 1996 Convention). For further information concerning kafala and the 1996 Convention, see the [Practical Handbook on the 1996 Convention](#) available on the Hague Conference website < [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) >.**

<sup>44</sup> See GGP No 1 at paras 561 to 563.

<sup>45</sup> *I.e.*, programmes in which children from certain States of origin, often children living in institutional or other non-family based alternative care, are hosted temporarily by families in other States for "holidays" to improve the child's mental and physical well-being.

Art. 2):<sup>46</sup>  
Not applicable

### ***Foster care resulting in adoption***

#### Both States of origin and receiving States

55. Is your State aware of cases in which a domestic foster care placement has been used in order to circumvent Convention intercountry adoption procedures? If so, please provide details, including the challenges which these cases have presented and any good practices your State has developed to deal with such cases.

*Example: a couple, usually resident in State A, travels to State B and applies to foster a child. They intend to apply to adopt this child in State B and to return shortly thereafter to live in State A.*

This may have happened in individual cases, but the Central Authority is not familiar with such cases.

### **F. Triangular adoptions<sup>47</sup>**

#### Both States of origin and receiving States

56. Does your State allow PAPA's wishing to adopt intercountry to use an accredited body located in a *third* State to mediate the adoption (*i.e.*, an accredited body *not* located in the State of origin or in the receiving State)? If so, please briefly describe any conditions imposed by your State,<sup>48</sup> the procedure used and any challenges encountered. Please also share any good practices your State has developed in relation to such cases.

No, this is not allowed in the Netherlands.

### **G. International surrogacy arrangements<sup>49</sup> and intercountry adoption<sup>50</sup>**

#### Both States of origin and receiving States

57. Following the recommendations of the 2010 Special Commission meeting,<sup>51</sup> has your State experienced any cases of international surrogacy arrangements in which use of the 1993 Hague Convention has been sought in order to remedy the situation of the legal status of the child? If so, please explain the circumstances in which this occurred, how it was ensured that the safeguards of the Convention were respected, and the outcome for the child and family.

No, there have not been any cases in which the 1993 Hague Convention was sought to remedy the situation. In a number of cases of surrogacy, that took place in another State, a judge in the Netherlands has ordered that the prospective parents are to be granted a 'Laissez-passer' for the child in order to have the possibility to travel to the Netherlands with the child and start a domestic

<sup>46</sup> *E.g.*, how it is ensured that: the child is legally and psycho-socially adoptable; the subsidiarity principle is respected; the eligibility and suitability of the PAPA's is appropriately assessed; the Convention requirements concerning professional "matching" are met; and the child and parents are appropriately prepared, informed and counselled for the adoption.

<sup>47</sup> For a definition of "triangular adoption", please see GGP No 1 at Chapter 8.8.7.

<sup>48</sup> See the good practices recommended at para. 555 of GGP No 1.

<sup>49</sup> The term "international surrogacy arrangement" is used in this Questionnaire to mean "a surrogacy arrangement entered into by intending parent(s) resident in one State and a surrogate resident (or sometimes merely present) in a different State". (See further the Glossary attached to the "Report on the desirability and feasibility of further work on the Parentage / Surrogacy Project" (Prel. Doc. No 3B of March 2014).)

<sup>50</sup> Please note that the issue of international surrogacy arrangements is being studied separately by the Hague Conference in the context of its "Parentage / Surrogacy Project": for further information on this Project, please see the specialised section of the Hague Conference website, under "Parentage / Surrogacy Project". These questions therefore only relate to the use of the 1993 Convention and related bodies / authorities in these cases.

<sup>51</sup> See SC 2010 C&R Nos 25 to 26 in which it was stated that the Special Commission "viewed as inappropriate the use of the Convention in cases of international surrogacy".

adoption procedure in the Netherlands.

#### IV. SERVICES AND SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THE HAGUE CONFERENCE

##### Both States of origin and receiving States

58. Are the following documents used in your State as tools to assist with the operation of the Convention and / or to periodically review your State's intercountry adoption system and processes:
- (a) the Conclusions and Recommendations of previous Special Commission meetings:  
Yes.
  - (b) Guide to Good Practice No 1 *"The Implementation and Operation of the 1993 Intercountry Adoption Convention"*:  
Yes.
  - (c) Guide to Good Practice No 2 *"Accreditation and Adoption Accredited Bodies"*:  
Yes.
  - (d) the tools<sup>52</sup> developed by the Experts' Group on the Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption:  
Not yet.
  - (e) the "Discussion Paper on Co-operation between Central Authorities to develop a common approach to preventing and addressing illicit practices in intercountry adoption cases":<sup>53</sup>  
Yes

Please explain how these tools are currently promoted in your State and how they could, in your State's view, be more effectively promoted at the regional and / or international level:

In general these tools have been spread among the accredited bodies, Child Care and Protection Agency and Foundation Adoption Service.

59. In light of the fact that the importance of ICATAP (the "Intercountry Adoption Technical Assistance Programme" of the Hague Conference) to the proper implementation and operation of the 1993 Convention has been reiterated by Special Commission meetings and by meetings of the Council on General Affairs and Policy for many years, does your State have any suggestions as to how to secure more regular and consistent funding for this work at the Permanent Bureau, including for the key position of the ICATAP Co-ordinator?
- No.

Is there any other comment your State wishes to make concerning the implementation and / or operation of the 1993 Convention?

No.

---

<sup>52</sup> See the tools developed by the "Experts' Group on the Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption", available on the Intercountry Adoption Section of the Hague Conference website, under "Expert and Working Groups": *i.e.*, the harmonised Terminology adopted by the Experts' Group on the financial aspects of intercountry adoption, the Note on the financial aspects of intercountry adoption, the Summary list of good practices on the financial aspects of intercountry adoption and the Tables on the costs associated with intercountry adoption.

<sup>53</sup> Available on the Intercountry Adoption Section of the Hague Conference website, under "Expert and Working Groups".