

# Presentations to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

## Thematic Hearing

*We are privileged to share these transcripts of presentations from Hague mothers and members of the FiLiA Hague Mothers Human Rights' Group from a ground-breaking event held in Guatemala City on 11 March 2026.*

*Our speakers were:*

- *Professor Merle Weiner (University of Oregon, School of Law)*
- *Loana Noguera (Argentina / Sanctuary for Families)*
- *Janaina Albuquerque Gomez (Revibra)*
- *Nicole Fidler (Sanctuary for Families)*
- *Dr Tamara Amoroso Gonsalves (SHERA Research Group)*
- *Professor Caroline Bettinger-Lopez (University of Miami, School of Law)*
- *Hague mother (Brazil/Europe), Shivangi Misra (Equality Now)*

## Professor Merle Weiner

Good afternoon. My name is Merle Weiner and I am a law professor at the University of Oregon. On behalf of 16 non-governmental organizations dedicated to assisting survivors of gender-based violence in the Americas, I thank you so much for granting our request for a Thematic Hearing. Everyone on this panel is honoured to be here. Collectively, we seek to illuminate how survivors of gender-based violence and their children face injustice from the application of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and the InterAmerican Convention on the International Return of Children.

Perpetrators of domestic violence successfully use these laws to harm their victims when these survivors flee transnationally for safety, with their children. Courts deem the mothers child 'abductors', and return the children to the place from which the mothers have just fled. The law is stacked in favour of the abusers. Mothers routinely lose their cases and are forced to choose between their own safety and their children. When they return with their children to the place from which they have fled, as they often do, they and their children face danger, violence, and unnecessary hardship.

Governments who are party to the Conventions as well as the Hague Conference on Private International Law have known about this problem for approximately thirty years, but change has been slow, inadequate, and at times counterproductive. Mothers and children continue to suffer even though the imperative for change has grown stronger over time.

In the last thirty years, researchers have found:

- That most 'abductors' are in fact mothers, and a very high percentage allege that they are fleeing for safety.
- That gender-based violence harms children exposed to DV.
- That batterers use extensive forms of coercive control to abuse their victims and have high recidivism rates.

- And that batterers use the legal system to further their abuse, including by using the abduction conventions.
- Last, but not least, the imperative for change has grown as gender-based violence has become a serious mainstream human rights concern.

Our panel will now explain the issue in more detail, starting with the lived experience of a Hague mother.

### Loana Noguera

Good morning My name is Loana Noguera. I am the mother of a child who was taken from me through the application of the Hague Convention after I fled the United States to protect him from domestic violence. This is my story.

After a short relationship, I became pregnant. Soon after, the physical and psychological abuse began. Over time I became isolated and was made to believe his anger was my fault.

When my son, Alex, was only three-months old, his father left me locked in the car while he took my baby into a friend's house. I panicked and honked the horn, begging for my baby to be brought back. When he returned, and I tried to leave with my child, he threw me to the ground and began choking me while holding Alex with his other arm. His family pulled him off me and begged me not to call the police. I was ashamed and scared, and I did not report it. The violence continued.

Child Services investigated and found him responsible for child endangerment and domestic violence.

The last time he assaulted me, my son was two-years old. While his father was choking me, my little boy began screaming 'Mommy, Mommy' and tried to help me. His father pushed him and locked him outside the room while my child cried for me. That was when I knew I had to protect my child, and got my first restraining order. I did not file a police report.

After nearly a year of restraining orders and Child Services involvement, my son was being hospitalized almost weekly with respiratory problems and was later diagnosed with epilepsy triggered by emotional stress. I begged Family Court for help, but my concerns were not taken seriously. In one hearing, a judge told me: 'This is the father you chose.'

I lived in constant fear that my son would die in his father's care.

In May 2012, I fled with my child — with a stroller, a few clothes, and no plan — because survival was the only option left. Alex and I lived in Argentina for six years. He went to school, played sports, had friends, and had a life free from abuse.

Alex's father had filed a Hague Convention petition. One morning federal police stopped us on the way to school. Despite Alex crying and begging not to go, that same day, the judge ordered him to spend the weekend with his father, a man he had not seen in years. No one cared about his medical history. I was physically removed from the courtroom while my son screamed and clung to me.

That was the last time I saw my nine-year-old.

Alex's father was represented by a public defender and, while in Argentina, he received housing and police protection. In contrast, I was forced to hire a private attorney to represent me. I had no understanding of Hague law or of what type of attorney to retain. I was overwhelmed and trying to navigate a complex legal system while my son had already been taken from me. I felt completely lost

throughout the process and, instead of being treated as a mother trying to protect her child, I was treated like a criminal.

My Hague Convention trial in Argentina lasted seven days. I was never given a meaningful opportunity to fully present my case. The limited evidence I was able to gather was overlooked. The restraining orders were ignored. The domestic violence findings by Child Services were disregarded. The psychological reports were dismissed. Any defence based on the violence, trauma, or medical risks that Alex and I endured was treated as an obstacle to his return. not as evidence that I had acted to protect my son.

Three days after I received the judge's order that Alex had to be returned to the United States—and after a week without contact with my son—I was given no warning, no chance to say goodbye, and no information about his whereabouts. While I was appealing, I was informed by the Argentine Embassy that Alex had already been returned to the United States

For a full year, I had no access to my child whatsoever. I did not even know where he was living. I was repeatedly denied visas to return to the United States to fight for custody and defend myself against kidnapping charges. I was criminalized for protecting my child.

With help from Sanctuary for Families, I did regain limited, supervised contact with my son through video calls. Over time, Alex began to disclose the abuse he had endured. He was slapped, dragged by his hair, threatened with a knife, left without food, left in the cold without covers, mocked for missing me, and told that I was mentally ill. These are only some of the experiences he was able to share.

For five years, he learned to survive in silence. At fourteen, Alex finally found the strength to leave that abusive home. Nearly a year later, he was allowed to return to Argentina.

The Convention claims to protect children. But in practice, it often prioritizes return over safety and limits the evidence courts consider.

Alex lost 6 years of his childhood.

There are other children like Alex right now, suffering in silence.

That cost must matter.

Thank you.

### **Janaína Albuquerque Gomez & Nicole Fidler**

My name is Janaína Albuquerque. I'm an attorney in Brazil and Portugal who works with international child abduction cases, and I am also a legal coordinator at Revibra, an organisation that provides support to Brazilian victims of domestic and gender-based violence abroad.

Firstly, I would like to clarify that in the Americas there is also a regional convention on the international restitution of children. However, in practice, what we see is that the regional framework is frequently superseded by the Hague Convention, even when both States are parties to the inter-American instrument. There are practical reasons for this. The Hague Convention has broader global reach, more contracting States, more case volume, and more interpretative guidance. As a result, even when the inter-American convention formally applies, courts often interpret it through the Hague lens or simply apply the Hague Convention instead. This matters because both frameworks share the same structural limitation, which my colleague Nicole will discuss.

My name is Nicole Fidler. I'm an attorney at Sanctuary for Families, a New York based NGO serving survivors of gender-based violence.

To understand the structural flaw inherent in applying the Convention to survivors of domestic violence, it helps to consider the two ways a parent's international move with a child can be understood. On the one hand, when a child is taken from a safe, primary caretaker parent without justification, the move can be a harmful act, and rightly deemed a child abduction that must be remedied. But often, like when domestic violence victims escape dangerous situations, a parent's decision to cross borders with their child is a justified, protective act, taken to ensure their child's safety. It's an act of survival, not an abduction.

These situations are complex, and it's impossible to know whether a move is harmful or protective without examining the circumstances. But the Hague Abduction Convention ignores that complexity and nuance. Instead, its foundational premise is that *every* international move of a child by one parent, without consent, is inherently a harmful abduction.

This structural flaw has devastating consequences for protective mothers escaping violence. In my work with survivors I've seen how mothers responding to Hague petitions face an almost insurmountable uphill battle.

1. First, survivor-mothers unfairly begin their case with two significant hurdles: the deeply stigmatizing label of 'abductor,' and the powerful presumption that return is in the child's best interest.
2. Second, because of the Convention's ill-conceived focus on returning children 'promptly,' Hague cases are expedited. Contracting States encourage courts to decide cases very quickly. As a result, judges rush to trial, leaving insufficient time for evidence gathering, meaningful fact-finding, and risk assessment; they also fail to make time to hear the voice of the child. This is a significant due process problem and a violation of the rights of both child and mother to be free from violence.
3. Third, there is no domestic violence defence in the Convention. The defence survivors typically use is the Article 13 grave risk defence - which states that children need not be returned if there is a grave risk of exposure to physical or psychological harm or an intolerable situation. In theory, survivors should also be able to invoke Article 20, which allows States to refuse return if doing so would violate human rights and fundamental freedoms. But in practice, these defences are narrowly construed and difficult to establish to a court's satisfaction, especially in the expedited timeline mandated by the Convention. In fact, in the U.S. there has never been a successful Article 20 defence.
4. Fourth, States do not ensure adequate training, and therefore survivors often face judges who:
  - fail to understand the dynamics of domestic violence and its harm to children
  - minimize the devastating consequences of coercive control, and
  - perpetuate harmful gender biases.

Perhaps most troubling, the Convention gives courts discretion to order a child returned even when grave risk is proven. This has led to judges relying on so-called 'protective measures,' to return children to dangerous situations, even though practitioners know these measures are a legal fiction that rarely provide our clients and their children with real protection.

5. Finally, there is a staggering 'inequality of arms' problem wherein the left-behind parent, often the abusive and wealthier parent, receives legal assistance and resources. But in many countries, including the US, the respondent-survivor parent receives no such support. The lack of legal aid

for survivors creates an enormous power imbalance in the courtroom and is another fundamental due process problem.

Thank you. I turn now to my colleague Janaína to further illustrate the issues.

---

It is crucial to recognize that there are regional dimensions that influence how these cases unfold. What we observe across the Americas is a systemic problem rooted in intersectionality. Gender, migration status, race, and class are often overlooked in the rush toward prompt return, and the protection benefits from granting a defense are ignored. There are also political perceptions within the region that influence decision-making. Narratives that the legal systems of certain Inter-American States are too slow or overly protective of mothers can generate pressure to demonstrate compliance at any cost. This pressure leads to insufficient use of the defences.

We are not here today to review the provisions of these conventions. We are here to call for the strengthening of their application through alignment with regional human rights standards for women and children. Private international law cannot operate in isolation from the human rights obligations that bind the same States within this regional system.

The intersection between domestic violence and international child abduction has been recognized at the international level, but progress has been limited. The Hague Conference on Private International Law has developed a Guide to Good Practice on Article 13(1)(b). Notwithstanding, the guidance remains insufficient in situations involving domestic violence.

First, the Guide indicates that violence against a parent will only 'exceptionally' amount to grave risk for the child, when this approach actually minimizes the well-documented reality that violence against a caregiving parent directly affects the child's safety and wellbeing.

Second, the Guide introduces a high threshold for establishing grave risk, requiring courts to assess factors such as the nature, frequency, and intensity of the violence. This framework overlooks the cumulative harm caused by coercive control, intimidation, and threats, which may not always appear as intense incidents but can nonetheless create an intolerable situation for both the child and the abused parent.

Third, as previously noted, the Guide encourages courts to consider protective measures even after grave risk has been established. Still, many of the measures contemplated are either dependent on the abuser's compliance or simply impossible to guarantee in practice, such as migration regularization, financial support, housing, or access to legal assistance. These measures do not eliminate the risk of renewed contact with the abuser and reports from victims repeatedly indicate that such measures are frequently breached.

The Hague Conference has recently organized two international fora on domestic violence and the Child Abduction Convention, including meetings in South Africa in 2024 and in Brazil in 2025. While these initiatives demonstrate growing awareness, they have not yet produced concrete solutions. States have not reached consensus on issues such as the definition of domestic violence, how violence against a parent affects the child, and when domestic violence can meet the grave risk threshold.

It must be borne in mind that institutional progress within the Hague system is gradual. Periodic monitoring of the Convention takes place through Special Commission meetings that occur only every five to six years. The Guide itself took eight years to develop and already requires updating. Until the recent fora, a space that included survivors and members of civil society had never been provided.

The current institutional agenda is focused on the cross-border recognition of protective orders. This, however, does not address the core problem raised here today. It only magnifies the injustice by putting up yet more barriers to a survivor's use of a defence that already exists in the Convention.

### **Tamara Amoroso Gonsalves**

Buenos días, I am Dr Tamara Amoroso Gonsalves, a senior human rights lawyer with expertise on gender-based violence. On behalf of GAMBE, CLADEM, Organización El Paso, and SHERA research group, I address a human rights crisis: women and children who are not protected locally and flee domestic violence across borders encounter a transnational labyrinth of barriers under the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

We must remember that legal systems are never neutral: they mirror and reproduce the gender asymmetries of our societies. In the context of the Hague Convention they are often weaponized through:

- **Linguistic, gender and racial bias**

Limited language proficiency creates isolation, often leaving the abuser as the sole gatekeeper to the outside world. Gender stereotypes harm all women in the judicial system, but for Latin American ones, these are compounded by Global North perceptions that racialize Latin American women and cast them as 'hysterical' or 'manipulative,' leading authorities to dismiss credible reports of violence.

- **Institutional coercion**

Survivors often do not report abuse because they fear deportation or the loss of their migration status—fears their abusers deliberately exploit to maintain control. By withholding identification documents, they leave mothers unable to prove their legal ties to their children or access basic services.

- **Economic disparity**

Restricted work permits and financial vulnerability means that mothers face legal proceedings on highly unequal grounds.

This lack of protection culminates in 'institutional violence,' where the State—by dismissing domestic abuse and allowing procedural tactics such as repetitive, meritless litigation—effectively extends the abuser's coercive control into the judicial system. The human cost is devastating.

Consider Ana, who fled to Brazil after surviving physical and economic abuse in Canada. Despite Brazil becoming the child's centre of life, the Hague Convention was activated. The child was forcibly returned to an abusive father, full custody was granted to the aggressor, and Ana was even forbidden from speaking Portuguese to her son. Similarly, in a 2025 case, a Colombian mother who fled explicit death threats and got judicial protection under Colombian law, saw her child returned to Perú with her father to an environment of proven 'vicarious violence' because the court ignored the 'grave risk' exception under Article 13(b). As a result, she returned to live under his roof to remain with her children despite the danger. For her, as for many others, being with their children means returning to their abuser's territory and facing imminent risk.

The 'habitual residence' the courts seek to protect is often a site of trauma. By ordering a return, courts rely on 'protective measures' that are frequently illusory, emboldening abusers and increasing the risk of femicide during the dangerous and high-risk period of separation.

These issues fit squarely within the well-developed jurisprudence and legal framework established by the Inter-American Human Rights System. At the intersection of gender and migration, the current application of international child return mechanisms without a gender perspective harms survivors and their children's rights to safety, violating State's positive obligations under Articles 1, 7 and 8 of the Belém do Pará Convention, in connection with articles 5, 8, 19, 24, and 25 of the American Convention on Human Rights. Therefore, when courts disregard coercive control, or minimize the well-documented harms of domestic violence against women and children, States enable perpetrators to instrumentalise the law to continue abuse across borders and undermine women's access to justice, by exposing both mothers and children to continued harm. They also ignore regional human-rights standards that determine due diligence must be ensured free from gender bias, as determined in *Maria da Penha v. Brazil*, *Campo Algodonero v. México*, y *Carrión González v. Nicaragua*, *Lenahan v. United States*.

CEDAW jurisprudence is clear. Domestic violence must be a primary consideration in custody decisions and, I would argue, custody-adjacent decisions; judicial officers should receive specialised training on the intersection of gender-based violence, migration; and the Hague Convention; and embassies must provide active support for their nationals facing domestic abuse abroad. While States must address the root causes of mothers' and children's cross-border flight by ensuring safety from domestic violence, until that violence is eliminated they must confront present realities and apply the Convention's return exceptions in abuse cases to uphold human rights protections.

### **Caroline Bettinger-Lopez**

Good morning, my name is Caroline Bettinger-Lopez. I am a law professor and Director of the Human Rights Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law. It is wonderful to engage with the Commission again after hosting you for the 194th period of sessions at University of Miami School of Law last November. I apologize for being unable to travel to Guatemala in person.

Our discussion today is particularly timely, as it connects to the 70th session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women and its priority theme of *ensuring and strengthening access to justice for all women and girls* and promoting inclusive, gender-responsive justice systems.

Building on my colleague's remarks, I urge this Commission to examine international child-abduction cases involving domestic violence through the well-established principles of the inter-American human rights framework promoting women's and children's rights.

#### **1. Inter-American legal framework**

Under inter-American human rights law, States may not apply private international law instruments—including the Hague Convention and the inter-American Abduction Convention—in ways that reproduce gender-based violence, discriminate against women, or expose children to foreseeable harm. Where this occurs, international responsibility attaches not despite family law proceedings, but because of them.

Under the American Convention and the American Declaration, States are required to act with due diligence, ensure non-discrimination, provide effective judicial protection, and afford heightened protection to children in proceedings that expose them to harm. These obligations are reinforced by the Convention of Belém do Pará, which requires States to prevent and respond to violence against women, including where that violence is facilitated or entrenched through judicial processes. Hague proceedings must also comply with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which requires that the best interests

of the child be a primary consideration and that children be protected from all forms of violence, as well as CEDAW, which recognizes gender-based violence as discrimination and obligates States to eliminate discriminatory practices and stereotypes in family-law decision-making.

## **2. Due diligence and State responsibility for private violence**

Our request builds off this Commission's and Court's jurisprudence, particularly the Commission's decision in a case I litigated for many years: *Lenahan (Gonzales) v. United States*. In *Lenahan*, the Commission held that a State violates its human-rights obligations when law enforcement knew or should have known of a real and immediate risk of domestic violence and failed to act with due diligence, even where the violence was committed by a private actor. The Commission found violations of equality and non-discrimination, children's right to special protection, and judicial protection, and emphasized that systemic failures to address domestic violence amount to discrimination against women.

Critically, the principle articulated in *Lenahan* is not limited to policing failures. It applies with equal force when the State's failure occurs through judicial processes themselves, including family law and custody proceedings that discount violence, rely on formalism, or prioritize procedure over protection.

## **3. Reinforcement across inter-American jurisprudence**

This due diligence framework has been consistently reaffirmed across the inter-American system. In *Atala Riffo y Niñas v. Chile*, the Inter-American Court held that custody determinations based on stereotypes, speculation, or abstract assumptions of harm, violate the rights to equality, family life, and the rights of the child, and that judicial decision-making itself can constitute discrimination. In *Maria da Penha v. Brazil*, *González et al. v. Mexico (Cotton Field)*, and *Velásquez Paiz v. Guatemala*, the Commission and Court condemned judicial inaction, reliance on stereotypes, and dismissive reasoning in the face of known gender-based violence. In *Brisa de Angulo Losada v. Bolivia* and *Villagrán-Morales et al. v. Guatemala*, the Court underscored the requirement of enhanced and affirmative protective measures for children facing foreseeable risks of violence—an obligation grounded in children's dependency and vulnerability, as the Court later explained in Advisory Opinion OC-17/02.

## **4. Application to the Hague Convention**

These principles are directly implicated in the Hague Convention context. When Hague proceedings minimize or discount domestic violence, rely on abstract assurances of post-return protection, or penalise women through custody loss for fleeing abuse, they replicate the same due-diligence failures identified most clearly in *Lenahan* and repeatedly reaffirmed by the Inter-American Court and Commission.

Of note, these concerns have also been recognized by the UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women, who has warned that Hague return orders may compel abuse survivors to return to violence and has called on courts applying the Convention to expressly consider family and domestic violence when interpreting and applying its provisions (UN SR VAW, A/HRC/53/36).

## **5. Intersectionality and heightened risk for migrant women**

Finally, the inter-American system has made clear that violence against women is exacerbated by intersecting forms of discrimination, including migration status, poverty, and social

marginalization. Migrant women who flee across borders with their children face compounded barriers to protection, including language barriers, lack of legal representation, precarious immigration status, and heightened vulnerability to coercive control, which States are required to account for rather than erase through formal equality.

In short, OAS Member States may not apply the Hague Convention in ways that disregard domestic violence, rely on gender stereotypes, or ignore intersecting vulnerabilities. Where Hague proceedings expose women and children—particularly migrant and vulnerable women—to foreseeable harm, the violation lies in the State's own judicial action under inter-American human rights law.

**Hague mother** [https://youtu.be/htwWSCGLbRs?si=KT6BxoAXz\\_2B7s3n](https://youtu.be/htwWSCGLbRs?si=KT6BxoAXz_2B7s3n)

My name is Maria. I am Brazilian and I and my daughter have dual nationality due to the marriage to my European ex-husband.

I lived in his country for seven years where I suffered a lot of psychological violence to the point of having a dissection in the vertebral artery and I spent time in intensive care. I suffered so much psychological violence I went for help to the township, I went to the social worker to ask for help. An uncle of my ex-husband asked for help from the social worker for me but I never got support. Nothing. Nothing.

I didn't know about the Hague Convention. I sought assistance from a lawyer that I paid for in Brazil. I went to Brazil with all the letters he signed for me to go to Brazil with my daughter. I got psychological treatment. But in court I won in the first instance and lost in the second. I was heard about the psychological violence, nonetheless it didn't carry that much weight. It didn't matter at all that a Brazilian woman asked for help, that I asked for help for me and my daughter. Irrelevant.

When I lost in the second instance and my daughter was returned to Europe ... even before she returned he came back to his country first and the court basically rolled out the red carpet for him. She returned and I spoke to her on the phone.

I could only re-enter his country after almost two years when he dropped the criminal charges for kidnapping. Because otherwise I couldn't get in. I had to start from scratch.

Psychological violence? Counts for nothing. You can ask for all the help yet you will always be a foreigner, regardless of dual citizenship. The Hague Convention protects those who have more money to pay for better lawyers. If you don't, it does not work, no matter how much you seek help. In my case I didn't feel supported. Neither me nor my daughter.

When I returned to his country I paid for a lawyer in many instalments because I had no money. I found work. I couldn't see my daughter. In the custody hearing they called the social worker. I had to go to the interview with my ex-husband and his mother. He essentially said I was worthless. So that it was that we went to a psychologist every week for me to hear that. If he thought the psychologist wasn't good, we had to change. We would go to a different social worker. For what? For nothing. Nothing mattered in his country. He has sole custody. Today I speak to her when she calls me, hidden from the father, the grandmother. She tells me about how the school is going, if she likes a boy, how her day went. Saturday and Sunday? She can't talk to me when they are at home.

I lost custody, yes. How difficult it is to record this video. The impact on my life ... I have depression. I'm afraid. I'm afraid of everything. I don't post anything on social media. I don't publish if I'm happy. I don't publish if I'm sad.

I feel a sword in my heart that bleeds every day.

I lost the most precious thing of my life. My daughter.

### Shivangi Misra

My name is Shivangi Misra. I am a Senior Legal Advisor at Equality Now, an international human rights organization dedicated to securing the legal and systemic change needed to end discrimination against all women and girls.

We call upon the Commission to urge member States to recognize that domestic violence against a mother constitutes a *per se* grave risk to the child, under Article 13(1)(b) of the Hague Abduction Convention, that cannot be mitigated by so-called 'protective measures.' At the same time, they must also recognise that Article 20 affirms that returning a child to an unsafe home violates their fundamental human rights. This approach would ensure that private law mechanisms remain firmly bound by overarching human rights principles.

To that end, we suggest that this Commission:

1. **Formally recognize** the substantive inequality, systemic discrimination and structural barriers experienced by women *and* children in the implementation of the Hague Abduction Convention and the Inter-American Convention on the International Return of Children.
2. **Develop and publish a dedicated thematic report on international child abduction** and women's rights and the best interest of the child, grounded in rigorous gender- and human rights-based legal analysis, and containing clear recommendations for reform.
3. **Issue** a restorative interpretation that harmonizes the Conventions with the Belém do Pará Convention and the American Convention on Human Rights, affirming that all provisions of the Convention must be read through the lens of a woman's right to be free from violence and her right to physical and mental integrity.
4. **Prioritize cases affecting women and children**, particularly those involving dynamics of domestic violence and its impact on women & children under the Conventions, which results in gender-based biases, revictimization, or irreparable harm.
5. **Ensure timely and effective access to protective mechanisms**, including the granting of precautionary measures in cases involving irreparable harm arising from proceedings under the Conventions.
6. **Take institutional measures to strengthen awareness, expertise, and capacity within the Inter-American system**, ensuring that staff, and decision-makers are equipped to apply a gender- and human rights-based framework to cases involving the Convention.
7. **Exercise your monitoring mandate robustly to hold Member States accountable**, including by incorporating findings and recommendations into annual reports, country reports, thematic reports, and other available mechanisms of the OAS.
8. **Establish training standards and a 'checklist' for judges, law enforcement officials, and lawyers to ensure that enforcement of the Conventions complies fully with States' international human**

rights obligations, including the ones related to due diligence procedures in cases of violence against women.

9. **Facilitate sustained coordination between this Commission, MESECVI, the EDVAW Platform,** and other relevant regional and international mechanisms to promote coherence, mutual reinforcement of standards, and strengthened protection for women and children.
10. **Undertake meaningful engagement with survivors of gender-based violence, advocates, and civil society organizations,** including through regional conference, consultations, and follow-up procedures, to develop concrete and measurable pathways to eliminate and prevent harm in cases involving the Convention.
11. The Commission, in its recommendations and reports, must **adopt an intersectional approach in all steps taken for national implementation and enforcement of the Conventions,** recognizing that women's lived experiences are shaped by interconnected human rights, including economic, social, personal status, and migrant rights, as well as the right to be free from violence and to live a life of dignity.

**Thank you.**