



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Blyth, Eric

Donor anonymity to bite the dust in South Australia

### Original Citation

Blyth, Eric (2010) Donor anonymity to bite the dust in South Australia. *BioNews* (587).

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/9444/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>



*Published by the Progress Educational Trust*

## Donor anonymity to bite the dust in South Australia

*06 December 2010*

*By Professor Eric Blyth*

School of Human and Health Sciences, University of Huddersfield

Appeared in BioNews [587](#)

Australia has been a noted pacemaker in the field of assisted reproduction. It was the first nation to report [embryo](#) relinquishment for family-building (1), and a pregnancy (2) and live birth (3) from a previously cryopreserved human embryo.

The Australian state of Victoria was among the world's first jurisdictions to remove the rights of [gamete](#) and embryo donors to remain anonymous, allowing - with statutory endorsement - a donor-conceived person to learn the identity of her or his donor (4).

The Australian states of Western Australia (5) and New South Wales (6) have followed Victoria's lead. In September 2010, South Australia made a quartet of Australian states to abandon the legal protection of donor anonymity due to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Treatment Regulations 2010 made under the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988 coming into force (7). Virtually all donor conception procedures performed in Australia now operate on the basis on non-anonymity.

The policy change in South Australia provides evidence of the (albeit slow) shift internationally towards using gametes and embryos from identifiable donors. South Australia brings to 13 (8) the number of jurisdictions that provide legislative reinforcement to the notion a donor-conceived person should be able to learn the identity of her or his donor. Recent debates in Canada, however, indicate the global path to 'reform' is far from uniform (9).

As might be expected, legislative and regulatory requirements and procedures in these jurisdictions share common features, such as the establishment of registries. The South Australian government intends to establish a donor conception register and anticipates the necessary regulations will come into effect by early to mid 2011.

A unique feature of how the South Australian legislation has removed of donor anonymity is - unlike other jurisdictions - it has done so obliquely rather than directly. Under Section 15 of the Act, the 'Minister may keep a register of donors of human reproductive material' (Section 15(1)) and 'if the Minister does keep the donor conception register (Section 15(2))' any such register must contain the names of the donor, the recipient of donated gametes or embryos and any child born as a result of the donation.

Despite this cautious wording in Section 15, Section 8(2)(a) of the Assisted Reproductive Technology Regulations 2010 gives individuals conceived using assisted reproductive technologies (ART) the right to know their [genetic heritage](#) indirectly. Section 8(2)(a) amends Section 9(1)(e) of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988 so clinics must comply with the Ethical Guidelines on Assisted Reproductive Technology, published by Australia's National Health and Medical Research Council (9) as a necessary condition of registration to provide assisted reproductive treatment. These guidelines state:

'Persons conceived using ART procedures are entitled to know their genetic parents. Clinics must not use donated gametes in reproductive procedures unless the donor has consented to the release of identifying information about himself or herself to the persons conceived using his or her gametes. Clinics must not mix gametes in a way that confuses the genetic parentage of the persons who are born'. (section 6(1))

The South Australian government also intends - as other jurisdictions have done - to establish a voluntary contact register (VCR) for donations made before the ending of donor anonymity. VCRs are a recent innovation and evidence of their operation remains limited (10). Maybe the South Australian initiative will provide the necessary impetus for an international evaluation of these registers and for them to become the internationally-accepted approach to reconciling newly -acknowledged rights of donor-conceived people to information with previous assurances of anonymity given to donors (11).

#### **SOURCES & REFERENCES**

01) Trounson, A., Leeton, J., Besanko, M., Wood, C., & Conti, A. Pregnancy established in an infertile patient after transfer of a donated embryo fertilised in vitro

British Medical Journal, 286, 835 - 838 | 1983

02) Trounson, A. & Mohr, L. Human pregnancy following cryopreservation, thawing and transfer of an eight-cell embryo

Nature, 305, 707 - 709 | 1983

03) Downing, B., Mohr, L., Trounson, A., Freeman, L., & Wood, C. Birth after transfer of cryopreserved embryos

Medical Journal of Australia, 142, 409 - 411 | 1985

04) Infertility Treatment Act (amended by the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 2008)

| 1995

05) Human Reproductive Technology Amendment Act

| 2004

06) Assisted Reproductive Technology Act

| 2007

07) Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act

| 1988

## 08) National Health and Medical Research Council Guidelines on Assisted Reproductive Technology

NHMRC: Canberra | 2007

## 09) Blyth, E. Davina and Goliath: The personal cost of seeking justice

BioNews 582 | 29 October 2010

## 10) Crawshaw, M. and Marshall, L. Practice experiences of running UK DonorLink, a voluntary information exchange register for adults related through donor conception

Human Fertility 11(4): 231 - 237 | 2008

## 11) Blyth, E. and Frith, L. Donor-conceived people's access to genetic and biographical history: An analysis of provisions in different jurisdictions permitting disclosure of donor identity

International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family 23:192 - 210 | 2009

### RELATED ARTICLES FROM THE BIONEWS ARCHIVE

#### Consent and coercion in gamete and embryo donation

07 February 2011 - by *Dr Neil Manson*

The donation of gametes and embryos must be done with the consent of the donor, otherwise important rights are breached. Valid consent must be voluntary and coercion can undermine voluntariness. But how is coercion defined? Coercion is where one or more parties force another party to act in a way that the coercing party desires, which means that it shares something with offers, incentives and persuasion, but differs by relying on the power of a credible threat...

[\[Read More\]](#)

### HAVE YOUR SAY

So far 1 comment has been added.

*By posting a comment you agree to abide by the BioNews [terms and conditions](#)*

---

[Syndicate this story](#)- click here to enquire about using this story.

---