REGULATING ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY (ART): A GLOBAL LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

Harshnarayan Tiwari, Dr. Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya Sagar (M.P.)

Shivansh Kastwar, Dr. Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya Sagar (M.P.)

ABSTRACT

Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ART), such as in-vitro fertilization (IVF), surrogacy, gamete donation, and embryo cryopreservation, have transformed the reproductive healthcare, bringing hope to a large scale of peoples and couples facing infertility. Yet, the rapid advancement of Assisted Reproductive Technologies poses complex legal, ethical, and social challenges. This article provides an in-depth legal analysis of ART, exploring foundational principles like reproductive autonomy, the legal status of embryos, and non-discrimination. It compares global regulatory frameworks, examines ethical dilemmas, and integrates stakeholder perspectives, including those of patients, surrogates, and children born via ART. Drawing on case law, statutes, and quantitative data, the article highlights disparities in ART governance and proposes reforms, including a UN Model Law to harmonize standards. By addressing emerging technologies, economic pressures, and societal impacts, this study advocates for equitable, ethical, and adaptive ART regulations to protect all parties involved.

1. Introduction

In 2014, the world watched as the *Baby Gammy* case unfolded in Thailand. A child born via surrogacy to an Australian couple was abandoned when he was diagnosed with Down syndrome, initiating a global debate about the ethics and legality of cross-border surrogacy. This heart-wrenching story underscores the revolutionary power of Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ART)—and the urgent need for strong regulation. ART encompasses techniques like IVF, surrogacy, egg and sperm donation, and embryo freezing, enabling millions, including single parents and LGBTQ+ individuals, to build families. Since the birth of Louise Brown, the first IVF baby in 1978, over 8 million children have been born through ART globally, according to the European Society of *Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE)*.

However, the global proliferation of ART services—often across borders—raises intricate legal questions. Who is the legal parent of a child born via surrogacy? What rights do donors or surrogates have? How should emerging technologies, like gene editing, be governed? The answers vary dramatically across countries, revealing a patchwork of regulations that leaves children, parents, and surrogates vulnerable. This article demystifies ART regulation by analyzing legal principles, comparing international frameworks, and addressing ethical and societal challenges. It proposes actionable reforms to create a fair, inclusive, and ethically sound system of ART governance, ensuring that technological progress aligns with human dignity.

2. Foundational Legal Principles in ART

ART regulation rests on several core legal principles, each balancing individual rights with societal and ethical considerations. These principles, rooted in constitutional law, human rights, and judicial precedents, shape how ART is accessed and governed worldwide.

2.1 Reproductive Autonomy

At the heart of ART lies the principle of reproductive autonomy—the right to make independent decisions about procreation. Imagine a couple, unable to conceive naturally, choosing IVF to fulfill their dream of parenthood. This choice reflects a fundamental freedom, recognized in documents like Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which guarantees the right to health, including reproductive health. In India,

Article 21 of the Constitution (right to life and personal liberty) has been interpreted to include reproductive choices, as seen in cases like *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017), which upheld privacy as a fundamental right.

Yet, autonomy is not absolute. Ethical constraints arise when ART involves third parties, such as surrogates or donors, or technologies like embryo manipulation. For example, should individuals have the unrestricted right to select their child's traits through gene editing? Balancing autonomy with ethical oversight is a key challenge for regulators.

2.2 Legal Status of Embryos and Gametes

The legal status of embryos and gametes (sperm and eggs) varies widely, reflecting cultural and philosophical differences. In the landmark case *Evans v. United Kingdom* (2007), the European Court of Human Rights ruled that embryos do not have an absolute right to life under Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). This decision allowed a woman's ex-partner to block the use of their frozen embryos, prioritizing individual consent over embryo protection.

Contrast this with Italy, where Law 40/2004 (later amended) treated embryos with near-human dignity, restricting their destruction. In India, the ART (Regulation) Act, 2021, takes a pragmatic approach, mandating storage limits (e.g., 10 years for embryos) and disposal protocols without conferring personhood. These differences create legal uncertainty, especially in cross-border cases where embryos are transferred between jurisdictions with conflicting laws.

2.3 Non-Discrimination and Inclusive Access

Historically, ART access was restricted to heterosexual married couples, excluding single individuals and LGBTQ+ communities. Consider a single woman in India seeking IVF to become a mother. Under the ART Act, 2021, she faces barriers, as the law prioritizes married couples, raising questions under Article 14 (equality before the law). In contrast, countries like Canada and the UK have reformed their laws to ensure inclusive access, allowing single parents and same-sex couples to use ART services.

Non-discrimination is not just a legal principle but a social imperative. Restrictive policies reinforce traditional family norms, marginalizing those who do not fit the mold. Equitable

access to ART can promote gender and social equality, but legal barriers persist in many jurisdictions.

2.4 Third-Party Involvement and Surrogacy

Surrogacy and gamete donation introduce complex legal issues, particularly around parenthood and contract enforceability. In *Baby Manji Yamada v. Union of India* (2008), the Indian Supreme Court grappled with the legal status of a child born via surrogacy to Japanese parents. When the parents divorced, neither could claim custody due to India's lack of clear surrogacy laws at the time. The case highlighted the need for structured regulations to protect surrogates, intended parents, and children.

Surrogacy agreements often involve detailed contracts, but their enforceability varies. In altruistic systems (e.g., the UK, Canada), surrogates receive no financial compensation beyond reasonable expenses, reducing the risk of exploitation. In contrast, commercial surrogacy, once prevalent in India, raised concerns about commodification, prompting the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021, to ban it.

2.5 Ethical Oversight and Medical Standards

High ethical standards are crucial to prevent exploitation and ensure informed consent. Regulatory bodies like the UK's Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (HFEA) set rigorous standards for clinics, requiring psychological counseling and transparent consent processes. In India, the National ART and Surrogacy Board oversees compliance with the ART Act, 2021, but faces challenges like underfunding and inconsistent enforcement.

Ethical oversight is like a traffic light system for ART: it guides clinics to operate safely, protects vulnerable parties, and prevents reckless practices. Without it, risks like coercion of surrogates or uninformed embryo donation increase.

3. Comparative Legal Frameworks

ART regulation varies significantly across countries, reflecting cultural, religious, and legal differences. The table below summarizes key aspects of ART governance in select jurisdictions, highlighting surrogacy policies, donor anonymity, parentage laws, and key statutes.

Country/Region	**Surrogacy**	**Donor Anonymity**	**Parentage Laws**	**Key Statute/Authority**	**Emerging Tech Regulation**
India	Altruistic only (✓)	Anonymity mandatory (✗)	Genetic parents recognized	ART Act, 2021; Surrogacy Act, 2021	Bans heritable gene editing
United Kingdom	Altruistic only (✓)	Open identity post-18 (✓)	Legal parents via parental order	Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act, 1990	Permits MRT, bans CRISPR
United States	Varies by state (✓/✗)	Mixed approach (✓/✗)	Contract-based, varies	State laws, Uniform Parentage Act	Limited regulation, state-dependent
European Union	Mixed (Italy restrictive ✗, Belgium permissive ✓)	Generally open ID (✓)	Diverse	Varies by country	Bans heritable gene editing
Canada	Altruistic only (✓)	Open identity preferred (✓)	Emphasis on consent	Assisted Human Reproduction Act, 2004	Bans germline editing
China	Banned (✗)	Not allowed (✗)	Based on birth mother	Population and Family Planning Law	Strict bans on ART tech
Australia	Altruistic only (✓)	Open identity post-18 (✓)	State-based recognition	State legislation	Bans heritable gene editing

Key: ✓ = Permissive/Progressive, ✗ = Restrictive/Prohibited

This table illustrates the global diversity in ART regulation. For example, the UK and Canada prioritize open-identity donation, reflecting a child's right to know their genetic origins, while India mandates anonymity, potentially limiting this right. Emerging technologies, like mitochondrial replacement therapy (MRT), are permitted in the UK but banned elsewhere, highlighting regulatory gaps.

4. Ethical and Legal Challenges

ART's rapid evolution outpaces legal frameworks, creating ethical and legal dilemmas. Below are key challenges, enriched with stakeholder perspectives and case studies.

4.1 Surrogacy Disputes

Surrogacy often leads to disputes over parentage, nationality, and contract enforceability. The *Baby Gammy* case (2014) in Thailand is a stark example. An Australian couple hired a Thai surrogate, but when one of the twin babies was born with Down syndrome, they abandoned him, taking only his healthy sister. The surrogate, left to care for Gammy, faced financial and legal struggles, as Thailand lacked clear surrogacy laws. This case exposed the vulnerabilities of commercial surrogacy and prompted Thailand to ban it for foreign nationals.

From the surrogate's perspective, altruistic systems offer dignity but may not cover lost wages or medical risks. Intended parents, meanwhile, face uncertainty when contracts are unenforceable across borders. Children, like Gammy, risk statelessness or abandonment without legal protections.

4.2 Gamete and Embryo Donation

Gamete donation raises questions about anonymity, compensation, and the child's right to know their origins. In the UK, a 2005 law ended donor anonymity, allowing children to access their donor's identity at 18. This shift reflects the perspective of donor-conceived individuals, who often seek their genetic history for identity or medical reasons. In contrast, India's ART Act, 2021, mandates anonymity, potentially denying children this right.

Compensation is another issue. While commercial donation is banned in many countries,

informal markets persist, raising concerns about coercion. For example, egg donors—often young women—may face health risks like ovarian hyperstimulation syndrome, yet financial pressures can undermine informed consent.

4.3 Genetic Modification and Emerging Technologies

Technologies like CRISPR-Cas9 (gene editing) and mitochondrial replacement therapy (MRT) promise to prevent genetic diseases but raise ethical concerns. Imagine a couple using CRISPR to create a "designer baby" with enhanced traits. This scenario risks social inequality and unknown long-term health impacts. Most countries, including India and the EU, ban heritable genome editing, but enforcement is challenging.

Emerging technologies like in vitro gametogenesis (IVG)—creating gametes from stem cells—could allow same-sex couples or infertile individuals to have genetically related children. However, IVG challenges existing parentage laws and raises ethical questions about "artificial" reproduction. Artificial wombs (ectogenesis) and AI-driven embryo selection further complicate regulation, as laws lag behind innovation.

4.4 Cross-Border Reproductive Tourism

Legal loopholes drive reproductive tourism, where individuals seek ART in countries with lax regulations, like Georgia or Ukraine. The global ART market, projected to reach $45 billion by 2026, fuels this trend. However, cross-border ART creates risks: surrogates may face exploitation, children may be stateless, and parents may encounter legal barriers when returning home. The absence of enforceable international agreements exacerbates these issues, leaving vulnerable parties unprotected.

4.5 Religious and Cultural Sensitivities

ART regulations often reflect religious values. In Islamic countries, third-party donation is typically prohibited, as it disrupts lineage purity. Catholic-majority countries, like Italy before 2014, imposed restrictive ART laws, prioritizing embryo protection. These cultural differences complicate international harmonization but highlight the need for flexible, context-sensitive regulations.

4.6 Psychological and Social Impacts

ART participants face significant psychological and social challenges. Patients undergoing IVF often experience stress, anxiety, and financial strain, with cycles costing $10,000–$20,000 in the US. Surrogates may form emotional bonds with the child, complicating altruistic arrangements. Children born via ART may grapple with identity questions, especially in anonymous donation systems. Public awareness campaigns can help destigmatize ART and support participants, but such efforts are rare.

5. Future Legal Reforms and Policy Directions

To address ART's challenges, proactive reforms are essential. Below are proposed directions, addressing counterarguments to ensure robust solutions.

5.1 International Harmonization

The lack of global ART standards fuels disputes and exploitation. A UN Model Law on ART could set minimum standards for surrogacy, donor rights, and child protections. For example, it could mandate that surrogacy agreements include provisions for the child's nationality and healthcare. Critics argue that harmonization infringes on national sovereignty, but a flexible framework—allowing cultural adaptations—can balance global consistency with local values.

The Hague Conference on Private International Law has explored surrogacy guidelines, but progress is slow. Strengthening these efforts could prevent cases like *Baby Gammy* and ensure ethical cross-border ART.

5.2 Independent Ethical Oversight

Regulatory bodies like the HFEA (UK) and ICMR (India) are critical but face enforcement challenges, such as underfunding or corruption. Strengthening these bodies with adequate resources, clear mandates, and public accountability is essential. For example, the HFEA's success in reducing multiple births (twins/triplets) from IVF demonstrates the value of robust oversight. Countries without such bodies should establish them, ensuring psychological counseling, informed consent, and non-commercialization.

5.3 Adaptive Legal Frameworks

Laws must evolve to address emerging technologies. Artificial wombs, IVG, and AI-driven embryo selection require proactive regulation to prevent unethical use. For instance, AI could optimize embryo selection but risks prioritizing traits like intelligence, exacerbating inequality. Adaptive frameworks should include public consultations to reflect societal values and ban high-risk technologies, like heritable gene editing, until safety is assured.

5.4 Equitable and Inclusive Access

ART must be accessible to marginalized groups—LGBTQ+ individuals, single parents, and low-income populations. In India, subsidies for ART could reduce financial barriers, while legal reforms could remove marital status restrictions. Critics may argue that expanding access strains healthcare systems, but inclusive policies promote social equity and align with human rights principles, like those in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

5.5 Public Awareness and Education

Misconceptions about ART—e.g., that it's unnatural or elitist—persist. Public education campaigns, like those in Australia, can demystify ART, reduce stigma, and inform stakeholders about their rights. Schools, clinics, and media can play a role in fostering informed discourse.

5.6 Visualizing ART Processes

To aid understanding, regulators could use visual tools, like a flowchart of surrogacy processes. For example:

- **Step 1**: Intended parents and surrogate sign a legal agreement, reviewed by an independent authority.
- **Step 2**: Medical procedures (e.g., embryo transfer) occur under ethical oversight.
- **Step 3**: Post-birth, parentage is legally transferred, ensuring the child's nationality.

Such visuals clarify complex processes for stakeholders and policymakers.

6. Conclusion

Assisted Reproductive Technology stands at the crossroads of science, law, ethics, and human rights. From the hope of IVF to the complexities of surrogacy, ART has transformed lives but exposed regulatory gaps. While countries like the UK and Canada offer progressive models, global disparities—driven by cultural, economic, and technological factors—persist. Addressing these challenges requires bold action: international harmonization, robust ethical oversight, adaptive laws, and inclusive policies. As ART reshapes human reproduction, global leaders must act swiftly to create frameworks that prioritize dignity, equity, and protection for all involved. By bridging legal divides and embracing ethical innovation, we can ensure that ART fulfills its promise as a force for good.

References

- Baby Manji Yamada v. Union of India, (2008) 13 SCC 518 (India).
- Evans v. United Kingdom, Application no. 6339/05, European Court of Human Rights.
- K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1 (India).
- Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 (India).
- Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 (India).
- Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act, 1990 (UK).
- Assisted Human Reproduction Act, 2004 (Canada).
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, United Nations (1966).
- Johnson v. Calvert, 5 Cal.4th 84 (California Supreme Court, 1993).
- Uniform Parentage Act (U.S.).
- Indian Council of Medical Research. (2020). *National Guidelines for Accreditation, Supervision, and Regulation of ART Clinics in India*.
- European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology. (2020). *ART Fact Sheet*.