

## Index

- adoptions, donor conceived people compared to, 25
- Adult Adoption Information Act 1985 (New Zealand), 176
- affective forces, familial haunting and, 164–167
- Aggeles, James, 214
- American Society for Reproductive Medicine (ASRM), 213, 220–221
- Ando, Kakuichi, 229, 231–232
- anonymity culture
  - familial haunting and, 155–157
    - binding agreements in, 155–156
  - in U.S., legal challenges to, 216–218
    - for donor disclosure, 216
    - for half-siblings, 216
    - oppositions to anonymity, 221–222
    - under state statutes, 218–220
- anticipation, familial haunting and, 162–164
- Aotearoa New Zealand, ART in. *See also* Māori culture
  - access to entitlements under state law, 182–183
  - Adult Adoption Information Act 1985, 176
  - boundary negotiations for, 252–253
  - case study for, 179–180
  - conceptual approach to, 174–175, 177–179
  - ethical guidelines for, 179–180
  - Human Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2004, 176
  - information sharing in, 176–177
  - kinship affinity in, 177–179, 186–187
    - through creativity and negotiation, 178
    - beyond rational explanations for, 178
    - through sensory experiences, 179
  - for LGBTQ+ families, 185–187
  - methodological approach to, 179–180
  - new standards for, 176
  - Pākehā in, 174–175
  - public policy criteria for, 183–184
  - value of bearing children in, 184–187
  - wait lists for, 177
  - whakapapa in, 182–183
- ART. *See* assisted reproductive technology
- ART Review Committee, in Japan, 237–238
- ART Subcommittee, in Japan, 235–237
- ASRM. *See* American Society for Reproductive Medicine
- Assessment Subcommittee, in Japan, 234–235
- assisted reproductive technology (ART). *See also* Aotearoa New Zealand
  - in Japan, 230–231
  - same-donor offspring and, 121–122
    - regulations for, 133–135
- Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Donor Conception Register) Amendment Bill, Australia (2021), 15
- Australia
  - access to information for recipient parents in, 33–36, 44–46, 62–63
    - under Ethical Guidelines on the Use of Assisted Reproductive Technology in Clinical Practice and Research, 34–35
  - information disclosure and, 35
  - open identity donation, 33–34
  - Reproductive Technology Accreditation Committee, 34–35
  - by state, 35–36
  - Victorian Assisted Reproductive Treatment Authority, 35–36, 43–47
- Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Donor Conception Register) Amendment Bill, 15
  - donor conception registers in, 16
  - donor information access in, 15
  - donor linking laws in, 1–2
  - familial haunting in, 156–157
  - online sperm donation in, 3
  - right to know policies in, 20–21
  - same-donor offspring in, 120–121
  - Sperm Donation Australia, 71–73
  - Sperm Donors Australia, 3
  - Victorian Assisted Reproductive Treatment Authority
    - access to information for recipient parents and, 35–36, 43–47

- Australia (cont.)  
 donor-linked families and, 52–55  
 social media and, 52–55
- Baden-Lasar, Eli, 23–24
- Barnwell, Ashley, 157–158
- Beatie, Thomas, 195, 204
- belonging, feelings of  
 in digital age, 251–253  
 with same-donor offspring, 125–126
- bioethics. *See also* ethic of openness  
 of insemination fraud and substitution, 96
- biogenetic connections, for donor siblings, 104
- Birth Registration Reform Group (BRRG), in U.K., 21
- Bobbi Jo R. v. Traci W.*, 217
- BRRG. *See* Birth Registration Reform Group
- Burghammer, Daniel, 192
- Canada  
 insemination fraud and substitution in, 85–86  
 case studies for, 87–91  
 College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, 86  
 by physicians, 87–91, 96  
 STORIES project case study in, 87–91  
 data analysis for, 88  
 feelings upon discovery of substitution, 90–91  
 participant profiles in, 88  
 results of, 88–90  
 steps prior to discovery, 90–91  
 trajectory of discovery of substitution, 88–90
- case studies. *See also* STORIES project case study  
 for ART in Aotearoa New Zealand, 179–180  
 Curious Connections Study, 139–140  
 with donor siblings, 105–110  
 data collection, 105–106  
 demographics in, 105  
 interviews in, 105–106, 116–117  
 for insemination fraud and substitution, 87–91  
 for relational authority, 144–149  
 for same-donor offspring, 123–124  
 meetings with multiple same-donor offspring, 124–127  
 participants in, 124, 124  
 for sperm donation by trans/masculine and non-binary people, 198–203  
 children's agency in, 202–203  
 donor's role in, 199–201  
 funding of, 198  
 interview process in, 198–203  
 kinship context in, 201–202  
 thematic analysis of, 199–203
- children. *See also* donor-conceived children;  
 donor siblings; only children  
 agency of, 202–203  
 cultural value of, in Aotearoa New Zealand, 184–187  
 feelings about insemination fraud and substitution, 93–94  
 whāngai, 174–175, 183–184
- cisgender males, sperm donation and. *See also*  
 sperm donation; sperm donors  
 conceptual approach to, 192–194
- cisgenderism, in fertility clinics, 196
- Civil Code, in Japan, 232–233, 242
- College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, 86
- complex personhood, familial haunting and, 159–161
- contact strategies  
 for donor-linked families, on Facebook, 58–60, 64–65  
 with sperm donors in Australia, 74–81  
 negotiations and renegotiations of, 76–81
- Convention on the Rights of the Child.  
*See* United Nations
- Cordley, Bill, 240
- creeping, on Facebook, 51, 61–62, 64
- Croatia, donor conception registers in, 16
- culture of openness  
 in digital age, 249–251  
 recipient parents in, 46–47
- Curious Connections Study, 139–140
- Davies, Katherine, 113
- DCPs. *See* donor conceived people
- DCR. *See* Donor Conceived Register;  
 Donor-Conceived Registry
- Denmark, same-donor offspring in, 120–121
- “diblings,” 104
- digital age, donor linking in  
 boundaries of, 251–253  
 direct-to-consumer genetic testing and, 249–251  
 emotional bonding, 251–253  
 evolution of, 249  
 feelings of belonging, 251–253  
 openness and, 249–251  
 regulatory mechanisms, 253–254  
 relatedness in, 253–254  
 secrecy culture and, 249–251
- direct-to-consumer DNA testing, 3  
 for donor relatives, 41–42
- direct-to-consumer genetic testing (DTCGT), 2  
 in digital age, 249–251  
 for donor conceived people, 15  
 long-term legacy of, 26–28

- in United Kingdom, 15–16, 18–19
  - challenges with, 23–24
  - donor conceived people's voice in, 21–24, 26–28
  - expansion of DTCGT, 18–19
  - internet-based forums and, 19
- disclosure/nondisclosure, for donor conception
  - of insemination fraud and substitution, 91–94
  - children's feelings about, 93–94
  - context of, 92–93
  - parental concerns about, 92
  - psychological repercussions as result of, 92
- in U.S., 211–213
  - legal challenges to anonymity, 216
- DNA Detectives Facebook group, 19
  - donor-linked families and, 57
- DNA kits, insemination fraud and substitution and, 85–86
  - democratisation of DNA kits and, 96
- DNA testing, direct-to-consumer, 3
- do-it-yourself linking, advantages of, 2
- donor anonymity. *See also* anonymity culture; Japan
  - recipient parents and, 42
- donor conceived people (DCPs), 5–6. *See also* donor-linked families; donor siblings; familial haunting; recipient parents; *specific countries; specific topics*
- direct-to-consumer genetic testing for, 15
- donor information for, 15
- under European Convention on Human Rights, 19–20
- right to choose for, 19–21, 27
- right to know for
  - in Australia, 20–21
  - familial haunting and, 156
  - in United Kingdom, 19–21, 27
- under UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 19–20
- in United Kingdom
  - right to choose for, 19–21, 27
  - right to know, 19–21, 27
- Donor Conceived Register (DCR), in U.K., 16, 18
- donor conception, international approaches to. *See also* United States
  - conceptual approach to, 211–212
- donor conception registers
  - in international jurisdictions, 16
  - in United Kingdom, 16–18
- donor information. *See also* donor relationships
  - in Australia, 15
  - for donor conceived people, 15
- donor linking laws. *See also* digital age; recipient parents; *specific countries*
  - conceptual approach to, 2–4
  - controversy over, 1–2
  - dis/connection in, 251–253
  - methodological approach to, 4–10
- donor relationships, with recipient families
  - after conception/birth, 142
  - conceptual approaches to, 138–139
  - donor personal relationships influenced by, 150–151
  - ethic of openness for, 149–152
    - Curious Connections Study, 139–140
    - in U.K., 138–139
  - history of, 138
  - with LGBTQ+ couples, 147–149
  - with multiple families, 150
  - policy practices and, 151–152
  - relational authority in, 140–149
    - case studies for, 144–149
    - challenges with, 143–149
    - donor personal relationships and, 150–151
    - identity-release donors, 141–142, 149–150
    - moral importance of, 143
  - secrecy of, 138
  - in U.K., 138
    - Curious Connections Study, 139–140
    - ethic of openness, 138–139
- donor relatives. *See also* donor relationships; donor siblings
- definition of, 1–2
- location strategies for, 40–44
  - with direct-to-consumer DNA testing, 41–42
  - Donor Sibling Registry, 40–41
  - through fertility clinics, 42–44
  - with online forums and registries, 40–41
- donor rights, in Japan, 230–231, 244
- Donor Sibling Link (DSL), U.K., 120–121, 134
- donor sibling registries, 103
- Donor Sibling Registry (DSR)
  - recipient parents and, 40–41
  - same-donor offspring and, 120–121
- donor siblings, 1–2
  - in case studies, 105–110
    - data collection, 105–106
    - demographics in, 105
    - interviews in, 105–106, 116–117
  - conceptual approach to, 103–104
  - cultural terminology for, 103–104
    - biogenetic connections and, 104
  - as “diblings,” 104
  - donor sibling registries and, 103
  - face-to-face encounters for, 109
    - first contact, 112
  - in family contexts, 103–104
    - biogenetic connections in, 104
    - establishment of labels in, 113–116

- donor siblings (cont.)  
   in Euro-American cultures, 104  
   idealization of siblings in, 113–114  
   kinship systems for, 103–104  
   biogenetic connections and, 104  
   labelling of, 113–116  
   lack of social familiarity with, 107–108  
   LGBTQ+ identity and, 110  
   methodological approaches to, 105–106  
   policy implications for, 118  
   relationship building with, 111–113  
     buildup in, 111–112  
     for children with other siblings, 116  
     disconnection in sibling status, 106–108  
     emotional engagement as part of, 109–110  
     feelings about donor siblings, 114  
     friendships and, 115  
     inability to maintain social connections, 108  
     indexing knowledge in, 111  
     mutual fulfillment as element of, 114  
     for only children, 115  
     stages of, 112–113  
   responses to physical resemblance, 106–107  
 donor-conceived children  
   in Japan, 239–241  
   legal status of, 232–233  
   parents of, 241–242  
   under UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 19–20, 233  
   whāngai, 174–175, 183–184  
 Donor-Conceived Registry (DCR), 120  
 donor-linked families. *See also* donor relationships; donor siblings  
   on Facebook, 49–50  
     contact strategies, 58–60, 64–65  
     creeping on, 51, 61–62, 64  
     ethics of online surveillance, 57–58  
     information seeking on, 63  
     name connections through, 53–56  
     through physical resemblance in photos, 56–57  
     privacy settings for, 50–51  
     social media stalking, 51–52  
     use and abuse of “likes,” 60–61  
   on Instagram, 49–50  
   social media and  
     conceptual approach to, 49–50  
     DNA detectives and, 57  
     ethics of online surveillance, 57–58  
     normalisation of social surveillance and, 50–52  
     studies and surveys on, 52–53  
     survey results for, 53–62  
     Victorian Assisted Reproductive Treatment Authority and, 52–55  
   on TikTok, 49–50  
   DSL. *See* Donor Sibling Link  
   DSR. *See* Donor Sibling Registry  
   DTCGT. *See* direct-to-consumer genetic testing  
 ECHR. *See* European Convention on Human Rights  
 embryos, insemination fraud and substitution with, 87  
 ethic of openness, in donor relationships with recipient families, 149–152  
   Curious Connections Study, 139–140  
   in U.K., 138–139  
 Ethical Guidelines on the Use of Assisted Reproductive Technology in Clinical Practice and Research, in Australia, 34–35  
 ethics  
   for ART in Aotearoa New Zealand, 179–180  
   bioethics of insemination fraud and substitution, 96  
   in U.S. donor conception mechanisms, 220–221  
 European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), 19–20  
 European settlers in New Zealand. *See* Pākehā expectations, of sperm donors in Australia, 74–81  
   alignment with recipient parents, 74–76  
   renegotiations of, 76–81  
   extended family groups. *See* whānau  
 Facebook  
   DNA Detectives, 19  
   privacy settings on, 50–51  
   Sperm Donors Australia, 3, 69  
 familial haunting, donor-conceived people's experiences with  
   academic scholarship on, 156–157  
   affective forces and, 164–167  
   anonymity culture and, 155–157  
     binding agreements in, 155–156  
   anticipation feelings, 162–164  
   in Australia, 156–157  
   complex personhood, 159–161  
   conceptual approach to, 154–155  
   definition of, 154–155  
   emotional ambivalence and, 164–167  
   familial engagement and, 167–168  
   fear of rejection and, 166  
   feelings of loss and, 162–164  
   identity reformation and, 159–161  
   kinship blockage and, 162  
   methodological approaches to, 158–159  
     data analysis in, 159  
     data collection in, 158–159  
     sample size in, 158–159

- for missing fathers, 155–157
- personal narratives of familial resemblance, 160–161
- regulatory frameworks for, 168–169
- relationality and, 164–167
- research findings for, 159–167
- “right to know” and, 156
- secrecy culture and, 155–157
  - insemination fraud and, 155
  - sperm mixing as part of, 155
- temporal experiences and, 160–161
- theory of slow violence and, 157–158
- waiting to interact, 162–164
- Families We Choose* (Weston), 104
- family contexts. *See also* donor relationships; donor-linked families; familial haunting
  - for donor siblings, 103–104
    - biogenetic connections in, 104
    - establishment of labels, 113–116
    - in Euro-American cultures, 104
    - idealization of siblings in, 113–114
  - for sperm donation by trans/masculine and non-binary people, 201
- fear of rejection, 166
- fertility clinics
  - cisgenderism in, 196
  - donor relatives’ use of, 42–44
- fertility treatment risks, sperm donation and, 70–71
- Finland
  - donor conception registers in, 16
  - donor linking laws in, 1–2
- Fiom KID-DAN Database, 120, 122–124
  - establishment of, 134
  - guided group meetings through, 123, 127–133
    - conditions of, 129–133
    - demographics of, 128
    - environmental conditions for, 128
    - formatting of, 130
    - goals of, 129
    - group bonds in, 132
    - history of, 133
    - norms in, 132
    - operating procedures of, 130
    - participants in, 128–129
    - roles in, 130–132
    - size of, 129
    - stages of, 133
    - structural forms of, 130–133
  - networks within, 122–123
- France, insemination fraud and substitution
  - in, 85
- Free Sperm Donors Worldwide, 68–69
- friendships, with donor siblings, 115
- gamete donors, 77
  - insemination fraud and substitution with, 87
- genetic genealogy services. *See* online genetic genealogy services
- genetic testing, in U.S. donor conception, 222–223
- Ghostly Matters* (Gordon), 157–158
- Gollancz, David, 21
- Gordon, Avery, 157–159
- half-siblings
  - legal challenges to anonymity of, 216
  - same-donor offspring as, 127
- Hewitt, Geraldine, 240
- HFEA Register. *See* Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority Register
- Hooper, Adam
  - Sperm Donation Australia and, 71–73
  - Sperm Donation World and, 72
- Human Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2004, New Zealand, 176
- Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority Register (HFEA Register), 16–18, 68
  - DCP right to know policies, 20–21
  - Donor Sibling Link, 120–121, 134
- Human Rights Act 1998, U.K., 22
- ICSI. *See* intracytoplasmic sperm injection
- identity reformation, familial haunting and, 159–161
- identity-release donors, 141–142, 149–150
- Iizuka, Rihachi, 231–232
- informal sperm donation. *See also* insemination fraud
  - in Australia
    - health and safety risks to women, 71
    - within LGBTQ+ populations, 68
    - mainstreaming of, 68–71
    - for single mothers by choice, 69
- information disclosure
  - in Aotearoa New Zealand, 176–177
  - for recipient parents in Australia, 35
- Information Donor Insemination Law, Netherlands (2004), 122–123, 134
- in vitro* fertilisation (IVF)
  - in Japan, 234
  - Māori culture and, 179–180
  - sperm donors in Australia and, 70–71
  - in U.S. donor conception approaches, 224
- insemination fraud and substitution
  - academic literature review on, 86–87
  - analysis of, 94–96
  - in Canada, 85–86
    - case studies for, 87–91
  - College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, 86
  - by physicians, 87–91

- insemination fraud and substitution (cont.)  
 conceptual approach to, 85–86  
 confirmation of, 91  
 disclosure of, 91–94  
   children's feelings about, 93–94  
   context of, 92–93  
   parental concerns about, 92  
   psychological repercussions as result of, 92  
 DNA kits and, 85–86  
   democratisation of, 96  
 donation tracking inconsistencies and, 85  
 with embryos, 87  
 familial haunting and, 155  
 family contexts for, 86  
 in France, 85  
 with gametes, 87  
 as malpractice, 96  
 media attention on, 86  
 by physicians, 87–91  
   bioethics of, 96  
   confirmation of substitution, 91  
   from record-keeping inconsistencies, 85  
   secrecy culture and, 155  
 STORIES project case study, 87–91  
   data analysis for, 88  
   feelings upon discovery of substitution,  
     90–91  
   participant profiles in, 88  
   results of, 88–90  
   steps prior to discovery, 90–91  
   trajectory of discovery of substitution,  
     88–90  
 in U.S., 85  
   victims' reactions to, 94–96  
 Instagram, donor-linked families on, 49–50  
 International Society of Genetic Genealogists, 19  
 intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI), 223  
 Ireland, donor conception registers in, 16  
 IVF. *See in vitro* fertilisation
- Japan, donor insemination and conception in  
 analysis of, 242–244  
 assisted reproductive technologies in,  
   230–231  
 under Civil Code, 232–233, 242  
 donor anonymity and  
   abolishment movement for, 239–242  
   conceptual approach to, 229–231  
   cultural background for, 231–233  
   early challenges to, 230  
   historical background for, 231–233  
   legislation on, 234–239  
   public debates over, 234–239  
 donor rights and, 230–231, 244  
 donor-conceived children in, 239–241  
   legal status of, 232–233  
   parents of, 241–242  
 historical development of, 229–233  
   demographics in, 229  
   *in vitro* fertilisation and, 234  
 institutional limitations in, 230  
 institutional mechanisms  
   ART Review Committee, 237–238  
   ART Subcommittee, 235–237  
   Assessment Subcommittee, 234–235  
   Liberal Democratic Party Project Team,  
     238–239  
   under Special ART Law of 2020, 239, 243  
   Medical Practitioners Law, 244  
   public attitudes toward, 233–234  
   support groups for, 242  
 Japan Society of Obstetrics Gynecology  
   (JSOG), 229
- kinship affinity  
 in Aotearoa New Zealand, 177–179, 186–187  
   through creativity and negotiation, 178  
   beyond rational explanations for, 178  
   through sensory experiences, 179  
 in Māori culture  
   biological relatedness and genetic legacy  
     in, 180–184  
   personal identity and, 180–184  
   whakapapa as, 181–183
- kinship blockage, 162  
 kinship systems, donor siblings and, 103–104  
   biogenetic connections and, 104
- LGBTQ+ populations. *See also* trans/masculine  
   and non-binary people  
 in Aotearoa New Zealand, 185–187  
 donor relationships with recipient families,  
   147–149  
 donor siblings and, 110  
 Pride Angel website and, 68–69, 72  
 Rainbow Families, 72  
 as recipient parents, 37  
 Liberal Democratic Party Project Team, in  
   Japan, 238–239  
 loss, familial haunting and, 162–164
- Macmillan, Caitlan, 157  
 malpractice, insemination fraud and  
   substitution as, 96
- Māori culture, ART and  
 access to entitlements under state law, 182–183  
 analysis of, 187–188  
 case study for, 179–180  
 conceptual approach to, 174–175  
 ethical guidelines for, 179–180

- information sharing in, 176–177  
*in vitro* fertilisation and, 179–180  
 kinship affinities in  
   biological relatedness and genetic legacy  
     in, 180–184  
   personal identity and, 180–184  
   whakapapa as, 181–183  
 methodological approaches to, 179–180  
 Pākehā compared to, 174–175, 182–183  
 Te Ao Māori and, 175, 187–188  
 under Treaty of Waitangi principles, 179–180  
 value of bearing children in, 184–187  
 whānau and, 174–175, 186  
   biological relatedness and, 180–181  
 whāngai and, 174–175, 183–184  
 Māori worldview. *See* Te Ao Māori  
 masculinity. *See* trans/masculine and non-binary people  
 media. *See also* social media  
   insemination fraud and substitution cases  
     in, 86  
   “pregnant men” in, 192, 194–195, 204  
   sperm donation in trans/masculine and  
     non-binary people in, 194–195  
 Medical Practitioners Law, Japan, 244  
 misgendering, for trans/masculine and  
   non-binary people, 195–196  
 morality, of relational authority, 143  
 motivations  
   for access to information for recipient  
     parents, 37–40  
   for sperm donors in Australia, 70  
 multiple donations  
   donor relationships with recipient families  
     and, 150  
   same-donor offspring meetings and, 124–127  
 Nagaoki, Satoko, 240–241  
 the Netherlands. *See also* Fiom KID-DAN  
   Database  
   donor conception registers in, 16  
   donor linking laws in, 1–2  
   Information Donor Insemination Law,  
     122–123, 134  
   same-donor offspring in, 133–135  
 Nezu, Yahiro, 238  
 non-binary people. *See* trans/masculine and  
   non-binary people  
 Norway, donor conception registers in, 16  
 online forums, donor relatives’ location  
   strategies and, 40–41  
 online genetic genealogy services, 120–121  
 online sperm donation  
   in Australia, 3  
   as donor relative location strategy, 40–41  
 online surveillance  
   by donor-linked families, ethics issues for,  
     57–58  
   ethics of, 57–58  
   normalisation of, 50–52  
 only children, donor siblings and, 115  
 open identity donation, 33–34  
 openness. *See* culture of openness  
 Pākehā (European settlers in New Zealand),  
   ART and, 174–175  
   Māori culture compared to, 174–175,  
     182–183  
 PANEL Principles, in U.K., 22  
*Pasik v. Russell*, 218  
*Perry-Rogers v. Fasano*, 217  
*Personal Life* (Smart), 157  
 physicians, insemination fraud and substitution  
   by, 87–91  
   bioethics of, 96  
   confirmation of, 91  
 post-birth relationships, with sperm donors in  
   Australia, 67–68  
 “pregnant men,” 192, 194–195, 204  
 Pride Angel, 3, 68–69, 72  
 privacy  
   for donor-linked families, 50–51  
   on Facebook, 50–51  
   prolific sperm donors, in Australia, 69  
   psycho-social consequences, for same-donor  
     offspring contact, 121–122  
 qualitative research, with sperm donors in  
   Australia, 71–74  
   choice of informal online donation, 73–74  
   participants in, 71–72  
   structure of research, 71–72  
 Rainbow Families, 72  
 recipient parents (RPs), access to information  
   for. *See also* donor relationships  
   under Australian law, 33–36, 44–46, 62–63  
   under Ethical Guidelines on the Use of  
     Assisted Reproductive Technology in  
     Clinical Practice and Research, 34–35  
   for information disclosure, 35  
   open identity donation, 33–34  
   Reproductive Technology Accreditation  
     Committee, 34–35  
   by state, 35–36  
   Victorian Assisted Reproductive Treatment  
     Authority, 35–36, 43–47  
   conceptual approach to, 33–34  
   in culture of openness, 46–47

- recipient parents (cont.)  
 disclosure of insemination fraud and  
   substitution, 92  
 do-it-yourself techniques by, 34, 44–45  
 donor anonymity and, 42  
 donor relative location strategies, 40–44  
   with direct-to-consumer DNA testing,  
   41–42  
   Donor Sibling Registry, 40–41  
   through fertility clinics, 42–44  
   with online forums and registries, 40–41  
 methodological approach to, 36–37  
 LGBTQ+ populations, 37  
 single mothers by choice in, 36–40, 43,  
   45–46  
 motivations for, 37–40  
 prohibitions to, 33  
 recognition, feelings of, with same-donor  
   offspring, 125–126  
 record-keeping, insemination fraud and  
   substitution and, 85  
 rejection. *See* fear of rejection  
 relational authority, in donor relationships with  
   recipient families, 140–149  
   case studies for, 144–149  
   challenges with, 143–149  
   donor personal relationships and, 150–151  
   identity-release donors, 141–142, 149–150  
   moral importance of, 143  
 relationality, familial haunting and, 164–167  
 relationship building, with donor siblings.  
   *See* donor siblings  
 Reproductive Technology Accreditation  
   Committee (RTAC), 34–35  
 right to choose, for donor conceived people, in  
   United Kingdom, 19–21, 27  
 right to know, for donor conceived people  
   in Australia, 20–21  
   familial haunting and, 156  
   in United Kingdom, 19–21, 27  
 RPs. *See* recipient parents  
 RTAC. *See* Reproductive Technology  
   Accreditation Committee  
 same-donor offspring, of donor-conceived  
   people. *See also* Fiom KID-DAN  
   Database  
   assisted reproductive technology and, 121–122  
   regulations for, 133–135  
   in Australia, 120–121  
   case studies for, 123–124  
   meetings with multiple same-donor  
   offspring, 124–127  
   participants in, 124  
   conceptual approach to, 120–124  
   contacts between, 121  
   feelings of belonging from, 125–126  
   feelings of recognition from, 125–126  
   for multiple same-donor offspring, 124–127  
   in Denmark, 120–121  
   Donor Sibling Registry, 120–121  
   Donor-Conceived Registry and, 120  
   as half-siblings, 127  
   legal limits on, 121–122  
   meetings with multiple numbers of, 124–127  
   in Netherlands, 133–135  
   online genetic genealogy services and,  
   120–121  
   policy applications for, 133–135  
   psycho-social consequences of, 121–122  
   regulations for, 133–135  
   in U.K., 120–121  
   in U.S., 120–121  
 SDA. *See* Sperm Donation Australia  
 SDW. *See* Sperm Donation World  
 secrecy culture  
   donor linking in digital age and, 249–251  
   familial haunting and, 155–157  
   insemination fraud and, 155  
   sperm mixing as part of, 155  
   in U.S. donor conception, 212–215  
 sex difference research, 197  
 Shapiro, Dani, 212–213  
 Shimizu, Kiyomi, 242  
 single mothers by choice (SMC)  
   informal sperm donation for, 69  
   as recipient parents, 36–40, 43, 45–46  
 slow violence, theory of, 157–158  
 Smart, Carol, 157, 159  
 SMC. *See* single mothers by choice  
 social media  
   donor-linked families and  
   conceptual approach to, 49–50  
   DNA detectives and, 57  
   ethics of online surveillance, 57–58  
   normalisation of social surveillance and,  
   50–52  
   studies and surveys on, 52–53  
   survey results for, 53–62  
   Victorian Assisted Reproductive Treatment  
   Authority and, 52–55  
 Facebook  
   DNA Detectives, 19  
   privacy settings on, 50–51  
   Sperm Donors Australia, 3, 69  
 Instagram, 49–50  
 TikTok, 49–50  
 social scripting, for trans/masculine and  
   non-binary people, 194–197  
   barriers to, 197, 203–204  
   for disclosure, 204–206  
   sex difference research and, 197



- Special ART Law of 2020, Japan, 239, 243
- sperm donation. *See also* cisgender males;  
informal sperm donation; sperm donors  
fertility treatment risks and, 70–71  
multiple donations  
donor relationships with recipient families  
and, 150  
same-donor offspring meetings and,  
124–127  
online, 3  
open identity donation, 33–34  
sperm mixing and, 155  
Sperm Donation Australia (SDA), 71–73  
Sperm Donation World (SDW), 72  
sperm donors, in Australia  
conceptual approach to, 67–68, 81  
contact experiences with, 74–81  
negotiations and renegotiations of, 76–81  
demographics of, 69–70  
expectations of, 74–81  
alignment with recipient parents, 74–76  
renegotiations of, 76–81  
fertility treatment risks and, 70–71  
Free Sperm Donors Worldwide, 68–69  
gamete donors, 77  
informal donation by  
health and safety risks to women, 71  
within LGBTQ+ populations, 68  
mainstreaming of, 68–71  
for single mothers by choice, 69  
*in vitro* fertilisation and, 70–71  
motivations for, 70  
post-birth relationships with, 67–68  
Pride Angel and, 68–69, 72  
prolific, 69  
qualitative research with, 71–74  
choice of informal online donation, 73–74  
participants in, 71–72  
research structure of, 71–72  
Rainbow Families, 72  
responsibilities of, 74–76  
Sperm Donation Australia, 71–73  
Sperm Donation World, 72  
Sperm Donors Australia, 3, 69  
sperm mixing, secrecy culture and, 155  
stalking, on social media, 51–52  
STORIES project case study, 87–91  
data analysis for, 88  
feelings upon discovery of substitution,  
90–91  
participant profiles in, 88  
results of, 88–90  
steps prior to discovery, 90–91  
trajectory of discovery of substitution,  
88–90  
Sweden, donor linking laws in, 1–2
- Te Ao Māori (Māori worldview), 175, 187–188
- Teuscher, Danielle, 215
- theory of slow violence, 157–158
- Thompson, Peter, 27
- TikTok, donor-linked families on, 49–50
- trans/masculine and non-binary people, sperm  
donation and  
in academic literature, 195  
case study for, 198–203  
children's agency in, 202–203  
donor's role in, 199–201  
funding of, 198  
interview process in, 198–203  
kinship context in, 201–202  
thematic analysis of, 199–203  
cisgenderism in fertility clinics, 196  
conceptual approach to, 192–194  
family relationships among, 201  
legal contracting for, 204  
media representations of, 194–195  
misgendering for, 195–196  
“pregnant men,” 192, 194–195  
reproductive approaches by, 194–197  
social scripting for, 194–197  
barriers to, 197, 203–204  
for disclosure, 204–206  
sex difference research and, 197
- Treaty of Waitangi (New Zealand), 179–180
- U.K. *See* United Kingdom
- UN. *See* United Nations
- Uniform Parentage Act, U.S. (2017), 212, 217,  
219–220
- United Kingdom (U.K.)  
direct-to-consumer genetic testing in, 15–16,  
18–19  
challenges with, 23–24  
donor conceived people's voice in, 21–24,  
26–28  
expansion of, 18–19  
internet-based forums and, 19  
donor conceived people in, 16–18, 21–26  
adoption as less preferable option, 25  
Birth Registration Reform Group, 21  
direct-to-consumer genetic testing for,  
21–24, 26–28  
genetic significance for, 21  
HFEA Register policies, 20–21  
right to choose for, 19–21, 27  
right to know for, 19–21, 27  
voice for, 21–26
- Donor Conceived Register, 16, 18
- donor conception registers in, 16–18
- donor linking laws in, 1–2
- donor relationships with recipient families  
in, 138

- United Kingdom (cont.)
  - Curious Connections Study, 139–140
  - ethic of openness, 138–139
  - Donor Sibling Link, 120–121
  - ethic of openness in, 138–139
  - Human Fertilisation and Embryology
    - Authority Register, 16–18, 68
    - DCP right to know policies, 20–21
    - Donor Sibling Link, 120–121, 134
  - Human Rights Act 1998, 22
  - PANEL Principles, 22
  - Pride Angel in, 68–69, 72
  - same-donor offspring in, 120–121
- United Nations (UN), Convention on the
  - Rights of the Child, 19–20, 233
- United States (U.S.), donor conception
  - approaches in, 211–224
  - American Society for Reproductive Medicine,
    - 213, 220–221
  - Bobbi Jo R. v. Traci W.*, 217
  - disclosure/nondisclosure contexts, 211–213
    - legal challenges to anonymity, 216
  - ethical guidelines for, 220–221
  - at federal level, 213–214, 218
  - insemination fraud and substitution in, 85
  - legal challenges to anonymity, 216–218
    - for donor disclosure, 216
    - for half-siblings, 216
    - oppositions to, 221–222
    - under state statutes, 218–220
  - new technologies for, 222–223
    - for genetic testing, 222–223
    - in vitro* fertilisation, 224
    - intracytoplasmic sperm injection, 223
  - Pasik v. Russell*, 218
  - Perry-Rogers v. Fasano*, 217
  - in private market, 215
  - regulatory mechanisms in, 213–215
  - same-donor offspring in, 120–121
  - secrecy culture and, 212–215
  - at state level, 213–214
  - in Supreme Court case law, 211
  - Uniform Parentage Act, 212, 217, 219–220
- Victorian Assisted Reproductive Treatment
  - Authority (VARTA)
    - access to information for recipient parents,
      - 35–36, 43–47
    - donor-linked families and, 52–55
    - social media and, 52–55
- Webb, Danielle, 179
- Weston, K., 104
- whakapapa (kinship affinity), 181–183
- whānau (extended family groups),
  - 174–175, 186
  - biological relatedness and, 180–181
- whāngai (donor-conceived children), 174–175,
  - 183–184
- Winfrey, Oprah, 195