



**Monthly Review n° 5/2005  
May 2005**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial

- p. 1 [Non relative inter-country adoption : Does The Hague Convention 1993 make it obligatory to co-operate with every receiving State or body that so requests?](#)

IRC News

- p. 3 [Job vacancy: Deputy Co-ordinator](#)  
p. 3 [Change of address of the documentalist](#)

The Hague Convention of 1993 on Intercountry Adoption (THC-1993)

- p. 3 [Hungary](#)

Protagonists in matter of adoption

- p. 4 [Burkina Faso, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy and Mexico](#)

Procedure

- p. 4 [Madagascar](#)

Rights of children deprived of their family

- p. 5 [The adoption of children with special needs: the case of Bulgaria](#)

Interdisciplinary resources

- p. 6 [The social and school adaptation of adopted children: complementary points of view](#)  
p. 7 [The findings of research on inter-country adoption must be interpreted with shades of meaning](#)

Forthcoming conferences, seminars, symposia and courses

- p. 8 [Canada \(Québec\) and Switzerland](#)

EDITORIAL

**Non relative inter-country adoption: Does The Hague Convention 1993 make it obligatory to co-operate with every receiving State or body that so requests? **

*The spirit of The Hague Convention 1993 invites States of origin to collaborate with the number and type of partners in receiving States that best fit the needs of their children.*

**A**mongst the greatest assets of *The Hague Convention of 1993 on the protection of children and co-operation* in respect of intercountry adoption are, as the name suggests, the promotion of the best interests and fundamental rights of children, and the creation of a co-operative system between States, through Central Authorities, competent authorities and adoption accredited bodies (art. 1).

- *The best interests of children:* The Hague Convention of 1993 refers notably, in its Preamble, to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which provides that States have a particular duty to protect children deprived of parental care (art. 20 and 21). An important element in achieving this is *permanency planning*, that is to say the devising for every child in care a permanent and preferably family protective solution, including, in the last resort,

inter-country adoption (see the Editorial of ISS/IRC Bulletin 66).

- *Co-operation between States*: the co-operative system created by The Hague Convention of 1993 builds into each specific case of adoption a *joint responsibility* of the State of origin and the receiving State (through their authorities and bodies) in order to ensure that both the letter and the spirit of the entire Convention be implemented, that is to say centred on children's needs and rights.

Therefore, States Parties to the Convention agree that if children from one State need inter-country adoption, and if this State co-operates with other States Parties (which may be considered a safeguard), then the adoption has to be carried out according to the requirements protecting children and the co-operative system provided by the Convention.

### **Co-operation shaped by the best interests of children**

Co-operation between State Parties can thus only be shaped by the best interests of the children concerned. However, some authorities and accredited bodies (especially in receiving States) seem to use this concept of co-operation in an effort to convince States of origin that they have to entrust to them adoptable children for non relative inter-country adoption: supposedly, if both States are bound by The Hague Convention of 1993, States of origin would not be able to refuse offers of co-operation from receiving States. This allegation sometimes claims to be based on the traditional legal theory of treaties (the binding effect of treaties): should a State ratify or accede to a treaty, it commits itself to enter into relationships with the other States Parties. Some States of origin are thus reluctant to ratify or accede to the Convention, thinking that as States Parties, they would be obliged to co-operate with all other States parties. However, this interpretation does not take into account the purpose of the Convention. *The best interests of children cannot be interpreted to mean that every State has an obligation to accept files from prospective adoptive parents from the (currently) 64 other States Parties.*

In particular, since the international situation makes it clear that the number of young and healthy adoptable children is dwindling in many countries and many inter-country adoptable children have special needs (older children, siblings, children with health problems ...; for

example, see below the chapter Rights of children deprived of their family), *it may be more in the interests of these children for a State of origin to co-operate with a restricted number of receiving States*, and preferably adoption accredited bodies (see Editorials in Monthly Reviews 70 and 71), which can propose files from prospective adoptive parents who precisely match the needs of the children (see also Editorial in Bulletin 65).

### **Reasons to collaborate with a limited number of State Parties and bodies**

*Several reasons based on the best interests of children can justify such a choice.* A limited number of partners contributes to enhancing the specialisation of foreign counterparts and to strengthening ties and thereby the expertise relating to particular children concerned. Furthermore, it prevents States of origin from being overwhelmed by a disproportionate number of sometimes unsuitable requests from foreign prospective adoptive parents, lessening their ability to focus on assessing the situation of children in care. In the best interests of children, a State of origin might also prefer to co-operate with States which have common linguistic, cultural or other specificities: this feeling of common characteristics can help the professionals to build closer co-operation, and the adopted children to integrate more harmoniously into their adoptive family and society and thereafter to revert to their roots. States of origin can also decide to work by choice with States which share values relating to child welfare: countries with compatible child welfare systems and similar professional and ethical standards for assessing the suitability and the preparation of prospective adoptive parents may indeed develop better and closer co-operation.

### **The view of the Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference**

Consulted on the issue raised by the present Editorial, the Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference issued the following statement on 19 May 2005: "the fundamental point is that a State's obligations under the Convention should be viewed in the light of the principle of the child's best interests. *The Convention does not oblige a State to engage in any inter-country adoption arrangements where these are not seen to be in the best interests of the individual*

*child. Considerations of children's best interests may lead to a preference by a country of origin for placements in particular receiving countries. Moreover, limited capacity and scarce resources in the country of origin may also be a good reason for limiting the number of countries, or accredited bodies, with which a country of origin can realistically enter into effective, well-managed and properly supervised cooperative arrangements. Indeed, attempting to deal with too many receiving countries, or too many accredited bodies, may constitute bad practice if its effect is to dilute to an unsatisfactory level the control which a country of origin must necessarily exercise over the inter-country adoption process.*

*At the same time, the more general obligation of co-operation under the Convention does require that Contracting States generally should deal with each other in an open and responsive manner. This includes countries of origin being ready to explain when and why certain policies may have to be maintained. Equally, receiving countries should be sensitive to the difficulties that countries of origin may have in developing a well managed system of alternative child care."*

## **The challenge**

Of course a State Party to The Hague Convention 1993 should not refuse to co-operate with other States Parties or some of their adoption accredited bodies for motives that do not proceed from the best interests of children, such as financial interests. But The Hague Convention of 1993 fully entitles States of origin – and even in its spirit invites them – to co-operate with those States and bodies, and a limited number of them which best fit the children's needs. This should not be viewed by receiving States as just a problem but rather as *a challenge to work more and more closely with the States of origin and the prospective adoptive parents in order to adapt, as far as possible, the requests of the latter to the needs of the adoptable children* (see also Editorial in Bulletin 67).

*All the previous Editorials can be found at [http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/editoriatronc\\_di.html](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/editoriatronc_di.html). More about The Hague Convention 1993: [http://hcch.e-vision.nl/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=69](http://hcch.e-vision.nl/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=69).*

*The IRC team*


## IRC NEWS

- ISS/IRC is looking for a **Deputy Co-ordinator**. For further information, see: [www.iss-ssi.org/documents/Deputyco-ordinator06.05.pdf](http://www.iss-ssi.org/documents/Deputyco-ordinator06.05.pdf).
- **Stéphanie Romanens-Pythoud**: Our documentalist has changed her name as a result of her recent marriage. From now on she is no longer Stephanie Pythoud but rather Stephanie Romanens-Pythoud. Her direct e-mail address has also been changed: [stephanie.pythoud@iss-ssi.org](mailto:stephanie.pythoud@iss-ssi.org) has become [stephanie.romanens-pythoud@iss-ssi.org](mailto:stephanie.romanens-pythoud@iss-ssi.org).

---

## THE HAGUE CONVENTION OF 1993 ON INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION (THC-1993)

Source : Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference : [http://hcch.e-vision.nl/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.status&cid=69](http://hcch.e-vision.nl/index_en.php?act=conventions.status&cid=69)

**Hungary** : On 6 April 2005, Hungary ratified this Convention, which it had signed on 25 May 2004. The Convention will enter into force in this country on 1 August 2005.

## PROTAGONISTS IN MATTER OF ADOPTION

Source : Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference::

[http://hcch.e-vision.nl/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.authorities&cid=69](http://hcch.e-vision.nl/index_en.php?act=conventions.authorities&cid=69).

- **Burkina Faso, Germany (Bavaria) and Italy:** These States have updated the particulars of their Central Authorities.
- **France:** This country has updated the particulars of its adoption accredited bodies.  
Source : MAI, [http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/mai/ind\\_last.html](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/mai/ind_last.html).
- **Germany:** Germany has updated its list of adoption accredited bodies.
- **Hungary:** This country has designated the Ministry of Youth, Family, Social and Equal Opportunities as its Central and competent Authority.
- **Mexico :** This country has updated the list of contact persons in the Central Authority.

---

## PROCEDURE

### MADAGASCAR

*While waiting for the law embodying new rules for inter-country adoption, transitory measures are implemented in Madagascar and recommendations formulated for the foreign prospective adoptive parents.*

**A**fter the entry into force on 1 September 2004, of The Hague Convention of 1993 (THC-1993) in Madagascar, a first draft of a law embodying new rules for inter-country adoption has been completed and must, according to the French Central Authority (MAI), be given a first reading during the parliamentary session beginning in May 2005. This draft is not currently available in the ISS/IRC.

#### Current Procedure

Since the modalities for handling new files are still uncertain, MAI recommends to families wishing to initiate adoption proceedings in Madagascar to defer their approach. MAI specifies, furthermore, that applications that predate the entry into force of the Convention will as of now be studied by an « *Ad Hoc Inter-ministerial Committee* » set up by the Malagasy Government and empowered to act instead of the Inter-ministerial Commission for inter-country adoption. This Commission was the equivalent to the Central Authority before the entry into force of THC-1993. The « *Ad Hoc Interministerial Committee* » which is in charge of revising the Adoption law and is currently acting as intermediary body waiting for the designation of the definitive Central Authority.

*MAI recalls in short for prospective adoptive parents, who might be offered a child directly by a child reception centre, that « such matching is contrary to the provisions of THC-1993 henceforth applicable in this country ».*

As a reminder, according to articles 14 of the Convention and those that follow, matching falls under the joint responsibility of the Central Authorities of the countries of origin and the receiving countries, which may delegate this task to public authorities or to adoption accredited bodies to the extent envisaged under their national law (art. 22). On the other hand, according to article 29 of the Convention, no contact between future adoptive parents and the person serving as guardian of the child may take place before the child's adoptability and the prospective adoptive parents' suitability have been established.

#### Situation and issues at stake

For more information about the status of inter-country adoption in Madagascar, readers may consult Bulletin 54 of February 2003, Bulletins 63 and 67 of January and May 2004. Instances of trafficking associated with intra-country adoption, involving, in particular, a child reception centre, were cited in these bulletins. The analyses stressed that, despite the efforts already made by the Malagasy Government, *the*

modalities for matching, as well as the practises of certain intermediaries give rise to uncertainty and even incur risks.

Thus, although not imposed by the Malagasy legislation so far, it can serve a useful purpose to recommend to adopters that they *refer to an adoption body* accredited by their country (see Editorials of Monthly Reviews 70 and 71, [www.iss-](http://www.iss-)

[ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/editoriatronc\\_di.html](http://ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/editoriatronc_di.html)).

Moreover, the process of legislative review currently under way provides an important opportunity to introduce a legal framework that most effectively guarantees the best interests of the child in inter-country adoption .

Source : MAI, [www.diplomatie.fr/MAI/index.html](http://www.diplomatie.fr/MAI/index.html).

---

## RIGHTS OF CHILDREN DEPRIVED OF THEIR FAMILY

### The adoption of children with special needs: the case of Bulgaria

*In Bulgaria, as in many other countries, numerous children waiting for inter-country adoption present "special needs ". It is essential that prospective adoptive parents adapt to this situation.*

**T**he French Central Authority (MAI) has announced that it had a meeting with the Bulgarian Central authority (the Ministry of Justice), which is responsible only for intercountry adoptions, in March 2005. This meeting made it possible to be more specific about the implementation of the overall reform of the Bulgarian policy for the protection of children living outside their family environment. This reform, as well as the challenges that it raises, was the subject of analysis in the ISS/IRC Bulletin 63. The meeting of March 2005, in particular, made it possible to shed light on certain characteristics of children in need of adoption.

#### The limited number and special needs of children in need of inter-country option

In the absence of other better suited solutions, particularly those which lead to maintaining or to reintegrating children in their family, a project for domestic adoption can be initiated for children, who are not taken care of by their parents. *Inter-country adoption is subsidiary in comparison with domestic adoption.* As MAI recalls, Bulgarian prospective adoptive parents have priority. Furthermore, the practice reflects more and more this principle, since 680 children were adopted in the country in 2004, while less than 300 were adopted internationally.

According to the Bulgarian Central Authority "from November 2003 till 1<sup>st</sup> May 2005, 425 children are inscribed in the register for children who can be adopted by foreigners under conditions of full adoption; for 249 of them the Minister of Justice has given his explicit consent

for adoption, which means that the administrative procedure has come to an end; for another considerable number of children adoption procedure has already started (they have been matched) and is at the various stage of the administrative part of adoption procedure".

Furthermore, according to the MAI, from "there are currently supposedly to be no more than some sixty children inscribed in the [Bulgarian] register [of those eligible for inter-country adoption], a large number of whom are suffering from severe illnesses" (on this subject see Monthly Review 71). The MAI notes also that the number of foreign prospective adoptive parents inscribed in the register of prospective adopters (see Bulletin 63: the Family Code) is greater by far than the number of adoptable children. *Thus, it is essential that the wishes of foreign applicants be adapted, to the extent possible, to the needs of children waiting for adoption.* In this regard, according to MAI, the Bulgarian Ministry of Justice has asked that "the prospective adopters specify when they make a request the complaints that they would accept in children placed in their care and indicate the diseases or handicaps, which they would categorically exclude".

#### A tendency in many countries of origin

Bulgaria is not the only country of origin that insists upon receiving applications from foreign prospective parents for the adoption of children with special needs (that is to say, older children, in sibling groups or with health problems). Latvia, Lithuania and Peru, in particular, have already done this. Other States (Colombia, Ukraine and Vietnam) have underlined the

impasse that the influx of requests for adoption of young and relatively healthy children is leading to. Certain countries of origin have already announced, as far as inter-country adoption is concerned, that they henceforth will give priority to adopters, who are ready to receive a child "with special needs" (China), that the majority of their children in need of inter-country adoption are children and "with special needs" (Brazil, Bulgaria, Moldova, Philippines, Romania, Ukraine), even that they are suspending the registration of requests for inter-country adoption, except for children with special needs (Thailand completely in 2003 and 2004).

To meet the needs of specific children who are adoptable at the international level, *receiving countries are thus more and more called upon to promote the adoption of children with special needs*, and consequently to encourage an evolution in the wishes of prospective adoptive parents and of the psychosocial work in supporting and accompanying adoptive families (see the Editorial above and those in Bulletins 65, [www.iss-ssi.org/Edito.65.fra.pdf](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Edito.65.fra.pdf) and 67, [www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/documents/Edito.67.fra.pdf](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/documents/Edito.67.fra.pdf)).

For a commentary on the laws and procedures in Bulgaria, see Bulletins 63,60- 61 and 58-59.

Source: MAI: [www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/mai/ind\\_last.html](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/mai/ind_last.html)

---

## INTERDISCIPLINARY RESSOURCES

### DOSSIER: ISS/IRC RESEARCH ON THE ADAPTATION OF ADOPTED CHILDREN (PART 2)

## The social and school adaptation of adopted children: complimentary points of view

*Besides the Quebecker and Swedish studies that we presented in last month's bulletin, numerous other specialists – French, Swiss, Norwegian and Lithuanian – have explored the subject, particularly in relation to the child's age at the time of adoption.*

**T**he question of social and school adaptation of adopted children has already spilt a lot of ink. Besides the Quebecker and Swedish studies that we presented in our bulletin last month, the ISS/IRC has acquired other research on the results of inter-country adoption particularly that carried out by *Terre des Hommes* – France at the beginning of the 1990s. This work is the outcome of two inquiries carried out respectively among adopters ("investigation into inter-country adoption: the balance sheet 10 years later", 1992) and adoptees ("the adopted children have the floor", 1995), both in French.

The conclusions of this file tally on several points with the Quebecker and Swedish studies. Nonetheless, they differ considerably on the question of the impact of the child's age at the time of adoption. This research concludes in fact, that if it is better for the child to be quite small at the time, *it is not generally a handicap for a child to come to adoption older, with the exception of inevitable problems of language and adaptation in school. It would even seem that a child of six or seven is better able to*

*understand and accept adoption than a child of three.* At this latter age adoption would more often be lived through like abandonment that the child would be less able to assume a second time around.

### The great majority of adoptees of all ages come out of it well

The Swiss study "Inter-country adoption: what has become of them?" (1986), carried out in French by the social worker, *Denise Spring-Duvoisin*, goes in the same direction. She shows that adopted children generally encounter few problems in the area of in-school, professional and social integration. Her general conclusions are not well defined in terms of age. In some of her chapters, one notices, however, that *adopted children between three and six have slightly more schooling and relational difficulties with their parents than their peers, who came to adoption between the age of zero and two or older than seven.* These are also the ones who have the most negative opinion of adoption. In other areas, like social integration (network of

friends), age on the other hand does not seem to have any influence.

The *Norwegian* research "The Status of knowledge of foreign adoptions" (1999) also concludes that the vast majority of adoptees come out of it well, even if 25 to 30% of them encounter some problems of language, apprenticeship, identity and their ethnicity. Carried out by Monica Dalen, Professor in the Department of special needs education of the Faculty of Education of Oslo University, *this research considers furthermore that age is not as crucial a factor* as certain studies that have us believe for the success or failure of an adoption.

### Longer time for the adaptation of older children

For its part, the *Central Lithuanian Authorities* have carried out a study of the adaptation and integration of young Lithuanians adopted abroad. Under the title of "They have found themselves and others: analysis of reciprocal information about children adopted by foreign nationals" it paints a more positive picture of inter-country adoption. According to the authors, children in the three different groups under review (0 to 3 years of age, 4 to 6 and over 7) by

and large adapt well. They feel secure and confident in their new family and their physical and mental development is normal. The period of adaptation, nonetheless, seems longer for older children (over seven). In their case, this period can last several months and even several years. *Then their parents have need of great patience, perseverance, understanding and tolerance* in order to keep on the right path. But in the end, their overall flourishing is the same as that of the other two age groups.

Sources: "Enquête sur l'adoption internationale: bilan dix ans après" (1992) and "Les enfants adoptés ont la parole" (1995), by Terre des Hommes- France, Contact: [www.terredeshommes.asso.fr](http://www.terredeshommes.asso.fr);

« L'adoption internationale: que sont-ils devenus ? » (1986), by Denise Spring-Duvoisin. Contact : Editions Advimark, 2, ch. de Mézery, 1008 Jouxteus-Mézery/Lausanne, Suisse;

"The Status of knowledge of foreign adoptions" (1999), by Monica Dalen. Available at the following address: <http://www.comeunity.com/adoption/adopt/research.html>

"They have found themselves and others: Analysis of reciprocal information about children adopted by foreign nationals", by the Central Lithuanian Authority. Contact: *Lithuanian Adoption Service*, [www.ivaikinimas.lt/index.php?l=EN](http://www.ivaikinimas.lt/index.php?l=EN).

## The findings of research on inter-country adoption must be interpreted with shades of meaning

*Some research studies have been carried out on the basis of criteria such as the age, sex or origin of the child. However, it is best to avoid creating the impression of a "prize list" between the different adoptees.*

**C**ertain studies or collections of studies on the results of inter-country adoption presented in this dossier have been carried out in relation to criteria such as the child's age at the time when he/she arrived in the receiving country, his/her sex, origin.... Their findings are sensitive to interpret at the ethical level. They must not create the impression of "a prize list" between adoptees (see too the Editorial in *Mopnthly Review* 2/2005).

*Identifying groups that present more difficulties in the process of adoption only makes sense if it aims to put in place adapted support policies.* In fact, adoption consists of giving a family to each child who needs one, and not of choosing children depending upon their potential for "success", an aim that the studies commented on have obviously not wished to pursue.

This type of research nonetheless gives some useful indications of the reality lived through and it underlines, at a time when the merits of inter-country adoption are sometimes contested, the *interest of this measure for most children concerned, including those who have reached school age.*

### Different methodologies

The different works that we have presented have, nonetheless, not all the same perception of the integration of adopted children. Some of them consider that the latter generally come through it well, while others describe a more difficult situation. Why are there these contrasts? *The research methodology* can perhaps be one explanation. *The sampling* of the studies is probably another. In point of fact, the studies

based solely on clinical population of adopted children will obtain probably gloomier results than research based on a wider population group.

### The specificity of each child and his/her life story

The criteria for a quantitative measure of the "success" of adoption are, moreover, necessarily objectivized and globalized. They do not take into account *the shades of meaning of the psychic reality of each adopted child*, which can be taken into consideration within the framework of post-adoption support consultations.

More than in the cause and effect ties with the age, the genus or the origin, the reasons that

might explain the variations of "performance" between adopted children are also to be found in the circumstances of the pregnancy, the birth and the abandonment, and then in those of the child's life before his/her entry into the adoptive family.

*These differences can only incite the professionals to improve qualitatively the provision of care for women and families in difficulty, as well as the life of children in temporary placement (see the Editorial of Monthly Review 72-73). A redoubled and individualized attention should also be paid to the selection and preparation both of adoptive parents and children, and to their matching as well as to their post-adoption services.*

### FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, SYMPOSIA AND COURSES

- **Canada (Quebec) :** « *L'enfant adopté et sa famille* » (*The adopted child and his/her family*), a training course organised by Le Monde est ailleurs, at the Sainte-Justine Hospital and at the Hospital Centre of the University of Montreal, Montreal 13-17 June 2005. This training offers a new programme of theoretical and practical evidence of responsibility for health, feeding, growth, development, attachment, personality, learning phases and the identity of the child and the adolescent, set in a dynamic and family perspective. Audience: the course is open to professionals in health and childhood in any country, who work with adopted children and their family in pre- and post- inter-country adoption. *Contact :* Mme Julie Leblanc, [julie.leblanc@meanomadis.com](mailto:julie.leblanc@meanomadis.com); *Le Monde est ailleurs*, 10, 51<sup>e</sup> Avenue, Notre-Dame de l'Île-Perrot, Québec, J7V 7L8, Canada ; fax. : +1 514 453 6967 ; [www.meanomadis.com](http://www.meanomadis.com).
- **Switzerland:** *La « culture » des droits de l'enfant inscrite dans la Convention des droits de l'enfant* (*The « culture » of the rights of the child inscribed in the Convention on the Rights of the Child*), Summer University on the rights of the child organised by the Institut international des droits de l'enfant-IDE (International Institute for the rights of the child), Sion, 22 August - 3 September 2005. Raising awareness in a general culture of the rights of the child and an analysis of the many implications of the Convention on the Rights of the Child for professional practices. A theoretical and practical approach will be offered to participants (courses, practical problem-solving, team work, films, discussion groups,...), as well as cultural and convivial activities intended to stimulate communications and interaction between participants and speakers . For all young professionals working in a field linked to children and students finishing their studies interested in the rights of the child. Language: French. The training is intended mainly for European francophone countries (Belgium, France, Luxembourg and Switzerland). *Contact :* IDE, Université d'été autour des droits de l'enfant, c/o IUKB, Case postale 4176, CH 1950 - Sion 4, Suisse ; tel. : +41 27 205 73 03 ; fax. : +41 27 205 73 02 ; [ide@iukb.ch](mailto:ide@iukb.ch); [www.childsrights.org/new/](http://www.childsrights.org/new/).

*As a reminder, ISS/IRC Bulletin is distributed to a selected network of Authorities and professionals. It is not aimed at being posted on an internet website without the authorisation of ISS/IRC.*

*Table of contents of the Bulletins 1997 - 2005:*

[www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Resource\\_Center\\_EN/Country\\_Data/documents/BulletinTableofcontents1997-2005.pdf](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Resource_Center_EN/Country_Data/documents/BulletinTableofcontents1997-2005.pdf).

The ISS/IRC would like to express its gratitude to the governments (including certain Federated States) of the following countries for their financial support in the realisation of this Monthly review: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Island, Luxembourg, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland. The ISS/IRC also thanks the Canton of Geneva for its specific contribution.