

INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

U.S. Department of State • Bureau of Consular Affairs



U.S. Department of State Bureau of Consular Affairs 90-Day Report on International Parental Child Abduction



Contents

1. Introduction to the 90-Day Report..... 3
 1.1 Overview of the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act (ICAPRA)..... 3
2. Defining Patterns of Noncompliance 4
3. Actions Taken in Response to a Pattern of Noncompliance 6
 3.1 Countries Demonstrating a Pattern of Noncompliance..... 6
4. Conclusion..... 28

1. Introduction to the 90-Day Report

The U.S. Department of State's (Department) Office of Children's Issues serves as the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) under the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention). The Department hereby submits, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. § 9122(c)(4), a report to Congress (90-Day Report) on the specific actions taken against countries determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act (ICAPRA).

The USCA has continued to refine strategies to organize U.S. government engagement on IPCA in a particular country. These strategies encompass U.S. government-wide efforts that include those with the USCA in the lead but also those of other U.S. government entities responsible for issues such as law enforcement, public diplomacy, and political engagement. Our country strategies are uniquely tailored to a country's evolving political and cultural environment, and, as events dictate, steer our future engagement. One example of a concrete initiative developed as part of a country strategy is an International Visitor Leadership Program in August, 2015 for Brazilian judges and others aimed at sharing best practices for Convention implementation.

Diplomatic engagement remains one of our most effective tools with all countries to assist in resolving IPCA cases. We take every appropriate opportunity to raise IPCA cases with foreign government officials at the highest appropriate levels and to ensure the host government understands the U.S. government's concern for the welfare of U.S. citizens overseas, especially children.

As we coordinate and interact with our partner central authorities in foreign countries to monitor individual cases, we are also obtaining critical information we need to assess countries' compliance with the Convention. In addition, the USCA and other Department officials regularly engage with non-Convention countries both in Washington and overseas to encourage those countries to ratify or accede to the Convention. In September 2015, the USCA, in coordination with the Hague Permanent Bureau, will host a second symposium on the Convention in the Near East region to bring together government officials and experts to discuss the benefits of the Convention. This is also part of the USCA's ongoing efforts to support the work of the Hague Permanent Bureau and to collaborate with other countries to employ a multilateral approach in pressing countries that do not meet their obligations under the Convention or that do not work with the USCA to help resolve cases of international parental child abduction..

1.1 Overview of the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act (ICAPRA)

ICAPRA went into effect on August 8, 2014. The 90-Day Report on International Parental Child Abduction (90-Day Report) covers actions taken toward countries determined, in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, to have demonstrated a pattern of noncompliance per criteria established in the law. Unless otherwise noted, information in this report covers the period through July 31, 2015. Please refer to 22 U.S.C. § 9101 for definitions of terms used throughout this report.

After sending demarches to countries cited in the first annual report for demonstrating patterns of noncompliance, our U.S. missions conducted frank conversations with foreign government officials, informing them what actions their countries can take, moving forward, in order to avoid being cited again for demonstrating patterns of noncompliance in the next ICAPRA report. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) held meetings with foreign missions in Washington delivering the same stern messages.

We continue to have serious concerns in some countries we did not cite in the annual report as demonstrating a pattern of noncompliance per criteria established in the law. These include countries with pending IPCA cases that do not benefit from the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention), such as cases where an abduction occurred before our partnership under the Convention went into effect. We are keenly aware of and actively engaged on the pre-Convention cases as we are on all of our non-Convention cases, yet we are disappointed that few of these cases have been resolved with the return of an abducted child to the United States or through meaningful parental access.

ICAPRA was meant to address the prevention of IPCA cases in addition to the way cases are handled once they have occurred. Since ICAPRA was signed into law, under Title III, the USCA has submitted the names of 157 children who were the subject of a court order that prohibited their removal from the United States to Customs and Border Protection (CBP) for inclusion in the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) program aimed at preventing IPCA. In July 2015 alone, 26 children were added to the program, the largest number since the program went into effect.

The Department of State Inter-Agency Group on Prevention, comprising core group members from the Department, DHS, including Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and CBP, and the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as participants from the Department of Defense and non-governmental organizations, continues to discuss the implementation of the new Title III child prevention measures managed by CBP and the USCA. Key to the program's success, and a byproduct of the ICAPRA-mandated interagency working group, has been streamlined communications and information sharing between agencies on child abduction prevention initiatives. These new measures were instrumental in preventing 30 abductions in July 2015.

2. Defining Patterns of Noncompliance

Under ICAPRA, a pattern of noncompliance is defined as the persistent failure:

- Of a Convention country to implement and abide by provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention;
- Of a non-Convention country to abide by bilateral procedures that have been established between the United States and such country; or
- Of a non-Convention country to work with the USCA to resolve abduction cases.

Persistent failure may be evidenced in a given country by the presence of one or more of the following criteria:

- Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in such country are unresolved abduction cases;
- the Foreign Central Authority (FCA) regularly fails to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or any bilateral procedures between the United States and such country;
- the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of a Convention or bilateral procedures country fails to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable;
- law enforcement authorities regularly fail to enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the government of the country in abduction cases¹

Table 1: Description of Pattern of Noncompliance

Key	Description of Pattern of Noncompliance
A	Percentage of Unresolved Cases: Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in such country are unresolved abduction cases as defined by ICAPRA. Calculated by dividing total number of unresolved abduction cases as of the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014, by total number of abduction cases at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014.
B	Foreign Central Authority (FCA) Performance: The FCA regularly fails to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to the Convention or any bilateral procedures between the United States and such country.
C	Judicial Performance: The judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of a Convention country or a bilateral procedures country fails to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable.
D	Law Enforcement Performance: Law enforcement authorities regularly fail to locate children and/or enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the government of the country in abduction cases.
E	Persistent failure of a non-Convention country to work with the USCA to resolve abduction cases.

¹ 22 U.S.C. § 9101(19)

3. Actions Taken in Response to a Pattern of Noncompliance

No later than 90 days after the submission of the Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, the Department is required to report on the specific actions taken toward countries determined to have demonstrated a pattern of noncompliance. Please refer to 22 U.S.C. § 9122 for a list of those actions.

3.1 Countries Demonstrating a Pattern of Noncompliance

Below are country-specific summaries detailing actions taken toward countries determined to have demonstrated a pattern of noncompliance.

Table 2: Countries Demonstrating a Pattern of Noncompliance

Argentina	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>A, C</p> <p>Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Argentina remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. The judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) due to significant delays in resolving Convention cases.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In 2014-2015, U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires delivered multiple diplomatic notes to the Argentine Central Authority (ACA) regarding unresolved international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.</p> <p>In March 2014, officials from the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) met with the Deputy Chief of Mission of the Argentine Embassy to the United States to express concerns regarding the status of unresolved cases.</p> <p>In June 2014, a USCA official traveled to Buenos Aires and, accompanied by U.S. Embassy officials, held bilateral meetings with Argentine government officials and Argentine public defenders to express concerns regarding unresolved cases. The U.S. officials also discussed best practices under the Convention with the diplomatic missions in Argentina of Convention partner countries.</p> <p>In August 2014, the Department of State, in cooperation with the Department of Justice (DOJ), sent a formal extradition request, issued by the DOJ, in cooperation with the Department of State, to the Government of Argentina, requesting the extradition of a taking parent who abducted a</p>

	<p>child to Argentina from the United States.</p> <p>In October 2014, the USCA and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires hosted a working-level meeting with the ACA and the National Public Defenders’ Office via digital video conference to discuss their respective country’s Convention administrative and judicial processes and procedures. That same month, the USCA met with a representative from the Argentina Public Defenders’ Office to discuss the same issues.</p> <p>In March 2015, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs and USCA representatives met with the First Lady of Buenos Aires province to discuss IPCA issues. Special Advisor Jacobs raised U.S. concerns regarding unresolved cases.</p> <p>In April 2015, Argentine courts ordered and enforced the return of two U.S. citizen children who were abducted in 2010, resolving a pending Convention case.</p> <p>In May 2015, following the Department’s submission to Congress of the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires delivered a demarche to the Government of Argentina noting the country’s citation in the report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Argentina on resolving pending cases and on improving the performance of Argentina’s judicial branch.</p>
Brazil	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>A, C, D</p> <p>Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Brazil remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. Additionally, Brazil’s judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) due to delays in Brazilian courts, which were typically followed by numerous lengthy appeals. Law enforcement in Brazil regularly failed to undertake serious efforts to locate abducted children.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In January 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) hosted a delegation from Brazil including the Director of the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) and representatives from Brazil’s</p>

Office of Attorney General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Brazilian Embassy in the United States for meetings regarding international parental child abduction (IPCA) issues and cases.

In May 2014, the Department delivered a demarche to the Government of Brazil, noting that the country was cited in the 2014 Compliance Report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance with the Convention, in regard to judicial and law enforcement performance. The demarche specifically noted significant delays for obtaining relief under the Convention in Brazilian courts. The demarche also noted the failure on the part of Brazilian law enforcement officials to regularly locate abducted children.

In May 2014, a USCA official traveled to Brasilia to discuss pending cases. In July 2014, then Acting Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs Michele T. Bond met with the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs and a high-level Brazilian delegation to discuss the importance of international cooperation on and compliance with the Convention.

In July 2014, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Liliana Ayalde met with high-level Brazilian officials to express concern regarding unresolved IPCA cases. In August 2014, nine Brazilian federal judges participated in a Department-sponsored International Visitor Leadership Program. The 10-day program demonstrated how the United States implements the Convention, with a goal of facilitating expeditious resolutions of pending IPCA cases in Brazil.

In September 2014, Special Advisor Jacobs traveled to Brasilia to hold high-level meetings with Brazilian government officials to promote Convention compliance and the expeditious resolution of pending cases.

In 2014 and 2015, the U.S. Minister Counselor for Consular Affairs for Brazil and other U.S. Embassy officials met regularly with Brazilian government officials to express concerns about pending IPCA cases.

In April 2015, Special Advisor Jacobs met with the Chargé d'Affaires of the Brazilian Embassy to encourage the continued dialogue between the United States and Brazil on IPCA cases and reinforce the importance of the expeditious resolution of pending cases.

In May 2015, following the Department's submission to

	<p>Congress of the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, U.S. Embassy Brasilia delivered a demarche to the Government of Brazil noting the country’s citation in the report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In May 2015, the Department hosted the Director of the BCA, Brazil’s Office of Attorney General, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Washington to review IPCA cases and issues.</p> <p>In July 2015, the Department scheduled an International Visitor Leadership Program for six Brazilian federal judges, two federal prosecutors, and a representative from the Attorney General’s Office. The 10-day program will demonstrate how the United States implements the Convention, with the goal of facilitating expeditious resolutions of pending IPCA cases in Brazil.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Brazil on resolving pending cases and improving the performance of Brazil’s judicial branch and law enforcement.</p>
Colombia	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>B, C</p> <p>Colombia demonstrated significant delays in the central authority responding to requests for information regarding pending 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) cases. Additionally, Colombia’s judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Convention because of lengthy delays in judicial proceedings, sometimes as a result of judicial strikes.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In September 2014, new leadership at the Colombian Central Authority (CCA) brought renewed bilateral engagement on international parental child abduction (IPCA) issues.</p> <p>In January 2015, U.S. Embassy Bogota officials met with the Director General and representatives of the CCA to discuss IPCA. In April 2015, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs met with this same group in Colombia to continue the discussion on IPCA and implementation of the Convention.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Bogota delivered a demarche to the Government of Colombia, noting the country’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child</p>

	<p>Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In May 2015, then Acting Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs Michele T. Bond traveled to Bogota and emphasized the importance of mutual compliance with the Convention.</p> <p>In June 2015, U.S. Embassy Bogota officials met with the Colombian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to discuss IPCA.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Colombia on improving the performance of Colombia’s central authority and Colombia’s judicial branch.</p>
Costa Rica	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>C</p> <p>Costa Rica’s judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) because of significant delays in the judicial proceedings for Convention cases.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In March 2014, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs attended meetings with Costa Rican officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Costa Rican Central Authority (CRCA), and judicial officials in San Jose to raise concerns about unresolved cases and Convention compliance.</p> <p>In April 2014, the Department delivered a demarche to the Government of Costa Rica noting that the country was cited as not compliant with the Convention in the 2014 Compliance Report, in regard to the performance of the CRCA and courts in their handling of Convention cases. In May 2014, a Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs Deputy Assistant Secretary met with Costa Rican judicial officials in San Jose to raise pending international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases and to discuss Convention compliance. In August 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) facilitated the travel of a U.S. Hague Network Judge to speak on the benefits of judicial communication in IPCA cases in Costa Rica.</p> <p>In January 2015, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs participated in a high-level meeting with Costa Rican government officials in Washington to discuss IPCA and promote Convention compliance and the expeditious resolution of pending cases.</p> <p>In February 2015, Costa Rican officials from the CRCA and</p>

	<p>judicial branch participated in a Department-sponsored International Visitor Leadership Program where USCA officials demonstrated how the United States implements the Convention, with a goal of facilitating expeditious resolutions of current cases in Costa Rica and promoting Convention compliance.</p> <p>In February and March 2015, U.S. Embassy San Jose also engaged in promoting the resolution of pending Convention cases and hosted meetings with high-level Costa Rican officials to discuss IPCA.</p> <p>In April 2015, Special Advisor Jacobs traveled to Costa Rica to meet with the Executive President and representatives of the CRCA, judicial officials, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials to discuss pending IPCA cases.</p> <p>In May 2015, following the Department’s submission to Congress of the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, U.S. Embassy San Jose delivered a demarche to the Government of Costa Rica noting the country’s citation in the report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Costa Rica on improving the performance of the country’s judicial branch.</p>
Dominican Republic	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>A, C</p> <p>Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in the Dominican Republic remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. The judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) because of significant delays in resolving Convention cases.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In October 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) traveled to Santo Domingo to discuss international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases. In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Santo Domingo delivered a demarche to the Government of the Dominican Republic, noting the country’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of the Dominican</p>

	Republic on resolving pending cases and improving the performance of the country's judicial branch.
Ecuador	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	D Law enforcement in Ecuador regularly failed to undertake serious efforts to locate children in cases under the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention).
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In March 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) traveled to Ecuador for meetings with the Ecuadorian Central Authority (ECA) director and other officials. The USCA expressed concern over the lack of communication between the two central authorities, failures to notify parents of Convention hearings, and the failure of law enforcement agencies to locate abducted children.</p> <p>In October 2014, U.S. Embassy Quito delivered a diplomatic note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to request assistance with the resolution of pending IPCA cases.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Quito delivered a demarche to the Government of Ecuador noting the country's citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Quito hosted a digital video conference (DVC) at the Embassy with the ECA, the Ecuadorian special police force charged with IPCA issues (DINAPEN), the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), and the USCA. Participants discussed the obstacles to the rapid resolution of IPCA cases in Ecuador and how to overcome these obstacles.</p> <p>In June 2015, U.S. Embassy Quito hosted a follow-up DVC focusing on processes for locating abducted children in Ecuador.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Ecuador on improving the performance of Ecuador's law enforcement.</p>
Egypt	
Convention Country?	No

<p>Description of Pattern of Noncompliance</p>	<p>E</p> <p>Egypt has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve cases of international parental child abduction (IPCA). The Egyptian government’s Good Intentions Subcommittee (GISC), responsible for reviewing international child custody cases, has provided assistance in arranging access in some IPCA cases. The GISC has no authority or mechanism to obtain assistance needed from other Egyptian government agencies and law enforcement for the resolution of cases and the return of abducted children.</p>
<p>Summary of Actions Taken</p>	<p>In March 2014, Special Advisor Susan S. Jacobs met with the Egyptian Ambassador to the United States in Washington and then later that month with Egyptian government officials in Egypt to request assistance with pending IPCA cases and to encourage Egypt’s ratification of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention).</p> <p>In April 2014, U.S. Embassy Cairo delivered a diplomatic note to the Egyptian government with the Convention text, Convention resources, and another request for assistance with pending cases. In May 2014, U.S. Embassy Cairo delivered a demarche to the Egyptian government declaring the urgency of our requests for assistance with IPCA cases. In October 2014, Special Advisor Jacobs met with Egyptian government officials attending a Department-hosted regional symposium on the Convention in Amman, Jordan.</p> <p>In March 2015, U.S. Embassy Cairo met with the GISC to express appreciation for its cooperation in arranging visits with abducted children and to discuss and encourage better cooperation between the GISC and the U.S. Embassy on returning abducted children to the United States. In April 2015, U.S. Embassy Cairo met with the Egyptian Foreign Ministry to discuss the return of abducted children; the Foreign Ministry expressed its interest in deepening cooperation with the U.S. Embassy and working toward resolution of IPCA cases, consistent with Egyptian law.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Cairo delivered a demarche to the Egyptian government noting the country’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In July 2015, the USCA began organizing and planning a</p>

	<p>regional symposium scheduled for September 2015 on the Convention and its potential application in Egypt and in other countries in the Near East region.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Egypt to improve its efforts with the USCA and to resolve IPCA cases.</p>
Guatemala	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>B, C</p> <p>Guatemala demonstrated significant delays in the central authority responding to requests for information regarding pending cases under the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) and submitting cases to court. Additionally, Guatemala’s judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Convention because of lengthy delays in setting court hearing dates and resolving Convention cases.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In April 2014, the Department delivered a demarche to the Government of Guatemala noting Guatemala’s citation in the 2014 Compliance Report as not compliant with the Convention in regard to the performance of the Guatemalan Central Authority (GCA) and the handling of Convention cases in Guatemalan courts.</p> <p>In October 2014, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs met with the Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States in Washington to express concern regarding the GCA’s handling of Convention cases.</p> <p>In 2014 and 2015, Special Advisor Jacobs traveled to Guatemala on several occasions and highlighted concerns regarding pending cases in multiple high-level meetings; her latest trip to Guatemala was in February 2015.</p> <p>In early 2015, the GCA experienced staff turnover, and U.S. Embassy Guatemala City met with the new GCA officials to again raise concerns regarding pending cases.</p> <p>In March 2015, the Department requested monthly conference calls with the GCA to continue to request updates on Convention applications submitted to their office. The GCA has been consistent in attending the meetings and has been receptive to USG requests. However, the GCA has failed to follow-through on those requests for information and the cases remain stalled.</p>

	<p>In May 2015, following the Department’s submission to Congress of the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, U.S. Embassy Guatemala City delivered a demarche to the Government of Guatemala noting the country’s citation in the report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>On July 19, 2015, GCA assisted in securing the negotiated return of two children in one of the five pending cases in Guatemala.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Guatemala on improving the performance of the GCA and the country’s judicial branch.</p>
Honduras	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>B, C</p> <p>Honduras demonstrated significant delays in the central authority processing of cases under the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention). Additionally, Honduras’s judicial authority failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Convention because of lengthy delays in judicial proceedings, including continuing to require apostilles before proceeding with judicial review of Convention cases.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In May 2014, the Department delivered a demarche to the Government of Honduras noting that Honduras was cited in the 2014 Compliance Report as not compliant with the Convention in regard to the areas of central authority, judicial, and law enforcement performance.</p> <p>In June and August 2014, U.S. Central Authority (USCA) officials met with the Honduran Embassy to the United States in Washington to discuss pending IPCA cases and Convention compliance. In October 2014, U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa met with HCA officials to discuss pending cases. In December 2014, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs hosted a high-level meeting with Honduran government officials in Washington to discuss IPCA and Convention compliance. Again, in January 2015, U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa met with the HCA to express concern over pending cases.</p> <p>In February 2015, Special Advisor Jacobs met with the executive director of the HCA and the Honduran Minister for</p>

	<p>Justice, Human Rights, Governance, and Decentralization to promote Convention compliance and the expeditious resolution of cases.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa delivered a demarche to the Government of Honduras noting the country’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In July 2015, Honduran officials from the HCA participated in a Department-sponsored International Visitor Leadership Program. During the program, USCA officials demonstrated how the United States implements the Convention, with a goal of facilitating expeditious resolutions of current cases in Honduras and promoting Convention compliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Honduras on improving the performance of the HCA and the country’s judicial branch.</p>
India	
Convention Country?	No
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>E</p> <p>India has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.</p> <p>The Department has consistently encouraged India to accede to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) and resolve pending cases. Despite positive expressions of interest and a stated willingness to accede to the Convention, India has not yet acceded. Without the Convention remedy, parents are left to pursue custody of abducted children in Indian courts. Resolution of custody cases in Indian courts has been very slow. Typically, any returns of abducted children from India have been the result of voluntary agreements between parents.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In May 2014, the U.S. Mission met with Indian government officials to request assistance in confirming the welfare of U.S. citizen children abducted to India. In June 2014, the U.S. Mission met with the Bangalore High Court Chief Justice to discuss how IPCA cases can be resolved through the Indian legal system. In July 2014, the U.S. Mission met with a Joint Secretary for the Ministry of Women and Children’s Development (MWCD) to encourage accession to the Convention and subsequently met with Indian government</p>

officials to request assistance in confirming the welfare of U.S. citizen children abducted to India. In August 2014, the USCA and U.S. Mission met with a Hyderabad Family Court Advocate to discuss how cases can be resolved through the Hyderabad Family Court's mediation center. Following this meeting, the USCA and U.S. Mission met with Indian government officials to request assistance in confirming the welfare of U.S. citizen children abducted to India.

In September 2014, then Acting Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs Michele T. Bond led the U.S. delegation to the third U.S.-India Consular Dialogue in New Delhi. Then Acting Assistant Secretary Bond and the U.S. delegation met with Indian government officials to encourage accession to the Convention and request assistance with resolving all IPCA cases.

Following the U.S.-India Consular Dialogue, then Acting Assistant Secretary Bond and Chargé d'Affaires Kathleen Stephens met with key Indian government officials to discuss IPCA and seek support for India's accession to the Convention. In October 2014, the U.S. Mission participated in a panel discussion with members of India's judiciary and private stakeholders on how IPCA cases are handled in India and future prospects of India's accession to the Convention.

In February 2015, U.S. Ambassador to India Richard Verma met with Indian government officials from the MWCD to encourage accession to the Convention. The U.S. Mission also conducted outreach to Indian government officials on IPCA and the Convention. During the U.S. Mission's outreach, Indian government officials supported a proposed visit to India by Special Advisor for Children's Issues Susan S. Jacobs to discuss IPCA and the Convention.

In March 2015, the U.S. Minister Counselor for Consular Affairs met with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) Joint Secretary for Consular, Passport, and Visas to discuss the Department's 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction and accession to the Convention. In April 2015, the U.S. Mission provided the MEA with the text of ICAPRA, as well as information on the Convention. That same month, the U.S. Mission met with Indian government officials to request assistance in confirming the welfare of U.S. citizen children abducted to India.

	<p>In May 2015, Special Advisor Jacobs traveled to India to meet with Indian officials to encourage accession to the Convention and request assistance with resolving all IPCA cases. In May 2015, the U.S. Mission delivered a demarche to the Indian government noting the country’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of India to improve its efforts with the USCA and to resolve IPCA cases.</p>
Jordan	
Convention Country?	No
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>E</p> <p>Jordan has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve abduction cases.</p> <p>Despite high-level attention given to the issue, the Government of Jordan did not provide meaningful assistance to left-behind parents in returning children to their country of habitual residence. International parental child abductions (IPCA) to Jordan are often complicated by travel holds and the fact that foreign court orders are generally not enforced.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In April 2014, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs met with Jordanian government officials in Jordan to encourage accession to the Convention and to request assistance with resolving all IPCA cases. During the meeting, Jordanian officials stated their desire to learn more about the Convention and how it can be applied to a country with an Islamic law tradition.</p> <p>In October 2014, U.S. Embassy Amman hosted a symposium focusing on educating government officials in the region on the Convention. Following the symposium, in November 2014, U.S. Embassy Amman met with the Director of the Jordanian National Commission for Women to further discuss the Convention and resolving pending cases.</p> <p>In January 2015, Special Advisor Jacobs met with the Deputy Chief of Mission and Consul at the Jordanian Embassy in Washington to encourage Jordan’s accession to the Convention and request assistance with pending cases. In March 2015, U.S. Embassy Amman met with a Sharia law judge to discuss how the Convention could be implemented in a country with an Islamic law tradition.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Amman delivered a demarche to the Jordanian government noting Jordan’s citation in the 2015</p>

	<p>Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In July 2015, the USCA began organizing and planning a regional symposium scheduled for September 2015 on the Convention and its potential application in Jordan and in other countries in the Near East region.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Jordan to improve its efforts with the USCA and to resolve IPCA cases.</p>
Lebanon	
Convention Country?	No
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>E</p> <p>Lebanon has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve abduction cases. The Government of Lebanon did not take action to assist left-behind parents in returning children to their country of habitual residence. International parental child abductions (IPCA) to Lebanon are often complicated by travel holds and the fact that foreign court orders are generally not enforceable in Lebanon.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In March 2014, U.S. Embassy Beirut met with the chief justice of Lebanon’s supreme court to discuss IPCA, the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention), and enforcing Lebanese court orders. In October 2014, U.S. Embassy Beirut officials met with officials from the European Union and Commonwealth missions to discuss best practices in resolving IPCA.</p> <p>In January 2015, the Department hosted a prominent juvenile court judge to participate in an International Visitor Leadership Program with a focus on resolving IPCA cases and providing assistance to left-behind parents involved in IPCA. In April 2015, U.S. Embassy Beirut met with the juvenile court judge to discuss the Convention and pending IPCA cases in Lebanon.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Beirut delivered a demarche to the Lebanese government noting Lebanon’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Lebanon to improve its efforts with the USCA to resolve IPCA cases.</p>

Nicaragua	
Convention Country?	No
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	A, D Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Nicaragua remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. Law enforcement in Nicaragua regularly failed to undertake serious efforts to locate abducted children.
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>Nicaragua has acceded to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) but is not partners with the United States under the Convention. The Nicaraguan Central Authority (NCA) regularly cooperated with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) in efforts to resolve cases of children abducted to Nicaragua from the United States.</p> <p>In February 2015, Nicaraguan law enforcement and the NCA took action to resolve a case. In May 2015, the USCA delivered a demarche to the Government of Nicaragua noting Nicaragua's citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Managua also met with the NCA, the Nicaraguan National Police, and the Nicaraguan Supreme Court to discuss Nicaragua's citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In June 2015, the USCA met with the U.S. Ambassador-Designate to Nicaragua Laura Dogu on IPCA issues and pending cases in Nicaragua. Additionally, in June 2015, the USCA and U.S. Embassy Managua engaged with a Hague Network Judge in Nicaragua, providing information on Convention partnership with the United States.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Nicaragua on resolving pending cases and on improving the performance of the country's law enforcement.</p>
Oman	
Convention Country?	No
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	E Oman has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the

	<p>U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.</p> <p>The Government of Oman did not provide meaningful assistance in returning children to their country of habitual residence. Abductions to Oman are complicated by the fact that foreign court orders and Omani judgments are generally not enforceable. Returns of abducted children have been rare and the result of voluntary agreements between the parents. Many left-behind parents have reported difficulties in securing exit visas should they travel to Oman to see their children. The Omani Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been very slow to respond to diplomatic notes submitted by the U.S. Embassy on behalf of the USCA.</p>
<p>Summary of Actions Taken</p>	<p>In June and October 2014 and again in January, April, and June 2015, U.S. Embassy Muscat sent diplomatic notes on an unresolved IPCA case to Oman’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In July 2014, U.S. Embassy Muscat sent a joint diplomatic note, with the Embassy of Turkey, to the Government of Oman and sent another diplomatic note in April 2015 to request assistance regarding another pending IPCA case.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Muscat delivered a demarche to the Government of Oman noting Oman’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In May 2015, USCA staff spoke with the Omani Embassy in Washington to encourage accession to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and request assistance in resolving pending cases.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Oman to improve its efforts with the USCA and to resolve IPCA cases.</p>
<p>Pakistan</p>	
<p>Convention Country?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Description of Pattern of Noncompliance</p>	<p>E</p> <p>Pakistan has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.</p> <p>The Government of Pakistan has not taken actions to return children to their country of habitual residence; however on rare occasions they provided assistance in conducting welfare and whereabouts visits with abducted children.</p>

	<p>IPCA cases in Pakistan are often complicated by lengthy delays in the Pakistani judiciary. The Department is not aware of any case in which a Pakistani court ordered a child's return to the United States. Returns of abducted children from Pakistan have been rare and the result of voluntary agreements between the parents.</p>
<p>Summary of Actions Taken</p>	<p>In December 2014, U.S. Embassy Islamabad met with the Pakistani Passport Office Director and officials from Pakistan's Ministry of the Interior to discuss visas and passports for U.S. citizen children abducted to Pakistan, which is a very prevalent issue amongst cases of dual-national children abducted to Pakistan.</p> <p>In February 2015, U.S. Embassy Islamabad met with the Head of the Americas desk of Pakistan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs to discuss better cooperation in scheduling welfare and whereabouts visits between U.S. consular officers and U.S. citizen children abducted to Pakistan.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Islamabad delivered a demarche to the Government of Pakistan noting Pakistan's citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Pakistan to improve its efforts with the USCA and resolve IPCA cases.</p>
<p>Peru</p>	
<p>Convention Country?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Description of Pattern of Noncompliance</p>	<p>A, C</p> <p>Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Peru remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. Peru's judicial authority failed to implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) due to lengthy reviews conducted by Peruvian courts and numerous lengthy appeals.</p>
<p>Summary of Actions Taken</p>	<p>In March 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) traveled to Peru for meetings with the Peruvian Central Authority (PCA) and other officials to express concerns regarding judicial system decisions and delays in Convention cases.</p> <p>In March and April 2015, the U.S. Ambassador to Peru Brian Nichols conducted separate meetings with both the outgoing and the newly appointed Peruvian Minister of Justice. With</p>

	<p>both officials, Ambassador Nichols directly raised the issue of delayed resolution in international parental child abduction cases (IPCA), primarily due to obstacles in the judicial system. Ambassador Nichols emphasized the need to expedite resolution of IPCA cases for the welfare of the children and inquired about Peru’s interest in U.S. cooperation in training judges on Convention requirements.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Lima delivered a demarche to the Government of Peru noting Peru’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction international parental child abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Peru on resolving pending cases and improving the performance of Peru’s judicial branch.</p>
Poland	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>A</p> <p>Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Poland remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In January 2014, U.S. Embassy Warsaw contacted officials from the Polish Central Authority (PCA) to discuss the resolution of a pending international parental child abduction (IPCA) case under the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. In April 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) facilitated judicial communication between a Polish judge and a U.S. Hague Network Judge regarding a pending case. That same month, U.S. Embassy Warsaw contacted officials from the PCA to seek an update on an abduction case. In September 2014, U.S. Embassy Warsaw hosted officials from the PCA to discuss IPCA issues.</p> <p>In January 2015, the PCA informed the USCA that the Polish appellate court took action to conclude the unresolved long-standing case that was pending in the Polish courts.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Warsaw delivered a demarche to the Government of Poland noting Poland’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p>

	We continue to engage with the Government of Poland on resolving pending cases.
Romania	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>A, C, D</p> <p>Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Romania remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. Romania’s judicial branch failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) by moving forward with a custody case despite the existence of a valid Convention return order issued by a separate Romanian court. Law enforcement authorities regularly failed to fulfill their obligations by refusing to enforce a valid Convention return order.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In July 2014, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs met with the Romanian Embassy to the United States in Washington to discuss the single unresolved international parental child abduction (IPCA) case from the United States to Romania. In September 2014, U.S. Embassy Bucharest met with the Romanian Central Authority (RCA) to discuss the current status of judicial proceedings of an unresolved abduction case. In November 2014, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) hosted a digital video conference (DVC) with representatives from the RCA.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Bucharest delivered a demarche to the Government of Romania noting Romania’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance. Also in May the USCA met with the Romanian Embassy to the United States in Washington to inform Romania of the citation.</p> <p>In July 2015, the USCA traveled to Bucharest for meetings with the RCA and with Romania’s two appointed Hague Network Judges. The meeting focused on systematic improvements that Romania can make to improve its Convention compliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Romania on resolving pending cases, and improving the performance of the country’s judicial branch and law enforcement.</p>

Saudi Arabia	
Convention Country?	No
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	<p>E</p> <p>Saudi Arabia has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.</p> <p>Despite attention given to the issue, the Government of Saudi Arabia did not provide meaningful assistance to left-behind parents in returning children to their country of habitual residence. Abductions to Saudi Arabia are complicated by the fact that foreign court orders are generally not enforceable. Returns of abducted children have been extremely rare and the result of voluntary agreements between the parents.</p>
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In 2014 and 2015, the USCA met with the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Washington to discuss consular issues, including IPCA. In these meetings, USCA officials asked the Saudi Embassy to provide a centralized IPCA contact in Saudi Arabia to allow for better communication between the two governments regarding IPCA cases. In July 2014, U.S. Embassy Riyadh sent a diplomatic note to Saudi Arabia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), requesting a point of contact from the MFA's representative to the Permanent Committee for the Settlement of Child Custody Disputes. The MFA provided this information to the USCA in August 2014.</p> <p>In May 2015, the USCA delivered a demarche to the Government of Saudi Arabia noting Saudi Arabia's citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In May 2015, USCA staff met with the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Washington to encourage accession to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) and request assistance in resolving pending IPCA cases.</p> <p>In July 2015, the USCA began organizing and planning a regional symposium scheduled for September 2015 on the Convention and its potential application in countries in the Near East region, including Saudi Arabia.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Saudi Arabia to improve its efforts with the USCA and resolve IPCA cases.</p>

Slovakia	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	A Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in Slovakia remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014.
Summary of Actions Taken	<p>In September 2014, U.S. Embassy Bratislava delivered a diplomatic note, requesting assistance on a pending case under the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention). In June 2014, U.S. Ambassador to Slovakia Theodore Sedgwick joined ambassadors and chargés from other European embassies in Bratislava to participate in a multilateral effort with senior officials from Slovakia’s Ministry of Justice to encourage Slovakia’s compliance with the Convention. In November 2014, U.S. Embassy Bratislava met with working-level counterparts of this multilateral group. That same month, the group, along with Slovakian officials, also participated in a Convention conference hosted by the Slovak Central Authority (SCA).</p> <p>In February 2015, the SCA informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the children in the unresolved long-standing case that was pending in the Slovak courts have possibly relocated outside Slovakia.</p> <p>In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Bratislava delivered a demarche to the Government of Slovakia noting Slovakia’s citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>In July 2015, Embassy Bratislava met with the representatives of the Slovak Ministry of Justice’s Legislative Department responsible for civil and commercial law and the recent changes to the Family Code and Civil Procedural Law to improve Slovakia’s compliance with the Convention.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of Slovakia on resolving pending cases.</p>
The Bahamas	
Convention Country?	Yes
Description of Pattern of Noncompliance	A, C Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in The Bahamas remained unresolved as defined by ICAPRA at the end of the reporting period on December 31, 2014. The

	<p>judicial authority in The Bahamas failed to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) due to significant delays in judicial proceedings, including requiring apostilles for certain documents before proceeding with judicial review of Convention cases.</p>
<p>Summary of Actions Taken</p>	<p>In April 2014, the Department delivered a demarche to the Government of The Bahamas noting that The Bahamas was cited in the 2014 Compliance Report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance with the Convention for issues surrounding judicial performance. In September 2014, U.S. Embassy Nassau met with the Bahamas Central Authority to express concern about pending international parental child abduction cases.</p> <p>In May 2015, following the Department’s submission to Congress of the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction, U.S. Embassy Nassau delivered a demarche to the Government of The Bahamas noting The Bahamas’ citation in the report as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance.</p> <p>We continue to engage with the Government of The Bahamas on resolving pending cases and improving the performance of the country’s judicial branch.</p>
<p>Tunisia</p>	
<p>Convention Country?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Description of Pattern of Noncompliance</p>	<p>E</p> <p>Tunisia has demonstrated a persistent failure to work with the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to resolve international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.</p> <p>Despite high-level attention to the issue, the Government of Tunisia did not provide meaningful assistance to left-behind parents in returning children to their habitual residence. While left-behind parents have seen some success in Tunisian courts, including consideration of foreign court orders, legal obstacles prevented Tunisian authorities from enforcing these orders.</p>
<p>Summary of Actions Taken</p>	<p>In March and June 2014, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues Susan S. Jacobs met with the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States in Washington to discuss IPCA. In June 2014, U.S. Embassy Tunis officials also engaged the Tunisian government on the issue. As a follow-up to these meetings, Special Advisor Jacobs traveled to Tunisia in July 2014 and</p>

met with Tunisian government officials to encourage accession to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) and requested assistance with resolving all pending IPCA cases. U.S. Ambassador to Tunisia Jacob Walles also engaged with the Tunisian government on IPCA issues during Special Advisor Jacobs' trip. In May and July 2014, U.S. Embassy Tunis delivered diplomatic notes to the Tunisian government, again raising the issue of IPCA and requesting assistance on pending cases.

In May 2015, U.S. Embassy Tunis delivered a demarche to the Tunisian government noting the country's citation in the 2015 Annual Report on International Parental Child Abduction as demonstrating patterns of noncompliance. A separate diplomatic note was sent in May 2015, again raising the issue of IPCA. In June 2015, USCA staff met with the Tunisian Embassy in Washington to encourage accession to the Convention and request assistance in resolving all cases.

In July 2015, the USCA began organizing and planning a regional symposium to be held in the UAE in September 2015. The symposium will discuss the Convention and its potential application in Tunisia and in other countries in the Near East region.

We continue to engage with the Government of Tunisia to improve its efforts with the USCA and to resolve IPCA cases.

4. Conclusion

The USCA submits the 90-Day Report to the House Appropriations Committee; the Senate Appropriations Committee; the House Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs; the Senate Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs; the House Foreign Affairs Committee; and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

ICAPRA represents a joint effort by the Congress and the executive branches both to resolve difficult cases and to prevent their occurrence. On a regular basis, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) for the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention) meets with foreign government officials to address pending international parental child abduction (IPCA) cases.

We are continuing to initiate a process to develop and enter into appropriate bilateral procedures with non-Convention countries that are unlikely to become Convention countries in the foreseeable future, or with Convention countries that have unresolved abduction cases that occurred before the Convention entered into force with respect to the United States or that country.

Approved: CA:Michele T. Bond

Drafted: CA/OCS/CI: MMaclean, ext. 5-6326, 615-397-2951
CA/OCS/CI: CWalker, ext. 5-6182, 202-286-4788

Cleared: CA: DTDonahue ()
CA: LPetrush ()
CA/OCS: MBernier-Toth, Acting ()
CA/OCS:SOHood (ok)
CA: SJacobs (ok)
CA/OCS/CI:MAvery, Acting (ok)
CA/OCSCI: ACenter, Acting (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: MTedesco (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: CWalker (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: WWhitaker (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: VSmith, Acting (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: BCooper (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: FVillamor, Acting (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: SAnderson (ok)
CA/OCS/CI: LTrost (ok)
CA/OCS/L: LVogel (ok)
CA/OCS/L: SHines (ok)
CA/OCS/L: JHess (ok)
L/CA: CPeters (ok)
CA/P: TMazin (ok)
D: CLe (ok)
D-MR: MWard (ok)
P: Davis-Paguada, Jennifer (ok)
S/P: AMansour (info)
H: JDeMaria (ok)
M: MBishop (ok)
M/PRI: JCore (ok)
NEA/RMA: MMurphy Hall (ok)
SCA/I: MGeremia (ok)
WHA/BSC: GGriffith (ok)
Emb Brasilia: TLloyd (ok)
Emb Managua: KChavez (ok)
Emb Guatemala City: RSchofer (ok)
Emb San Jose: BSzczepaniak (ok)
Emb Tegucigalpa: CReyes (ok)

Emb Lima :RBatchelder	(ok)
Emb Quito :JSchool	(info)
Emb Santo Domingo : SJohnson	(ok)
Emb Bogota : SCraig	(ok)
Emb Nassau: BBorkowicz	(ok)
Emb Buenos Aires: HWilkerson	(ok)
Emb Cairo:SMurphy	(ok)
Emb New Delhi: GFloyd	(ok)
Emb Amman: IHopper	(ok)
Emb Beirut: CFlinchbaugh	(ok)
Emb Muscat: VDiPaola	(ok)
Emb Islamabad: JVick	(info)
Emb Riyadh: DSteele	(ok)
Emb Tunis: JOswelier	(ok)
Emb Bucharest:KEstes	(ok)
EUR/CE:MBlanchard	(ok)
Emb Bratislava: SNelson-Salcedo	(ok)
EmbWarsaw:RBatchelder	(ok)