The approval process and the psychological assessments both do not decide if intended parent(s) should be parents or not. I do agree with this, however should there be a step that does? Does this come under the implications counselling? If not, then maybe this should be considered? Patents could potentially be abusive or negligent towards the child, which could have been avoided. I understand there is an argument that this is discriminatory against intended parent(s) through surrogacy compared with natural parents, because there is nothing to prevent someone from becoming a parent in this way. But this is because that is very unpracticable, not because it isn't necessarily something that would benefit the population. This is obviously a very politically charged argument, but wouldn't it be better to avoid a child going through unnecessary trauma, and then potentially starting a further cycle of trauma if it could be?

Proposal 19:

A criminal history check should be required for all parties. At the very least intended parent(s). If you've done nothing wrong, then there is nothing to worry about. However, if the intended parent(s) have committed any offences that could potentially put the child in harms way, this should definitely be known. Refer to the above paragraph.

In response to Question G:

Maybe there should be one mandatory counselling session post-birth and then it should be decided from there if it is needed? This should occur for a maximum of 3 months. In my experience 3 months of counselling is generally a good length. Or stick to 10 sessions? This cap should probably not apply where both parties actively opted entered into the agreement despite knowing that there were some problematic findings in the pre-approval process (either psychological or medical). In which case, until the counsellor thinks they have reached enough sessions?

In response to Question H:

There should b a clause that states either party could choose not to proceed if they chose not to. Otherwise, they could feel like they must continue to go through with the agreement even if they are having second thoughts.

In response to Question I:

That only certain provisions within unlawful agreements should be enforceable. Otherwise, what's the point of this entire framework if you can just ignore it and the agreement still be enforceable.

In response to Question J:

There should be a ban on any provisions that require the surrogate to stay in the contract at any point if they change their mind.