



**Monthly Review n° 3/2006  
March 2006**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial

- p. 1 [Post-adoption \(II\): Follow-up reports required by countries of origin](#)

IRC News

- p. 4 [Project on distance training and exchange of experiences : new fact sheets on the ISS/IRC website](#)

International Documents relating to the Rights of the Child Deprived of Family

- p. 4 [Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children](#)

Protagonists in matter of adoption

- p. 4 [Germany, Philippines, Slovakia](#)

Legislation

- p. 4 [USA: A further step on the path to ratification and implementation of the 1993 Hague Convention](#)

Children's Rights

- p. 7 [UN Guidelines for the care and protection of children without parental care](#)

Interdisciplinary resources

- p. 8 [A new source of documentation on vulnerable children and those orphaned by AIDS is available on line and on CD-ROM](#)

Forthcoming conferences, seminars, symposia and courses

- p. 9 [Switzerland](#)

EDITORIAL

**POST-ADOPTION (II): Follow-up reports required by countries of origin** 

*During the post-adoption period, the child and the adoptive family may need professional support, as explained in our previous editorial. Concurrently, another step of a different nature aims at monitoring the welfare of the internationally adopted child for the information of the State of origin.*

**M**ost countries of origin require the submission of follow-up reports to monitor how an adopted child develops and adjusts to the new family and social environment. This requirement should be balanced with the need to respect the intrinsic nature of adoption, and the private and family life of the adoptee and his/her adoptive parents, as well as his/her need of security and

attachment. Questions are also raised regarding the extent to which the workload entailed in securing reports is justified by the real use made of the reports in practice by the country of origin. This need for balance was specifically recognised at the Special Commission in 2000<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Report and Conclusions of the Special Commission on the Practical Operation of THC-1993 (28 November – 1

examining the practical operation of the 1993 Hague Convention (1993 HC).

### Current situation

At the Special Commission in 2005<sup>2</sup> on the 1993 HC, it was noted that individual reports are often requested and supplied in practice, and that they are regarded in many countries of origin as an important safeguard.

Many countries of origin understandably want to follow the development of their adopted children. They feel continuing responsibility towards them, and also look for indications of any need to review the appropriateness of their adoption systems. Some countries even send a copy of the report to the institution where the child was living before the adoption. This may be very useful in order to promote confidence on adoption, as a child protection measure, to persons working in such institutions.

Reporting is also seen as an effective means of keeping track of adopted children, thereby putting a stop to allegations or rumours that the children concerned have been harmed or exploited (see Editorial 2005/11-12).

### International instruments

Systematic post-adoption reporting with respect to individual adoptions is not mentioned as such in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) or in the 1993 HC. The latter only places a responsibility on Central Authorities to take all appropriate measures to provide each other with general evaluation reports about experience with intercountry adoption (art. 9.d) and to reply to justified requests from other authorities for information about a particular adoption situation (art. 9.e).

### Considerations for determining reporting requirements

It may not be surprising that appropriate formulae could not be found to cover post-adoption reporting in the context of international treaties, as there are several considerations under discussion between countries of origin and receiving countries:

- *Incorporating reporting obligations into the legislation of the child's country of origin clearly has no direct effect, given that its*

jurisdiction is confined to the national territory. No penalty whatsoever can be imposed on defaulters. It may however have the indirect effect of instigating a "collective sanction" in the form of a unilateral restriction or ban on subsequent adoptions to those receiving State(s) failing to respect this requirement.

- *Thus, unless it is integrated into the law of each receiving country – which very few receiving countries would be prepared to accept – systematic reporting becomes in essence a moral obligation. There are also psychological and ethical arguments running counter to such an obligation, especially if it involves long-term reporting.* In the receiving country, an adopted child has exactly the same status, in the family and vis-à-vis the authorities, as a biological child. The need to report on the progress of an adopted child, but not on that of a biological child, may be seen as not fully consistent with that principle. Overall, adoptive parents nonetheless seem very willing to provide information on an adopted child, at reasonable intervals and for a given period following adoption. At the same time, others see obligatory reporting as an unjustified imposition stemming from implicit mistrust. More generally, after a pre-adoptive placement during which some mandatory follow-up can be imposed (see Editorial 2006/2), an over-demanding post-adoption reporting obligation can be considered as an intrusion into the private and family life of the adoptive family, as well as a risk for the development of the child's sense of security and attachment (for example, visits of social workers can be perceived as stressful both for the child and his/her adoptive parents).
- *Extensive reporting obligations may also be seen as reflecting mistrust of the efficacy of relevant services in the receiving country with responsibility for child protection.* Under the CRC, States Parties are to ensure that these services act without discrimination in regard to "each child within their jurisdiction" (art. 2.1), which clearly includes children adopted from abroad. As far as we are aware, there is no evidence to suggest that children adopted internationally are at greater risk from abuse or neglect than any others, especially when the adoption process was handled professionally, or that domestic services are less effective in their regard.

### Agreement on follow-up reports...but for a limited period

December 2000), <http://hcch.e-vision.nl/upload/scrpt33e2000.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Conclusions and Recommendations of the Second Meeting of the Special Commission on the Practical Operation of THC-1993 (17-23 September 2005), [www.hcch.net/upload/wop/concl33sc05\\_e.pdf](http://www.hcch.net/upload/wop/concl33sc05_e.pdf).

This said, receiving countries generally look on the wishes of countries of origin to keep some track of adopted children in the period following adoption as being legitimate and as demonstrating responsible concern. In this respect, the Hague Special Commission in 2005 indeed recommended that receiving States *“encourage compliance with post-adoption reporting requirements of States of origin.”*

The majority of countries of origin set a maximum compulsory period of three to five years following the adoption and between two and six reports, which could be acceptable. However, concerns were expressed during the Special Commissions in 2000 and 2005 on longer periods (for example, until the child reaches the age of majority). Specific cases like special need children may need sometimes closer reporting. In the end, in 2005 *it was recommended to limit this period in recognition of the mutual confidence which provides the framework for co-operation under the 1993 HC.*

#### **Who should draft such reports and how?**

Bearing in mind all these considerations, ISS/IRC would suggest that reporting be an integral part of the “post-adoption services” that AAB (Accredited Adoption Bodies) or child welfare authorities would be expected to provide. It could be both an explicit aspect of the contract drawn up with prospective adopters or a legal obligation in the receiving country and a requirement imposed by the country of origin when considering the authorisation for AAB to operate within its jurisdiction or for adopters to proceed without AAB. Furthermore, the Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference suggested that during the pre-adoption training and preparation, prospective adoptive parents should be informed about the need for post adoption reports and agree to cooperate in providing them. This should be also a function of AABs or the child welfare authorities who do the training. However, non-compliance with this requirement should not be used as a basis for suppositions or rumours that the children concerned are likely to have been harmed or exploited (see Editorial 2005/11-12).

Social workers from the AAB or the child welfare authority should interview the adoptive families and prepare the reports with photographs that the accredited body or the Central or competent Authority sends to the State of origin. It is not appropriate for these reports – as it is sometimes the case - to be drafted directly by the adoptive parents or on the basis of telephone conversations without arranging at least one visit to the adoptive home by a professional in childhood matters.

Reports can be concise, but have to be personalised. Standard texts are useless and may break respect and confidence among countries of origin and receiving countries.


Receiving countries should make sure that there is an AAB or a competent authority which would be able to guarantee such reports and proper post-adoption support (see Editorial 2006/2). States are moreover encouraged to check systematically if the placements for adoption effectively lead to a legal adoption, and to take the necessary measures to protect the child if it is not the case. When it is relevant, the question of the nationality of the adopted child has also to be checked properly.

#### **A balance between the requirement of the country of origin and the needs of the adoptive family**

Through such regulations and practice, a balance should be struck between protecting the needs of the child and of the adoptive family and answering the legitimate requirements of countries of origin. Furthermore, the authorities and organisations of the receiving countries should actively participate in all post-adoption steps, including post-adoption support (Editorial 2006/2), post-adoption reports and support to the child in the search for origins (which will be analysed in the next editorial).

ISS/IRC Team in cooperation with Nigel Cantwell, ISS International Consultant on Child Protection Policy.

The earlier Editorials are available on the website: [www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/tronc\\_di\\_edi.html](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/tronc_di_edi.html).

- **Project on distance training and exchange of experiences : new fact sheets on the ISS/IRC website**   
Three new thematic fact sheets (n° 6, 7 and 8) have been issued. They deal with the development of permanency planning, family reintegration and kinship care. You can access all six files on the ISS/IRC website:  
[http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/tronc\\_di\\_fic.html](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/tronc_di_fic.html).

## INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS AND DOCUMENTS ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD DEPRIVED OF PARENTAL CARE

### Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children

*The Protocol has 114 signatory States and 103 States Parties.*

**O**n 26 January 2006, 114 countries had signed the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and 103 had ratified or had acceded to it (see also Reviews 54, 63, 2005/6, 2005/10 and 2005/11-12). Among the new States Parties in 2006 appear Nepal (ratification on 26 January) and Thailand (accession on 11 January).

As a reminder (see Review 63), this instrument, which came into force on 18 January 2002, requires States, among others, to cover under their criminal or penal law the act of an intermediary to « improperly » induce consent to domestic or intercountry adoption, in violation of the applicable international instruments (art. 3), in particular the 1993 Hague Convention.

*Source:* United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,  
[www.ohchr.org/english/countries/ratification/11\\_c.htm](http://www.ohchr.org/english/countries/ratification/11_c.htm).

### PROTAGONISTS IN MATTERS 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).

- **Germany** : The particulars of the Central Authority of Neubrandenburg have been updated.
- **Philippines and Slovakia**: These countries have updated the particulars of their respective Central and competent Authorities.

## LEGISLATION

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: A further step on the path to ratification and implementation of the 1993 Hague Convention

*The U.S. Department of State has issued the final rules which outline the standards and procedures for the accreditation or approval of U.S. adoption service providers in Convention cases and which address the preservation of Convention records.*

**T**he Final Rules on “Accreditation of Agencies and Approval of Persons Under the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (IAA)” and “Intercountry Adoption – Preservation of Convention Records”, published in the Federal Register on 15 February 2006, are considered a key step

towards the ratification and implementation of the 1993 Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption (HC 1993) by the U.S. Department of State, which anticipates the

treaty's entry into force in the United States of America for 2007<sup>3</sup>.

### **Provision of adoption services under international and domestic legislation**

In accordance with art. 22 HC 1993, the functions of a Central Authority may only be performed by public authorities or by non-profit bodies accredited under domestic law or, possibly, by for-profit approved bodies or persons who meet the requirements of integrity, professional competence, experience and accountability of that State, and are qualified by their ethical standards and by training or experience to work in the field of intercountry adoption. The Convention clearly prohibits them from making an improper financial or other gain (arts. 8 and 32 HC 1993 ).

The possibility for approved bodies or persons to engage in adoption services was a controversial issue when drafting the HC 1993: some States were reluctant to see individual actors involved in the adoption process, which could result in an insufficiently multidisciplinary approach to adoption and increase the risk of putting financial gain at the forefront of the adoption process. However, the Convention has left it to the States of origin to decide, by making a declaration at any time, whether or not to allow these approved persons or bodies to work in their country (art. 22.4).

In close relation to this Convention provision, the IAA now requires that agencies be accredited and persons be approved to provide adoption services for intercountry adoptions when both countries involved are parties to the Convention<sup>4</sup>; and gives the Secretary of State responsibility for this accreditation or approval process. Therefore, before the country ratifies the Convention, it must have accredited or approved its providers of intercountry adoption services.

---

<sup>3</sup> The U.S.A. signed the Convention on 31 March 1994.

<sup>4</sup> Adoption services for which agencies must be accredited and persons must be approved are: identifying a child for adoption and arranging an adoption; securing consent to termination of parental rights and adoption; performing a home study and report on prospective adoptive parents or a background study or report on a child; making a non-judicial determination of a child's best interests and of the appropriateness of an adoptive placement; monitoring a case after a child has been placed with prospective adoptive parents until final adoption; and assuming custody of a child and providing childcare or any other social service, when necessary because of a disruption pending placement.

The approach taken by the U.S.A. is very particular, as no other country, to our knowledge, has a system whereby the Central Authority designates bodies who will act directly as accrediting entities for intercountry adoption agencies. These accrediting bodies will either be a non-profit organisation with experience in accreditation or a State licensing body. There seems to be no record of this possibility even having been explicitly considered at the time of drafting the HC 1993.

### **Final rules on accreditation of agencies and approval of persons for Convention adoptions**

Under these Rules, an "agency" is a private non-profit adoption agency and a "person" is a for-profit adoption organisation or individual practitioner.

The Final Rules establish the requirements and procedures for the designation and monitoring of accrediting entities; set out the accreditation and approval standards for agencies and persons that accrediting entities are to use; and establish a framework for the monitoring and supervision of accrediting entities, agencies and persons. The standards, which are designed to ensure compliance with the Convention and the IAA, also intend to secure the best interests of the child and prevent the abduction, sale and trafficking of children. These criteria address nine areas, which apply to agencies and persons alike<sup>5</sup>: licensing and corporate governance; financial and risk management; ethical practices and responsibilities; professional qualifications and training for employees; information disclosure; fee practices, and quality control policies and practices; responding to complaints and records and reports management; service planning and delivery (including safeguards regarding adoption services used in other Convention countries); and immigration to and emigration from the US in connection with an adoption (Subpart F: §96.30-96.55).

However, an agency or person engaged in intercountry adoptions does not necessarily have to apply for accreditation or approval, if it chooses instead to work under the supervision of another provider that is accredited or approved ("supervised provider"<sup>6</sup>), or to provide

---

<sup>5</sup> Temporary accreditation is subject to separate and specific criteria (Subpart N: §96.95-96.111).

<sup>6</sup> Outside individual or another organisation which is under the supervision of the accredited agency or approved person responsible for ensuring that the six adoption

only certain limited services that may be provided in Convention cases without being accredited/approved or supervised (“exempted provider”<sup>7</sup>).

Furthermore, prospective adoptive parents acting on their own behalf do not require approval. A number of issues arise from this approach, as State control is very limited, fewer guarantees exist to ensure the best interests of the child and experience shows that abuses may be more likely to occur. The Central Authority, however, considers that it is unlikely that parents could perform independently all steps needed to complete an adoption under the Convention.

### **Some questions of interpretation of the HC-1993**

It is of course a considerable challenge to regulate the extreme diversity of the many individuals and organisations currently operating in adoption in the U.S. The Final Rules undoubtedly represent an impressive step forward in this direction. Some questions, however, may still be raised.

According to arts. 22.2 and 22.5 of HC 1993, the approved bodies or persons may only perform in that State “subject to the supervision of the competent authorities”, and notwithstanding any declaration made by a State having delegated certain functions to approved persons, the reports provided for in arts. 15 and 16 shall be prepared under the responsibility of the Central Authority or other authorities and accredited bodies. The U.S. Final Rules implement this requirement by providing for reports under arts. 15 and 16 that are not prepared by accredited bodies to be reviewed and approved by such bodies (§96.13(a)). The rules also explicitly require the oversight of the approved persons by the same authorities and bodies that must also oversee the accredited agencies.

Furthermore, non-accredited agencies and non-approved persons may provide adoption services if under the supervision of an

---

services are provided and which is relied upon to carry out one or more of these adoption services. They may be agents, facilitators, attorneys, or other organisations working in the U.S. or in a foreign country.

<sup>7</sup> Specific circumstances in which accreditation, approval or supervision is not required are defined as: social work professional or organisation only providing home studies on prospective adoptive parents and child background studies in the U.S. so long as the study is approved by an accredited body; agency or person only providing child welfare services; agency or person only providing legal services; and prospective adoptive parents acting on own behalf.

accredited agency or an approved person. The standards contain detailed provisions covering the conduct of any supervised providers, including that an accredited agency or approved person oversee the conduct of foreign providers in the countries of origin even if the provider is accredited in the country of origin (§96.46).

In addition, Subpart I, J and K detail the accountability procedure through ongoing supervision, complaints and actions. It is hoped that that this mechanism will enable very high quality accreditation and implementation of high standards.

For further information on critical issues, see also Ethica’s Comments on the Final Regulations Implementing the Hague Adoption Convention, available at: [www.ethicanet.org/HagueRegComments.pdf](http://www.ethicanet.org/HagueRegComments.pdf).

### **Final rules on the preservation of Convention records**

The Department of State has also issued rules implementing the requirements relating to the preservation of Convention adoption records, based on the HC 1993 and the IAA. In the U.S.A., this will apply to records pertaining to adoptions under the Convention that are generated or received by two federal agencies – the Department of State or the Department of Homeland Security. It requires both agencies to maintain Convention records for 75 years. Retention, preservation and disclosure of adoption records held by an agency or person are governed by the provisions of §96.42 of the Final Rules on accreditation and approval, and by relevant State and Federal law.

### **Next steps**

Both these Rules became effective on 17 March 2006. Given that the Department of State may now finalise discussions with potential accrediting entities, the next step will include the designation of the accrediting entities and the accreditation or approval of adoption service providers. In the context of the latter, all private non-profit and for-profit organisations and individuals will be eligible to apply for Hague Convention accreditation or approval. It has been suggested that accreditation is likely to take at least 18 months.

As mentioned above, once the Convention has entered into force for the U.S., an agency or person will no longer be able to offer, provide, or facilitate the provision of any adoption service in the U.S. in connection with a Convention

adoption unless it is an accredited agency, an approved person, a supervised provider, or an exempted provider (§96.12 of the Final Rules). However, the Rules do not cover the conditions for providing, or facilitating the provision of, adoption services in cases of intercountry adoption between the U.S.A. and a non-Convention country.

It is, thus, hoped that the incorporation of Convention principles into the U.S.' domestic legal system in relation to Convention adoptions will be followed by similar safeguards to be applied in non-Convention adoptions. In 2000 and 2005, the Special Commission on the practical operation of HC 1993 recommended that State Parties '*as far as practicable, apply the standards and safeguards of the Convention to the arrangements for intercountry adoption which they make in respect of non-Contracting*

*States'* (see also Editorial Monthly Review 2005/2, [www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/documents/Edito.2005.2.eng.pdf](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/documents/Edito.2005.2.eng.pdf)).

This would enable the undeniable progress achieved through the Final Rules for the protection of children in Convention countries to also benefit, without discrimination, children from non-Convention countries.

*Sources:* Final Rules on "Accreditation of Agencies and Approval of Persons Under the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (IAA)" (22 CFR Part 96) and "Intercountry Adoption – Preservation of Convention Records" (22 CFR Part 98), Federal Register, Vol. 71, N° 31, Wednesday 15 February 2006; U.S. Department of State (Central Authority): [http://travel.state.gov/family/adoption/adoption\\_485.html](http://travel.state.gov/family/adoption/adoption_485.html); Ethica, [www.ethicanet.org](http://www.ethicanet.org); ISS-USA, [www.iss-usa.org](http://www.iss-usa.org); International expert.

## CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

### UN Guidelines for the care and protection of children without parental care

*The NGO Working Group released the first draft proposal about the future UN Guidelines.*

**T**he research and advocacy program launched by UNICEF and ISS early 2004 (see Monthly Review 72-73) underwent significant developments over the last few months. On 16 September 2005, following its annual informal Discussion Day, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) called on the UN and others "*to prepare a set of international standards for the protection and alternative care of children without parental care for the UN General Assembly to consider and adopt in 2006*"

([www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/discussion/recommendations2005.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/discussion/recommendations2005.pdf)).

Based on this Recommendation, the NGO Working Group on Children without Parental Care, which is convened by ISS, prepared a Draft of the Guidelines ([www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Tronc\\_DI/documents/DraftGuidelinesJan06.pdf](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Tronc_DI/documents/DraftGuidelinesJan06.pdf)). Inputs were also provided by a group of young adults having experience of alternative care, UNICEF, and various international experts, including members of the UN CRC. This document was submitted to the UN CRC in January for further analysis and comments. The results of the Committee's discussion will contribute to

determining exactly how this initiative might go forward.

#### Scope

These draft Guidelines are designed as a non-binding international instrument providing legal and practical recommendations on the use and conditions of alternative care for all persons under the age of 18 years, regardless of the care setting and of its formal or informal nature. They build on principles already internationally accepted. In particular, they are aimed at giving practical effect to the principle of the best interests of the child in the context of alternative care. They emphasize both the important role played by the extended family and community and the obligations of States for all children not in the care of their parents or caregivers. Principles in the document may also be applicable to young persons already in alternative care and who need continuing care or support after reaching the age of 18.

#### Main orientations

The draft Guidelines propose an integrated approach to child care. They give special prominence to the primacy of maintaining the child with his or her parents. States must provide

necessary support to the latter in their care-giving role, in order to prevent unwarranted or arbitrary separation. The draft Guidelines also recall the necessity to ensure the planned provision of a range of alternative care options, with priority to family- and community-based solutions, and to secure permanency for the child concerned through, wherever possible, reunification with the family or in an alternative stable family setting. Finally, they provide for the protection from abuse, neglect and exploitation in all care settings.

Specific chapters of the draft Guidelines are also dedicated to the establishment of clear policies and agreed procedures to ensure appropriate preparation of and follow-up after-care, as well as to care provision for children outside their country of habitual residence and in emergency situations.

### Evaluation and follow-up

The drafting process has aroused considerable interest from a wide variety of interested actors. On many issues, such as

family preservation or informal care, inputs provided have been innovative and, if accepted, would constitute important additional legal standards.. The first stages of this consultation process have thus been a success. However, the resulting text, on the basis of such wide inputs, does not necessarily respect all the wishes of each contributor, and undoubtedly the consultation process should continue.

Now, the next steps must take place principally within governmental and intergovernmental forums. In order to raise global acceptance, the draft Guidelines must be debated at political level. The UN CRC, following its Discussion Day, has recommended that States organise an '*intergovernmental expert meeting*' to finalise this document, with a view to its submission to the UN General Assembly for final adoption. It is of utmost importance that the future Guidelines be widely supported by the international community, if they are to make a real and positive difference in practice.

## INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

### A new source of documentation on vulnerable children and those orphaned by AIDS is available on line and on CD-ROM

*The website and the CD-ROM provide some 600 documents on health and nutrition, education, psychosocial support, economic strengthening, living environment, the rights of children affected by AIDS, as well as on the management of programmes to support them.*

**A** new source of documentation about vulnerable children and those orphaned by AIDS has been available on screen and CD-ROM for a few weeks. Produced by the NGOs *International HIV/AIDS Alliance* and *Family Health International*, in collaboration with the American Agency for International Development (USAID), the website [www.ovcsupport.net](http://www.ovcsupport.net) and the CD provide some 600 documents and tools to support orphans and vulnerable children. This information – reports, articles, training manuals, standard forms, Internet sites – stems from numerous organisations.

Specifically, the resources address seven main themes: the direction and management of a support programme, health and nutrition, education, psychosocial support, economic strengthening, the living environment and the

rights of orphans and vulnerable children. Each topic consists of subsections introduced by a brief presentation and accompanied by a list of resource materials which can be downloaded.

The website and the CD-ROM are intended for all organisations and individuals active in this field or training to become so. The documents presented are mainly in English but some of them are in French, Spanish, Portuguese or Russian.

More information is available on the website [www.ovcsupport.net](http://www.ovcsupport.net) or from the International HIV/AIDS Alliance, Queensberry House, 104-106 Queens Road, Brighton BN1 3XF ; Tel: +44 1273 718 900 ; email: [mail@aidsalliance.org](mailto:mail@aidsalliance.org); Internet website: [www.aidsalliance.org](http://www.aidsalliance.org). To receive the CD-ROM contact [vwomersley@aidsalliance.org](mailto:vwomersley@aidsalliance.org).



FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, COLLOQUIA AND COURSES 

- **Switzerland / International - Institut International des Droits de l'Enfant / Institut Universitaire Kurt Bösch and the Ministry for Family and Integration of Luxembourg:**

*Université d'été autour the droits de l'enfant: Une culture générale des Droits de l'Enfant* (Summer University on Children's Rights : A general culture of children's rights), Sion (Switzerland), 17 – 21 July 2006, in French. The objective is to raise the participants' awareness of a general culture of children's rights and to analyse the various implications of the Convention on the Rights of the Child for professional practices. Training intended for professionals working in a field linked to childhood and youth and for students.

For further information : Institut International des Droits de l'Enfant (IDE) – Université d'été 2006, CP 4176, 1950 Sion, Switzerland; tel : +41 (0)27 205 7303 ; fax : +41 (0)27 205 7302 ; e-mail : [ide@iukb.ch](mailto:ide@iukb.ch); web page: [www.childsrights.org](http://www.childsrights.org).

*As a reminder, this Monthly Review 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 - 2006:*

[www.iss-ssi.org/Resource\\_Centre/Resource\\_Center\\_EN/About\\_ISS-IRC/about\\_iss-irc.html](http://www.iss-ssi.org/Resource_Centre/Resource_Center_EN/About_ISS-IRC/about_iss-irc.html). See publications.

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, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. The ISS/IRC also thanks the Canton of Geneva for its specific contribution.