



Our ref: 2023/51257

The Hon Peter Foster MLC
Chair
Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs
18-32 Parliament Place
West Perth WA 6005

Dear Mr Foster

Parliamentary Inquiry into historic forced adoptive policies and practices

Further to my letter dated 4 October 2023, I note the Department of Communities' proposed to undertake a select audit of historical adoption client files to provide further information in support of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs' (the Standing Committee) Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices.

The Department of Communities has now completed its audit. Please find **attached** a copy of the audit report for your consideration.

The Department of Communities welcomes the opportunity to provide further input to the Standing Committee on these matters. If you have any further queries, please contact the Department of Communities at

[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

Mike Rowe
Director General

11 April 2024



Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Communities**

Department of Communities' Adoption Client File Audit

**Parliamentary Inquiry into historic forced adoptive policies
and practices**

Preamble

The Department of Communities (Communities) acknowledges the experiences of individuals and families affected by historical forced adoption practices, recognising the ongoing impacts experienced by many people. Communities supports the work of the Environment and Public Affairs Committee to both highlight historical policies and practices and provide an opportunity for those impacted, to share their lived experience.

Through its work connecting adoptees with their birth parents and families, Communities recognises the importance of providing information to enable people to better understand who they are. Communities is committed to supporting individuals impacted by forced adoption and encourages anyone who has been impacted, to approach the department for assistance in accessing information and appropriate supports.

Contents

Background.....	4
Objective	4
Scope.....	5
Approach.....	7
Process	8
Findings	10
Annexure 1: Sample size calculation	13
Annexure 2: Key document check-list	14
Annexure 3: Analysis of client documents	17

Background

On 22 February 2023, the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs (the Standing Committee) announced a Parliamentary Inquiry into historic forced adoption policies and practices (the Inquiry).

The Inquiry is considering past adoptive policies and practices, notably between 1939 and 1980. The terms of reference note the Standing Committee will seek to:

- understand the lived experiences of those affected by historical forced adoption practices;
- examine the role of the State Government, health services and private institutions in these practices;
- identify what measures are currently available to assist persons experiencing distress, their effectiveness and how those persons may be supported further; and
- consider any other matter that arises during the course of the inquiry deemed to be relevant by the Committee.

On 16 June 2023, the Department of Communities (Communities) provided its submission to the Inquiry and on 18 September 2023, Communities appeared before a Standing Committee hearing. During the hearing, the Hon Tjorn Sibma MLC requested advice from Communities attendees on whether there is demonstrated proof the WA Government departments that preceded Communities consistently discharged their relevant statutory obligations during the Inquiry period.

Communities took this question on notice and provided its initial response to the Committee on 4 October 2023. This response noted that to obtain more information on the specific matters raised, Communities would undertake a select audit of historical adoption client files.

Where the term “Communities” is used in this report, it is intended to refer to predecessor agencies responsible for adoption services at the time (although, depending on context, the name of the predecessor agency may also have been used at times).

Objective

The objective of the select audit was to answer the questions posed by the Committee, across as broad a period as possible, noting legislative constraints.

The questions posed by the Committee are:

Considering the legislation during the time periods in question, is Communities able to advise the Committee whether certain behaviours occurred, including:

1. *Applying pressure on women into signing consent forms, including not allowing women to leave hospital until forms were signed.*
2. *Failing to obtain a valid consent form, or obtaining consent by fraudulent means.*
3. *Taking consent too early in the process.*
4. *Not informing women of the right to revoke consent.*
5. *Not informing women of alternatives to relinquishment.*
6. *Denial of a reasonable request to see the baby were unlawful or unethical.*

7. *Is there evidence that the department complied with the paramountcy principle from the 1970s onwards.*

Scope

In the context of the above objectives, the audit scope was refined having consideration to the following broad issues.

Timeframe

In Communities’ initial response of 4 October 2023, it undertook to audit client files relating to the period between 1953 and 1980. This timeframe was proposed on the basis that Communities did not have any statutory responsibilities prior to 1953. Upon further review, the audit has been limited to the period from 1970-71 to 1979-80.

Prior to 1970,¹ the Department had limited duties in relation to adoptions including:

- The Minister for Child Welfare had power to make arrangements with adoption authorities in other States.
- Prospective adoptive parents had to notify the Child Welfare Department of their intention to apply for an adoption order and provide the Department with information so that it could report to the Court about their ability to meet the criteria for the making of an order, including whether they were “fit and proper”, “of good repute” and had sufficient ability to maintain and educate the child.

Communities does not believe that these legislative requirements have a sufficient connection to the seven questions posed by the Committee to warrant an audit of files during this time period.

Legislative changes which were effective from the 1970s saw a significant shift to the operation of the *Adoption of Children Act 1896* (Act). This includes a significant expansion of the Department’s role, with new responsibilities in relation to consent to adoptions and the introduction of the paramountcy principle.

As outlined in Communities’ submission to the Inquiry, reforms during the 1960’s, which came into force from 1 May 1970, included significant changes to the consent process such as:

- the introduction of a “revocation period” in which a person providing consent to an adoption could change their mind;
- requirements for certification of a birth mother’s fitness to provide consent if she gave consent within 7-days of the child’s birth;
- introduction of the concept of “defective consent” (the Judge could not make an adoption order if the consent was defective via factors such as fraud, duress, being altered without authority, the person providing consent was in an unfit condition, or the person did not understand the nature of the consent);
- introduction of an undue influence offence in relation to a birth mother’s decision to adopt her child; and
- expanded grounds for dispensation of the requirement for a person’s consent.

¹ Full details of the relevant legislative duties and timeframes are included in Communities’ Inquiry submission.

Multiple offences were also introduced, such as prohibitions against:

- Persons making payment for the adoption of a child (other than legal expenses, or medical or other expenses approved by the Director of Child Welfare or a Judge).
- A person exerting undue influence (including threats, force, restraint) with a view to inducing a birth mother to offer, or refrain from offering, a child for adoption.

From the Department’s perspective, new legislative responsibilities effective from 1 May 1970 included:

- The Director was required to acknowledge receipt of signed and attested Instruments of Consent; notices of revocation of consent received within the revocation period; and medical certificates about the child’s physical and mental health. They were also required to provide these documents to the Court once the applicant provided them with a copy of a lodged application for adoption.
- Once all required consents had been provided or dispensed with by the Court, prior to the granting of the adoption order, the Director of the Child Welfare Department became responsible, as guardian, for all children subject to a general consent to their adoption.

During the 1970’s, there was further substantial reform to adoptions legislation.

Amendments of relevance, noting the objective of the audit include:

- Amendments commencing from 1 July 1972 saw the introduction of a paramountcy principle into this Act, which made the “welfare and interest of the child” the paramount consideration for all purposes under the Act.
- A person’s general consent to the adoption of their child could be deemed to be revoked if the Director considered it was not possible or desirable to place the child for adoption, or the welfare and interest of the child would not be promoted by adoption.
- Director Child Welfare was given the power to make an application for discharge of an adoption order, where:
 - the adoption order, or any consent for the adoption order, was obtained by fraud, duress or other improper means; or
 - there is some exceptional reason why, subject to the welfare and interest of the child, the adoption order should be discharged.

Noting the specific questions posed by the Committee primarily relate to consent processes, including revocation of consent and undue influence, Communities has limited the scope of its audit to adoptions which were applied for from 1970-71 to 1979-80. This is to ensure alignment with the legislative provisions outlined above.

Client files criteria and exclusions

Departmental files

Communities holds a significant volume of client files across physical, electronic and microfilm formats, including from other organisations involved in historic adoptions.

The varying formats of client files, including the lack of appropriate indexing, referencing and folio numbers created challenges in defining an appropriate audit total population. While it is understood that Communities holds more than 39,000 client files, these are not indexed in a numerical or otherwise sequential order.

Noting the Committee’s interest in ascertaining details of the state government compliance with relevant legislative provisions and the limitations with record-keeping outlined above, the audit was limited to adoptions arranged by Communities and not those conducted by private solicitors or other external parties.

Communities holds six historical Court Register index books for the years 1970-1980. These indexes provide details of department-initiated adoptions in chronological order. Each index records the name and date of birth of the adoptee and the names of the adoptive parents, date the application was made to the Court and a registration number, which enables the identification of corresponding files within the required timeframe.

The Court index includes details of adoptions arranged by the Department and therefore, also includes adoptions that did not proceed. Files which relate to adoption applications that did not proceed were not excluded from the audit scope.

Adoption types

Previous inquiries into forced adoptions, including the Senate and Victorian inquiries, have noted that the majority of those impacted by these practices were young unmarried women at the time of their child’s birth. This appears to be consistent with the submissions published to date for the WA Inquiry and the terms of reference. On this basis, the audit was limited to consider client files that relate to single mothers.

Accordingly, the following types of adoptions were excluded from the client file review:

- Stepparent adoptions, adoptions of the child of a married couple and other related party adoptions
- Carer adoptions
- Adoptions of children in the care of the State
- Intercountry adoptions

Approach

Communities reviewed the Court index files for the relevant years, subject of the audit. This resulted in a total population set of 3,965 files for potential review across the ten year period, as follows:

Financial year	Total number of client files (as extracted from the court index)
1970 – 1971	210
1971 – 1972	444
1972 – 1973	528
1973 – 1974	623
1974 – 1975	367
1975 – 1976	380
1976 – 1977	405
1977 – 1978	349
1978 – 1979	342
1979 – 1980	317

Sampling

On the basis of a ten year timeframe and a 99% confidence level, a sample size of 30 clients was selected. To consider the questions raised by the Committee across the time span, Communities utilised a sample size equally spanned across the timeframe, being three clients per year. Details of the calculation are included at **Annexure 1**.

File Selection

A random number generator was used to select the three clients for each year period to be audited.

Alternative selection techniques

Where a client was selected which was out of scope (i.e., a step-parent adoption), the next sequential number was used for review. If the second client selected was also out of scope, the following sequential number was considered. This process was followed until a client was identified as being in scope for the relevant year period.

Process

Information accessed

Following the selection of an individual client, (based on the random number generator), all relevant files relating to the adoption were recalled from external storage or located from internal electronic databases. The documents reviewed were broader than the files, to ensure that fulsome consideration was given to any supporting evidence.

While the documents held on each file varied considerably based on the individual circumstances and time period, the files recalled for review included (where available):

- the adoptee's client file;
- the adoptee's biological mother's client file;
- the adoptee's siblings' client file;
- the adoptee's adoptive parents' client file;
- hospital records relevant to the adoptee and birth mother
- court documents.

Client files were assessed in the first instance, to confirm the adoption was in scope. Where the adoption was identified as being out of scope, a new client was selected in line with the alternative selection techniques outlined above. Working papers were maintained which detail the clients selected for each year, including details of clients which were out of scope and the reasons for their exclusion.

Overall, 11 out of scope files were selected for potential review in the audit. The reasons for the files being excluded are as follows:

- Relative adoptions (nine)
- Adoptions of children in the care of the State (one)
- Intercountry adoptions (one)

Checklist

To ensure consistency in the review of files, a key document checklist was developed. A copy is included at **Annexure 2**. The checklist provides details of the different types of documents available on client files, the purpose of the document in the context of the adoption and the key information to be reviewed to determine legislative compliance. Not all key documents listed in the checklist were available on each client file.

Analysis of client files

For the purposes of the audit, the seven questions posed by the Committee were analysed as eight separate questions being:

1. *Is there evidence of pressure being applied to women to sign consent forms by Communities?*
2. *Is there evidence that women were not allowed by Communities to leave hospital until consent forms were signed?*
3. *Is there evidence demonstrating Communities failure to obtain a valid consent form, or evidence of Communities obtaining consent by fraudulent means?*
4. *Is there evidence to suggest that consent was sought too early in the adoption process (Before or inside the seven days post birth)?*
5. *Is there evidence to suggest that women were or were not informed by Communities of the right to revoke consent?*
6. *Is there evidence to suggest that women were not informed of alternatives to relinquishment?*
7. *Is there evidence to suggest that Communities enabled or supported a denial of any reasonable request to see the baby which may have been unlawful or unethical given the legislation in affect at the time of the adoption?*
8. *Is there evidence that Communities complied with the paramountcy principle from the 1970s onwards?*

Communities reviewed all available client files and maintained a detailed analysis of all key documents on individual client files that was selected and in scope. A copy of a blank analysis sheet is included at **Annexure 3**. This document was prepared for dual purposes being:

- For record keeping purposes, the analysis summary document provides succinct details of the key documents reviewed and corresponding file numbers.
- To consider the information in individual documents against the questions posed by the Committee.

Key documents were reviewed against the relevant legislative frameworks at the time, with consideration given to the significant legislative reforms in the 1970’s and how these changes were reflected in the evolving legal and practice requirements of the department. To determine legislative compliance, the available and relevant documents were assessed against specific provisions of the legislative framework, including the specific legal requirements and obligations of the department at the time.

Finally, the information gathered from all available client files was consolidated into a single spreadsheet to collate a summary of the information reviewed against the committee questions.

Findings

Based on the analysis of client files reviewed, Communities:

- Did not identify any evidence of the specified behaviours in question by the Committee; and
- Determined that Communities’ predecessor agencies complied with the statutory requirements in place at the relevant points in time.

An analysis of the questions posed by the Committee is included below.

Line of Inquiry	Documents reviewed	Comments / analysis
<i>Is there evidence of pressure being applied to women to sign consent forms by Communities?</i>	Instrument of consent File notes Interview notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence was found to indicate any offence of undue influence (including threats, forced, restraint with a view to inducing a birth mother to offer, or refrain from offering, a child for adoption) by Communities against the birth mother to sign an instrument of consent. • In each instance, the file contained a valid instrument of consent signed by the birth mother, which was attested to by an approved authority.
<i>Is there evidence that women were not allowed by Communities to leave hospital until consent forms were signed?</i>	Instrument of consent Hospital records File notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence was found to indicate that a birth mother was not permitted by Communities to leave a hospital until an instrument of consent was signed. • Of the 30 client files reviewed, only seven included relevant information to ascertain the date when a birth mother was discharged from hospital. • Two of the client files indicate that a valid instrument of consent was signed by a birth mother on the same date as the birth mother was discharged from hospital. However, there are no available records on these files to indicate that the birth mothers were not permitted to leave the hospital until an instrument of consent was signed. • Of the seven files containing relevant records, there was no evidence found to indicate any offence of undue influence (including threats, forced, restraint with a view to inducing a birth mother to offer, or refrain from offering, a child for adoption) by Communities.
<i>Is there evidence demonstrating Communities failure to obtain a valid consent form, or evidence of Communities obtaining consent by fraudulent means?</i>	Order for Adoption Instrument of consent Affidavit of the birth parent(s) Supporting affidavit by a parent, guardian or near relative of a birth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent provisions varied through the time period, for example, adoptions that occurred prior to 1971 required a supporting affidavit by the birth mother’s parent, guardian or near relative when the birth mother is under the age of 21 years. This requirement changed in 1971, when a supporting affidavit was no longer required when the birth mother was aged over 18 years • Each client file reviewed contained a valid instrument of consent signed by the birth mother and attested to by an approved authority. There was no evidence found to indicate that the consent

Line of Inquiry	Documents reviewed	Comments / analysis
	<p>parent (if the birth parent is underage)</p> <p>Certificate of fitness of the birth mother to consent to an adoption (If consent is obtained with 7-days post birth)</p> <p>Affidavit in support of request to dispense with a birth parent(s) consent</p> <p>Receipt of certain documents by the Director</p>	<p>of the birth mother was obtained by fraudulent means or was defective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all instances where the birth mother was underage, the client file contained a valid supporting affidavit by a parent, guardian or near relative of the birth mother, in line with legislated requirements for underage birth mothers. • Supporting affidavits included all required aspects, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ whether they agree to the adoption order being made; ○ whether they understood the effect of the adoption order in permanently depriving the birth parent of any rights of the child; and ○ whether the effect of an order for adoption has been explained to the birth parent and whether the birth parent appears to understand it.
<p><i>Is there evidence to suggest that consent was sought too early in the adoption process? (Before or inside the seven days post birth)</i></p>	<p>Instrument of consent</p> <p>Receipt of certain documents by the Director</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence was found to indicate that an instrument of consent was signed by a birth mother before or inside 7 days after the birth of the child.
<p><i>Is there evidence to suggest that women were or were not informed by Communities of the right to revoke consent</i></p>	<p>Instrument of consent</p> <p>Affidavit of the birth mother</p> <p>File notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence was found to indicate that women were not informed by Communities of the right to revoke consent to an adoption. • Where legally required, all instruments of consent included a declaration relevant to the revocation of consent to an adoption, including the timeframe for revoking consent and the process for revoking consent.
<p><i>Is there evidence to suggest that women were not informed of alternatives to relinquishment?</i></p>	<p>Interview notes</p> <p>File notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the audit time period, there was no legislated requirement for Communities to inform women of alternatives to adoption. • Available records provide limited insight to indicate if a birth mother was or was not informed of alternatives to adoption.
<p><i>Is there evidence to suggest that Communities enabled or supported a denial of any reasonable request to see the baby which may have been unlawful or unethical given the legislation in affect at</i></p>	<p>Interview notes</p> <p>Hospital records</p> <p>File notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence was found to indicate that Communities enabled or supported a denial of any reasonable request to see the baby prior to expiration of the revocation period. • One file indicated that the birth mother was enabled to hold her baby after birth, but prior to signing an instrument of consent. Prior to the birth of the child, the birth mother expressed her intention to place the child for adoption.

Line of Inquiry	Documents reviewed	Comments / analysis
<i>the time of the adoption?</i>		
<i>Is there evidence that Communities complied with the paramountcy principle from the 1970s onwards?</i>	<p>Report to the Hon Judge in Chambers</p> <p>Affidavits of adoptive parents</p> <p>Affidavits of referees</p> <p>Director’s opinion of applicants</p> <p>Interview notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paramountcy principle was legislated in 1973. • All client files for the period following its introduction contain reasonable evidence to indicate that Communities complied with the paramountcy principle. For example, files included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Director’s written opinion of the prospective adoptive parents, including any specific reasons relating to the welfare and interests of as to why the Order of Adoption should be made. ○ The Report to the Hon Judge in Chambers, which outlined the Department’s assessment of the suitability of prospective adoptive parents and the department’s recommendation in support of that assessment. • For the relevant time period prior to the introduction of the paramountcy principle, all client files contain reasonable evidence to indicate that the future welfare and best interests of the child would be promoted through adoption. For example, files included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Report to the Hon Judge in Chambers, which outlined the Department’s assessment of the suitability of prospective adoptive parents and the department’s recommendation in support of that assessment. ○ Supporting affidavits from two referees of the prospective adoptive parents. ○ Police reports.

Annexure 1: Sample size calculation

Sample Size Calculation Example										
95% degree confidence corresponds to $\alpha = 0.05$. Each of the shaded tails in the following figure has an area of $\alpha/2 = 0.025$. The region to the left of $z_{\alpha/2}$ and to the right of $-z_{\alpha/2}$ is $0.5 - 0.025$, or 0.475 . In the table of the standard normal distribution, an area of 0.475 corresponds to a z value of 1.96 . The critical value is therefore ± 1.96 .									$\alpha/2$	
										Degree of Confidence
						Population Sample Size	Suggested Sample Size			$F(\mu + n\sigma) - F(\mu - n\sigma)$
90% DC	Deviations			Squared						n
1.64	2	1	3.289707	10.82		11	20		0.800	1.28
									0.900	1.64
95% DC	Deviations			Squared		Population Sample Size	Suggested Sample Size		0.950	1.96
1.96	2	1	3.92	15.37		15	25		0.980	2.33
									0.990	2.58
99.00% DC	Deviations			Squared		Population Sample Size	Suggested Sample Size		0.995	2.81
2.58	2	1	5.16	26.63		27	30		0.998	3.09
									0.999	3.29
99.99% DC	Deviations			Squared		Population Sample Size	Suggested Sample Size		0.9999	3.89
3.89	2	1	7.78	60.53		61	60		0.99999	4.42
									0.999999	4.89
Controls Testing									0.9999999	5.33
									0.99999999	5.73
									0.999999999	6.11
	Degree of Confidence	90.00%	95.00%	99.00%	99.99%					
	Tolerable Error	2	2	2	2					
	Sample Size	20	25	30	60					

Annexure 2: Key document check-list

Document title	Purpose	Key information
Order of Adoption	An Order of Adoption, made by a Court, transfers parental responsibility to the adoptive parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date the Order of Adoption was granted • Name of adoptee and adoptive parents • Signatory
Application for Order of Adoption	Application submitted the Department by the adoptive parents to adopt the child. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names of adoptive parents • Name and DOB of the adoptee • Signatory and date of signature
Affidavits of Adopting Parents	Sworn statement of the adoptive parents relating to their circumstances and intention to adopt the child. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names of adoptive parents • Date the adoptee was placed with adoptive parents • Signatories and date of signature
Certificate of Director	Director’s opinion of the adoptive parents as proper persons to adopt the child. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names of adoptive parents • Director’s opinion of the adoptive parents • Signature of the Director and date of signature
Report to the Hon Judge in Chambers (Report of Responsible Officer)	Report furnished by the Department to the Court addressing the suitability and capability of adoptive parents to care and provide for the child (paramountcy principle). Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names of adoptive parents • Particulars of the adoptive parents • Information relevant to the child of the application • Recommendation of the Department • Signatory and date of signature
Certificate of fitness of mother of child to consent to adoption	Certificate of a legally qualified medical practitioner as to the fitness of the birth mother to consent to an adoption. This document is required where consent to an adoption is provided within 7 days post-birth of the child. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of the birth mother and child • Date of signature of instrument of consent • Date and place of birth of the child • Certification of the fitness of the birth mother to provide consent
Affidavit in support of request to dispense with birth father’s Consent (or the birth mother’s Consent)	Sworn statement requesting to dispense with the consent of the birth mother or birth father. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name and title of signatory • Particulars relevant to the birth mother/ birth father and reason of request • Signatory and date of signature

Document title	Purpose	Key information
Supporting Affidavit by a parent, guardian or near relative of a birth mother/father (if the birth mother is underage)	Sworn statement in support of the birth mother’s consent to an adoption. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of parent and relationship to the birth mother • Name and age of the birth parent • Date and place of birth of the child • Declaration of understanding of the effect of an Order of Adoption, which has been explained to and understood by the birth mother • Approval of the birth parent’s consent to the adoption • Signatories and date of signature
Supporting affidavit (Identification affidavit)	Sworn statement (typically provided by a Matron of a hospital) regarding the birth and placement of the child. Legal document tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name and title of signatory • Particulars relevant to the admission of the birth mother, date and place of birth of the child and the transfer of the child to adoptive parents • Certification that the child is that of the Order of Adoption • Signatories and date of signature
Affidavit of birth mother/father	Sworn statement of the birth mother/ birth father regarding the birth of the child and an understanding of the effect of an Order of Adoption. Legal document tendered in Court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name and date of birth of the birth mother/father • Confirmation of biological relationship to the child • Declaration of understanding of the effect of an Order of Adoption • Signatories and date of signature
Instrument of consent	Legal consent provided by the birth mother and birth father (where required) to the adoption of the child.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name and date of birth of the birth mother • Name, date and place of birth of the child • Name and date of birth of the birth father • Declaration relevant to the revocation of consent • Signatories and date of signature
Interview notes with birth parent(s)	Contemporaneous notes of the initial interview between the department and the birth parent(s) regarding adoption.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date and place of interview conducted • Name of interviewer and interviewee and other present • Particulars of the birth mother and birth father • Facts of the relationship and insights into a decision to place a child for adoption • Signature and date of signature

Document title	Purpose	Key information
File notes	Contemporaneous notes from the Department or other organisations relating to the birth mother, birth father, child and adoptive parents in the context of an adoption.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information relevant to the birth mother, birth father, child or adoptive parents • Signatories and date of signature
Receipt of certain documents by Director	Formal acknowledgement of relevant documents received by the Director. Document contains an acknowledgement of the date of revocation. Legal document not tendered in court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of receipt • Name of person receiving • Description of documents • Final date of revocation • Date and signature of Director
Adopts. No.6	Departmental document regarding the date the child was placed with adoptive parents and comments relevant to the physical transfer of the child.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of child • Names of adoptive parents • File numbers of adoptee and adoptive parents • Date the child is placed with adoptive parents • Name and title of person placing the child and undertaking the physical transfer of the child • Relevant comments • Signatory and date
Hospital records (Ngala Mothercraft Home, King Edward Memorial Hospital, Hillcrest Hospital etc.)	Hospital and medical records pertaining to the birth mother and the child.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name and age of birth mother • Name and date of birth of the child • Admission and discharge information • Contemporaneous notes relevant to the health and development of the child • Contemporaneous notes relevant to the birth mother

Annexure 3: Analysis of client documents

Client and family details	
Client name:	First name, middle name, SURNAME
Files reviewed:	E.g., 1234/1234_qA12345678 (Adoptee) E.g., 1234/1234_qA12345678 (Bimo) E.g., 1234/1234_qA12345678 (Adfa/Admo) E.g., NG1234 (Bimo/Adoptee)
Date of birth:	Day, Month, Year
Place of child's birth:	E.g., King Edward Memorial Hospital
Birth mother name:	First name, middle name, SURNAME
Birth mother date of birth:	Day, Month, Year
Birth father name:	First name, middle name, SURNAME
Adoptive mother:	First name, middle name, SURNAME
Adoptive father:	First name, middle name, SURNAME
Date the child was placed with adoptive parents:	Day, Month, Year
Consent form signed on:	Day, Month, Year (X days post-birth)
Order for Adoption granted on:	Day, Month, Year
Other relevant notes/comments:	E.g., Birth mother was 20 years of age when the Instrument of Consent was signed.
Are there any areas of non-compliance or evidence of potentially unlawful behaviours?	Yes/No

Documents reviewed

Document title:	Order for Adoption
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

Document title:	Order for Adoption
	Notes on compliance:
Document title:	Application for Order of Adoption
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
	Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Affidavit of adoptive father
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
	Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Affidavit of adoptive mother
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	

Document title:	Affidavit of adoptive mother
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Certificate of Director (Director’s opinion of applicants)
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Report to the Honourable Judge in Chambers (Report of Responsible Officer)
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Certificate of fitness of birth mother of child to consent to adoption
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Affidavit in support of request to dispense with consent
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Supporting affidavit
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	

Document title:	Supporting affidavit
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Affidavit of birth mother
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Consent to the adoption of a child (Instrument of Consent)
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Receipt of certain documents by Director
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Departmental interview notes with birth mother
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Departmental file notes
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	

Document title:	Departmental file notes
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Adopts. No.6
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Hospital and medical records
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance:

Document title:	Other
Legal/non-legal document:	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal document <input type="checkbox"/> Non-legal document
Document signed by:	
Date of signature:	
Notes:	
Legislative compliance:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Notes on compliance: