

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
- From 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