

Morally Sensitive Issues and
Cross-Border Movement in the EU
The cases of reproductive matters and legal
recognition of same-sex relationships
Nelleke Koffeman



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Sheraton House | Castle Park
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

Nelleke Koffeman
Morally Sensitive Issues and Cross-Border Movement in the EU. The cases of
reproductive matters and legal recognition of same-sex relationships

ISBN 978-1-78068-349-2
D/2015/7849/134
NUR 828

Cover illustration: © Studio Hudson, Amsterdam

© 2015 Intersentia
Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is
available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or
any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There must be a correlation between the number of pages of a dissertation and the number of people whom the author would like to include in the acknowledgments, as there is indeed a considerable number of people whose names I would like to mention here.

Evidently I would like to start with my supervisors, my ‘*Doktoreltern*’, Prof. Janneke Gerards and Prof. Rick Lawson, a golden team. Rick, thank you first of all for opening the doors to academia to me by hiring me as your student assistant, ten years ago, and for being my mentor since. I have learned so much from your great expertise, your impressive analytical skills and your captivating writing style (in aqua blue!). I am also very grateful to you for your feedback and advice and for the enthusiasm with which you introduced me to many knowledgeable and inspiring people. Thank you also for the personal notes, the warm hospitality I received from you and Mielle at the Kloksteeg, and for the positive energy that you radiate.

Janneke, there are many reasons for which I admire you and I feel so privileged that you have been one of my supervisors. Not only are you a respected expert in the area of European (human rights) law, you are also – and to me even more importantly – an incredibly nice person and an outstanding supervisor. You are most reliable and you have (with no exceptions!) always provided me – quicker than I could dream or even think of – with clear, detailed and stimulating feedback. Thank you for all those meetings without any time pressure and for creating opportunities for me. Also, there has always been warm personal contact, and that has made me count my blessings even more.

In the course of my PhD research I have had the occasion and privilege to engage in cross-border movement myself, something for which I am very grateful. It has brought me new horizons, confronted me with new ideas and many inspiring people have crossed my path, both during international conferences and in the course of research visits to distinguished foreign universities. In Ireland I would like to thank NUI Galway, in particular Prof. Donncha O’Connell, as well as Dr. Ciara Smyth and Conor Hanly for hosting me twice, both in 2009 and 2013. You have been so hospitable and the insights into the Irish legal system and political debates you provided me with have been incredibly helpful. I am furthermore very grateful to Dublin-based Prof. Fergus Ryan and Fiona Duffy for the dedicated way in which they each kept me informed about the – often fast-moving – developments in those areas of Irish law that were relevant to my research.

At the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, where I spent six months in 2011, it is first and foremost Prof. Susanne Baer to whom I would like to express my sincere gratitude. Thank you for welcoming me at your chair and for helping me to reflect upon my research by posing spot-on, thought-provoking questions. Many thanks also to Sophie Rosenbuch for being such a kind and helpful host, to Dr. Sarah Elsuni and to the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) for making it possible by means of a scholarship. I would further like to thank Jerzy Szczesny at the Bundestag, for keeping me updated so enthusiastically about German developments in the area of LGBT rights. It was also in Berlin that I met the lovely and unequalled Prof. Nora Markard, and it was such a joy to find our friendship flourish during our time in New York. There have been others who made those months in Berlin such a dear time and that made, and make, me come back over and over again: Octavio Gonzalez Segovia, Pablo Rojas, Laura Ledesma, Beatriz Torres, Eyob Mulatu, Carlos Vallejos and Philip Mehls. I look forward to seeing you again, wherever that may be.

I am furthermore very grateful to Fordham Law School in New York, in particular to Dean Toni Fine, for hosting me in the spring of 2013, and to the Leiden University Fund for awarding me a grant that made it possible. My research time in the Big Apple has been very important for defining the ultimate direction of my book. Also, another metropolis was thereby enclosed in my heart.

There are a number of individual experts whom I would like to mention here, as I am grateful to them for taking the time to discuss my research with me. These are CJEU Judge Prof. Koen Lenaerts in Luxembourg, Dr. Jacco Bomhoff in London, and Prof. Richard Storrow, Prof. Susanne Goldberg, Prof. Arthur Leonard and Prof. Evan Wolfson in New York. Many thanks also to the colleagues from the *Rights on the Move* project for the highly interesting meetings. At Leiden University I would like to mention Prof. Kees Waaldijk, whose passion for LGBT rights has been contagious and who has furthermore put me in touch with many experts in the field. Prof. Aart Hendriks has, with great enthusiasm, shown a continuous interest in my research, and the ZONmW project that we did together with Janneke was a sheer joy. Thank you.

At the Europa Institute I would like to thank Prof. Stefaan Van den Bogaert for managing the department with devotion and expertise and for his confidence in me. I would further like to mention my (former) ‘roomies’ Bas van Bockel, Jorrit Rijpma and Armin Cuyvers whose humour, good company and helpful feedback I much appreciate. Armin, I am delighted that you accepted my invitation to be my *paranimf* and I look forward to all our future legal and non-legal reflections. There have been many other great EI colleagues over the years whom have contributed enormously to me having very much enjoyed working there. These are, amongst others (!), Barbara Cooreman, Yvonne van der Vlugt, Vestert Borger, Narin Tezcan, Elsbeth Beumer, Vicky Kosta, Jasmina Mačkić, Meehea Park, Darinka Piqani, Moritz Jesse, Agis Karpetas, Christa Tobler, Alison McDonnell, Wendy Rodger, Melanie Fink, and so many more. Then there were the ladies from ‘*het promoclubje*’ and the ‘*Renkum posse*’ (Vestert Borger, Ingrid Leijten and Ruben Zandvliet) with

whom I spent those both most productive and enjoyable weeks in villa ‘Molenbeke’ in the summer of 2014. It has been such a pleasure and privilege to work with many other great colleagues at Leiden Law School, for example the members of the Leiden Court Watchers, as well as outside Leiden, for example in ‘*het leesclubje*’ and in the Netherlands School of Human Rights Research.

A big thank you to Lara Rudnik for assisting me with finalising the references in the footnotes with care and precision, and to Joost Abbel and Rosan Dekker from Studio Hudson for the apt cover illustration.

Turning to the private sphere, there are many sweet and inspiring people in my circle of friends whom I would like to thank for their committed friendship and support during the PhD writing process. Whether we met through our studies (Anna Gouwenberg and Karima Hara), our student association (Nicole Janse, Marijke Kuiper, Maartje Beekman, and too many others to mention all by name here), sports or other shared interests (Camille Tonino and Joyce Dreessen), or during times abroad (Tonje Røland, Daniëla Kroemer, Stefan Mayr and Andrea Gruber), thank you all. Then there are three friends who have been there from my very first day in respectively primary school, secondary school and university, namely Lieke Buitink, Thessa Wong and Vera van Voorst. You are all very dear to me; I hope we stay as close during all other phases in life that may follow.

I would like to thank my parents, Leo and Greetje Koffeman, for all their confidence, support, inspiration, advice and love. Kees and Nico, it is simply great to have you on board in the family. Ide, my big brother, thank you for your care, your humour and creativity and your reflections upon life. My sweet sister Eva, my rock, thank you for being there for me always, for teaching me so many things (not least how to read and write!), and for sharing in the PhD writing process. Gijs, thank you for being you. I am so happy that we met again and I am very much looking forward to all that lies ahead of us.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 1.	
Introduction	3
1.1. Object of study and research questions	3
1.2. Approach and methodology	5
1.3. The two case studies	7
1.3.1. Definition of Case Study I	8
1.3.2. Definition of Case Study II	10
1.4. The five jurisdictions	10
1.5. Outline	13
CASE STUDY I – REPRODUCTIVE MATTERS	15
Chapter 2.	
ECHR	17
2.1. Reproductive matters under the ECHR	17
2.1.1. A right to respect for the decision (not) to become a genetic parent	17
2.1.2. The status of the unborn under the ECHR	21
2.1.3. The rights of the (future) child under the ECHR	22
2.1.4. The right to know one’s genetic origins	23
2.2. Abortion under the ECHR	26
2.2.1. The case of <i>D. v. Ireland</i> (2006)	28
2.2.2. The case of <i>Tysi�c v. Poland</i> (2007)	29
2.2.3. The case of <i>A, B and C v. Ireland</i> (2010)	31
2.2.3.1. Admissibility	33
2.2.3.2. Assessment of the complaints under Articles 2 and 3	33
2.2.3.3. Assessment of the complaints under Article 8	34
2.2.3.4. A wide margin of appreciation, no violation	35
2.2.3.5. Procedural approach; violation in respect of third applicant	38
2.2.4. Consolidation of the procedural approach in abortion cases	40
2.2.5. The rights of the father-to-be in abortion cases	43
2.3. Assisted human reproduction and surrogacy under the ECHR	43

2.3.1.	Access to AHR treatment	45
2.3.2.	Balancing the rights of parties to AHR treatment.....	46
2.3.3.	Donation of gametes	47
2.3.4.	Preimplantation genetic diagnosis	54
2.3.5.	Surrogacy	56
2.3.6.	Establishment of parental links after AHR treatment	57
2.4.	Cross-border cases and the ECHR	59
2.4.1.	Information about foreign treatment options and follow-up treatment	59
2.4.2.	Legal recognition of parental links established abroad	61
2.5.	Conclusions.....	69
Chapter 3.		
EU		73
3.1.	Constitutional framework.....	73
3.1.1.	The status of the unborn under EU law.....	73
3.1.2.	(Potentially) relevant Charter rights.....	76
3.1.3.	Relevant EU competences	80
3.1.3.1.	Public health	81
3.1.3.2.	Social security.....	81
3.1.3.3.	Civil matters (including family law) having cross-border implications	82
3.1.3.4.	Criminal law	83
3.2.	Absence of EU standards on abortion	84
3.3.	(Limited) EU standards related to assisted human reproduction and surrogacy	85
3.3.1.	The EU In vitro diagnostic medical devices Directive (1998)	87
3.3.2.	The EU Tissues and Cells Directive (2004)	88
3.3.3.	EU non-discrimination law and access to AHR treatment	91
3.3.4.	EU law and surrogacy.....	92
3.4.	Cross-border movement for reproductive matters in the EU: some statistics	97
3.4.1.	Statistics on cross-border abortions within the EU.....	97
3.4.2.	Statistics on CBRC within the EU	98
3.4.3.	Statistics on cross-border surrogacy within the EU	98
3.5.	EU standards on cross-border health care.....	99
3.5.1.	The Social Security Regulation and cross-border health care	101
3.5.2.	EU free movement law and cross-border health care	102
3.5.2.1.	A restriction of free movement? – The <i>Grogan</i> case....	105
3.5.2.2.	Justification of restrictions of free movement	109
3.5.2.3.	Conditions for authorisation requirements in respect of scheduled care	111
3.5.2.4.	The amount and the kind of costs to be reimbursed.....	113
3.5.3.	The EU Patient Mobility Directive (2011).....	114

3.5.3.1.	Authorisation and reimbursement for cross-border health care	117
3.5.3.2.	Information rights	118
3.6.	Cross-border movement in reproductive matters under EU law	119
3.6.1.	Political attention for cross-border movement in reproductive matters	119
3.6.2.	Open questions regarding the application of cross-border health care standards	122
3.6.2.1.	Reimbursement for treatment obtained abroad	123
3.6.2.2.	Prior authorisation requirements and refusal of authorisation	124
3.6.2.3.	Medical follow-up after cross-border treatment	127
3.6.2.4.	Information about foreign abortion and AHR services and surrogacy	128
3.6.2.5.	Different regimes as an obstacle to free movement?	128
3.6.3.	Recognition of parental links established abroad	128
3.6.3.1.	Green Paper on recognition of civil status records (2010)	130
3.6.3.2.	EP study on surrogacy in the EU (2013)	132
3.6.4.	The European Arrest Warrant and reproductive matters	133
3.7.	Conclusions	137
Chapter 4.		
Germany		
4.1.	Constitutional framework	139
4.1.1.	Human dignity (Article 1(1)) as guiding principle under the German Basic Law	139
4.1.2.	Article 2: personal freedoms	140
4.1.3.	The fundamental right to procreate	141
4.1.4.	The status of the unborn under German law	142
4.1.5.	The best interests of the child	143
4.1.6.	The right to know one's genetic origins	144
4.2.	German abortion legislation	145
4.2.1.	Early German abortion legislation	146
4.2.2.	The first BVerfG abortion judgment and subsequent legislation ..	149
4.2.3.	German reunification and abortion controversy	152
4.2.4.	The Pregnancy and Family Assistance Act (1992)	153
4.2.5.	The second BVerfG abortion judgment (1993)	155
4.2.6.	The Pregnancy and Family Assistance Revision Act (1995) and subsequent amendments	159
4.2.7.	Abortion and public funding	163
4.3.	German legislation on assisted human reproduction and surrogacy	164
4.3.1.	Early (legislative) developments	165
4.3.2.	The Embryo Protection Act (1991)	166
4.3.3.	Access to AHR treatment	168
4.3.4.	Donation of gametes and embryos	169

4.3.4.1.	Prohibition on egg cell donation	170
4.3.4.2.	Post-mortem reproduction	172
4.3.5.	Gender selection	172
4.3.6.	Preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD)	173
4.3.7.	Vitrification of egg cells	178
4.3.8.	AHR treatment and public funding	179
4.3.9.	Surrogacy	181
4.4.	Statistics on cross-border movement	184
4.4.1.	Statistics on cross-border abortions	184
4.4.1.1.	Cross-border movement from Germany	184
4.4.1.2.	Cross-border movement to Germany	188
4.4.2.	Statistics and reported cases on cross-border reproductive care ..	188
4.4.3.	Statistics on cross-border surrogacy	189
4.5.	German abortion and AHR legislation and cross-border movement	189
4.5.1.	Criminal liability for abortions and AHR treatment obtained abroad	190
4.5.2.	Public funding for treatment obtained abroad	191
4.5.3.	Cross-border surrogacy under German law	192
4.6.	Conclusions	196
Chapter 5.		
Ireland		199
5.1.	Constitutional framework	199
5.1.1.	The marital right to procreate	199
5.1.2.	The status of the unborn under Irish law	200
5.1.3.	The rights of the (future) child	201
5.1.3.	The right to know one's genetic origins	203
5.2.	Irish abortion legislation	203
5.2.1.	The success of pro-life campaigners	206
5.2.1.1.	The <i>Grogan</i> case (1991) and its aftermath	207
5.2.2.	The <i>X Case</i> (1992) and its aftermath	208
5.2.3.	The 1992 abortion referendum and the 1995 Abortion Information Act	212
5.2.4.	(Towards) the 2002 abortion referendum	214
5.2.5.	Abortion in case of lethal foetal abnormality? The cases of <i>D. v.</i> <i>Ireland</i> and <i>Miss D.</i>	215
5.2.6.	The ECtHR judgment in <i>A, B and C v. Ireland</i> (2010) and its follow-up in Ireland	217
5.2.7.	Towards abortion legislation	219
5.2.8.	The Protection of Life during Pregnancy Act (2014)	221
5.2.9.	Criminal prosecutions for abortions in Ireland	223
5.2.10.	Public funding for abortions in Ireland	224
5.3.	(The absence of) Irish legislation on assisted human reproduction and surrogacy	225
5.3.1.	The <i>Roche v. Roche</i> case (2006 and 2009)	227

5.3.2.	Developments since <i>Roche v. Roche</i>	229
5.3.3.	Access to AHR treatment	230
5.3.4.	Donation of gametes and embryos	231
5.3.4.1.	Post-mortem reproduction	235
5.3.5.	Gender selection	236
5.3.6.	Preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD)	236
5.3.7.	Vitrification of egg cells	237
5.3.8.	AHR treatment and public funding	238
5.3.9.	Surrogacy	238
5.4.	Statistics on cross-border movement	244
5.4.1.	Statistics on cross-border abortions	244
5.4.2.	(Insufficient) statistics on cross-border reproductive care	245
5.4.3.	Statistics on cross-border surrogacy	247
5.5.	Irish abortion and AHR legislation and cross-border movement	248
5.5.1.	Criminal liability for abortions and AHR treatment abroad?	248
5.5.2.	Public funding for treatment obtained abroad	248
5.5.3.	Information about treatment abroad and follow-up treatment	249
5.5.4.	Cross-border surrogacy under Irish law	250
5.6.	Conclusions	254
Chapter 6.		
The Netherlands		257
6.1.	Constitutional framework	257
6.1.1.	The right to respect for private life (Article 10) and the right to inviolability of the person (Article 11)	257
6.1.2.	The rights of the (future) child	258
6.1.3.	The status of the unborn under Dutch law	259
6.1.4.	The right to know one's genetic parents	260
6.2.	Dutch abortion legislation	261
6.2.1.	Early legislative developments	262
6.2.2.	The Pregnancy Termination Act (1981)	265
6.2.2.1.	The scope of the Pregnancy Termination Act	267
6.2.2.2.	Emergency situation	269
6.2.2.3.	Five-day reflection period	269
6.2.2.4.	Licensing and registration	270
6.2.3.	Reception of the Pregnancy Termination Act	270
6.2.4.	Criminal prosecutions for abortions in the Netherlands	271
6.2.5.	Abortion and public funding	271
6.3.	Dutch legislation on assisted human reproduction and surrogacy	272
6.3.1.	The Embryo Act (2002)	272
6.3.2.	Access to AHR treatment	274
6.3.3.	Donation of gametes and embryos	275
6.3.3.1.	Post-mortem reproduction	280
6.3.4.	Gender selection	281
6.3.5.	Preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD)	282

6.3.6.	Vitrification of egg cells	286
6.3.7.	AHR treatment and public funding	287
6.3.8.	Surrogacy	290
6.4.	Statistics on cross-border movement	295
6.4.1.	Statistics on cross-border abortions	295
6.4.1.1.	Cross-border movement towards the Netherlands	295
6.4.1.2.	Cross-border movement from the Netherlands	297
6.4.1.3.	Women on Waves	297
6.4.2.	Statistics on cross-border reproductive care	298
6.4.2.1.	Cross-border donation of gametes and import of gametes	299
6.4.2.2.	Cross-border movement for PGD	301
6.4.2.3.	Miscellaneous	301
6.4.3.	Cross-border surrogacy	302
6.5.	Dutch abortion and AHR legislation and cross-border movement	303
6.5.1.	Criminal liability for abortions and AHR treatment carried out abroad	303
6.5.2.	Public funding for treatment obtained abroad	304
6.5.3.	Information about treatment abroad and follow-up treatment	307
6.5.4.	Access to abortion for foreign women	308
6.5.5.	(Non-)applicability of the Dutch Donor Information Act in cross-border situations	308
6.5.6.	Cross-border surrogacy under Dutch law	310
6.6.	Conclusions	313

Chapter 7.

Conclusions Case Study I

7.1.	The internal picture – How are reproductive matters dealt with in the various jurisdictions?	317
7.1.1.	Balancing; the same interests but different weights	317
7.1.2.	Room for bright line rules	321
7.1.3.	Consistency of laws required	322
7.1.4.	Importance of procedures allowing for careful decision-making	322
7.1.5.	Fragmented regulation	323
7.1.6.	How was change brought about? A typification of (legislative and judicial) processes	324
7.1.7.	Resumé and outlook	326
7.2.	The cross-border picture – Legal responses to cross-border movement	327
7.2.1.	Warding off	328
7.2.1.1.	Travel bans and criminal prosecution upon return	329
7.2.1.2.	Bans on information about foreign services	329
7.2.1.3.	Refusals to provide follow-up care	330
7.2.1.4.	Refusals to reimburse treatment and prior authorisation requirements	331
7.2.1.5.	Non-recognition of legal effects	331
7.2.1.6.	Warding off by countries of destination	332
7.2.1.7.	Observations	332

7.2.2.	Accommodation.....	334
7.2.2.1.	Recognition of legal parenthood in cross-border surrogacy cases.....	334
7.2.2.2.	Information, reimbursement and follow-up care.....	335
7.2.2.3.	Observations.....	337
7.2.3.	Adaptation.....	337
7.2.4.	Outsourcing.....	338
7.2.5.	Resumé and outlook.....	343
CASE STUDY II – LEGAL RECOGNITION OF SAME-SEX RELATIONSHIPS.....		345
Chapter 8.		
ECHR		347
8.1.	Framework of ECHR rights.....	347
8.1.1.	Sexual orientation as most intimate aspect of private life (Article 8 ECHR).....	347
8.1.2.	Same-sex relationships and the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8 ECHR).....	349
8.1.3.	The right to marry (Article 12 ECHR).....	351
8.1.4.	Discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation.....	353
8.2.	Legal recognition of same-sex relationships and the ECHR.....	354
8.2.1.	Early case law on transsexuals' right to marry.....	355
8.2.2.	The case of <i>Schalk and Kopf v. Austria</i> (2010).....	359
8.2.2.1.	The Court's examination of the complaint under Article 12 ECHR.....	359
8.2.2.2.	The Court's examination of the complaints under Articles 8 and 14 ECHR.....	361
8.2.2.3.	Affirmation of the special status of traditional marriage in subsequent case law.....	364
8.2.3.	Spouses, registered partners and stable partners compared under Article 14 ECHR.....	365
8.2.3.1.	Spouses compared to unmarried partners.....	365
8.2.3.2.	Spouses compared to registered partners.....	368
8.2.3.3.	Registered partners compared to unmarried partners....	372
8.2.3.4.	Same-sex unmarried partners compared to different-sex unmarried partners.....	373
8.2.4.	Parental rights for same-sex couples.....	377
8.2.4.1.	Adoption by same-sex partners or couples.....	379
8.2.4.1.1.	Single-parent adoption.....	379
8.2.4.1.2.	Second-parent and successive adoption.....	382
8.2.4.1.3.	Joint adoption.....	386
8.2.4.2.	Legal parenthood by operation of the law.....	387
8.2.4.3.	Access to AHR treatment.....	388
8.2.5.	The role of existing alternative forms of registration in the Court's case law.....	389

8.2.6.	(Towards) a right to some form of legal recognition of (same-sex) relationships?	393
8.3.	Cross-border cases	397
8.3.1.	Recognition of foreign same-sex marriages and partnerships	398
8.3.2.	Refusal of a residence permit to a same-sex partner	398
8.3.3.	Cross-border cases involving children	398
8.4.	Conclusions	399
Chapter 9.		
EU	403
9.1.	Constitutional framework	403
9.1.1.	Relevant Charter rights	403
9.1.2.	Relevant EU competences	404
9.2.	The EU Staff Regulations and same-sex relationships	405
9.3.	EU non-discrimination law and same-sex relationships	411
9.3.1.	The <i>Grant</i> case (1998)	412
9.3.2.	The inclusion of sexual orientation in the Treaties in 1999	414
9.3.3.	The Employment Equality Directive and relevant case law	416
9.3.3.1.	The <i>Maruko</i> judgment (2008)	417
9.3.3.2.	The <i>Römer</i> judgment (2011)	421
9.3.3.3.	The <i>Hay</i> judgment (2013)	422
9.3.4.	Possible future developments in EU non-discrimination law	424
9.3.4.1.	Proposed horizontal Equal Treatment Directive	424
9.3.4.2.	Non-discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation as a general principle of EU law?	426
9.4.	LGBT rights in the EU's fundamental rights agenda	426
9.5.	Cross-border movement of rainbow families in the EU; some statistics ...	429
9.6.	Free movement law and rainbow families – open questions	431
9.6.1.	Regulation 1612/68 and workers with rainbow families	433
9.6.2.	The Free Movement Directive and EU citizens with rainbow families	435
9.6.2.1.	Same-sex spouses	438
9.6.2.2.	Same-sex registered partners	444
9.6.2.3.	Same-sex stable partners	447
9.6.2.4.	Children of same-sex couples	448
9.6.3.	The free movement of rainbow families under primary law	449
9.6.4.	The Family Reunification Directive and third-country nationals with rainbow families	453
9.7.	European Private International Law and rainbow families	455
9.7.1.	The <i>Brussels I</i> and <i>Brussels II bis</i> Regulations and subsequent EU PIL instruments	456
9.7.2.	Proposals for Regulations on property regimes (2010)	459
9.7.3.	Green Paper on recognition of civil status records (2010)	462
9.8.	Conclusions	465

Chapter 10.	
Germany	469
10.1. Constitutional framework	469
10.1.1. Article 3 Basic Law: equality before the law	469
10.1.2. Article 6(1) Basic Law: special protection of marriage and the family	471
10.1.2.1. Definition of ‘marriage’ and ‘family’ in Article 6(1) Basic Law	473
10.1.2.2. The meaning of ‘special protection’ in Article 6(1) Basic Law	473
10.1.2.3. The relationship of Article 6(1) to other provisions of the Basic Law	475
10.1.2.4. Article 6(1) Basic Law as expression of a cultural identity	475
10.2. (De-)criminalisation of homosexual activities	476
10.3. Legal recognition of same-sex relationships under German law	477
10.3.1. Early (legislative) developments	477
10.3.2. The Civil Partnerships Act (2001)	480
10.3.3. The 2002 BVerfG judgment upholding the Civil Partnerships Act	483
10.3.4. Further equalisation of the Civil Partnership with marriage	488
10.3.4.1. Employment law	490
10.3.4.2. The legal position of civil servants	491
10.3.4.3. Tax issues	494
10.3.5. Parental rights for same-sex couples	499
10.3.5.1. 2004: Introduction of second-parent adoption	500
10.3.5.2. 2009 and 2010: principled BVerfG rulings	500
10.3.5.3. 2013: Successive adoption	501
10.3.5.4. Exclusion of civil partners from joint adoption	508
10.3.5.5. Legal parenthood by operation of the law	508
10.3.5.6. Access to AHR treatment	510
10.3.6. Towards access to marriage for same-sex couples?	510
10.4. Same-sex relationships and cross-border movement	512
10.4.1. Cross-border movement; some statistics	513
10.4.2. (Development of) the relevant German conflict-of-laws rules	513
10.4.3. Access to registered partnership for foreign same-sex couples	514
10.4.4. Implementation of Directives 2004/38 and 2003/86 in German law	516
10.4.5. Recognition of foreign same-sex registered partnerships under German law	520
10.4.6. Recognition of foreign same-sex marriages under German law	523
10.4.7. ‘Downgrading’ and free movement law according to the German Courts	525
10.4.8. Cross-border parental issues	527

10.4.9. Recognition of German civil partnerships in other Member States	529
10.5. Conclusions	529

Chapter 11.

Ireland	531
----------------------	-----

11.1. Constitutional framework	531
11.1.1. Equality before the law	531
11.1.2. The right to marry and the protection of family under the Irish Constitution	531
11.2. (De-)criminalisation of homosexual activities	534
11.3. Legal recognition of same-sex relationships under Irish law	536
11.3.1. Early developments towards legal recognition	537
11.3.2. The <i>Zappone & Anor</i> judgment (2006)	541
11.3.3. Towards a Civil Partnership Act	543
11.3.4. The Civil Partnership Act 2010	545
11.3.5. Parental rights for same-sex couples under Irish law	547
11.3.5.1. <i>McD v. L & Anor</i> (2009): no constitutional protection of same-sex <i>de facto</i> family life	548
11.3.5.2. Limited change brought about by the 2010 Adoption Act and the 2010 Civil Partnership Act	550
11.3.5.3. The Children and Family Relationships Bill (2014)	552
11.3.6. Towards access to marriage for same-sex couples?	554
11.4. Same-sex relationships and cross-border movement	556
11.4.1. Cross-border movement; some statistics	556
11.4.2. Access to civil partnership for foreign same-sex couples	557
11.4.3. Implementation of Directives 2004/38 and 2003/86 in Irish law ..	558
11.4.4. Recognition of foreign partnerships and marriages under Irish law	560
11.4.5. Parental issues	561
11.4.6. Recognition of Irish civil partnerships in other Member States ..	561
11.5. Conclusions	562

Chapter 12.

The Netherlands	565
------------------------------	-----

12.1. Constitutional framework	565
12.1.1. Equal treatment (Article 1)	565
12.2. (De-)criminalisation of homosexual activities	566
12.3. Legal recognition of same-sex relationships under Dutch law	567
12.3.1 The 1990 Supreme Court judgment on same-sex marriage	567
12.3.2. The first legislative initiatives towards legal recognition of same-sex relationships	570
12.3.3. The Act Introducing Registered Partnerships (1998)	571
12.3.4. Towards the opening up of marriage	573

12.3.5.	The Act opening civil marriage to same-sex couples (2001)	577
12.3.6.	Parental rights for same-sex couples	578
12.3.6.1.	Early developments; single-parent adoption	581
12.3.6.2.	2001: Joint adoption of children from the Netherlands; second-parent and successive adoption and joint parental authority	582
12.3.6.3.	2009: Interstate adoption by same-sex spouses and simplification of second-parent adoption	585
12.3.6.4.	2014: Legal parenthood by operation of the law for female couples	586
12.3.6.5.	Access to AHR treatment	589
12.4.	Same-sex relationships and cross-border movement	590
12.4.1.	Cross-border movement: some statistics	590
12.4.2.	(Development of) the relevant Dutch conflict-of-laws rules	592
12.4.3.	Access to marriage and registered partnerships for foreign same-sex couples	597
12.4.4.	Implementation of Directives 2004/38 and 2003/86 in Dutch Law	599
12.4.5.	Recognition of foreign registered partnerships and marriages under Dutch law	600
12.4.6.	Parental issues	602
12.4.7.	Recognition of Dutch partnerships and marriages in other Member States	602
12.5.	Conclusions	604
Chapter 13.		
Conclusions Case Study II		
607		
13.1.	The internal picture – What do the various jurisdictions provide in respect of legal recognition of same-sex relationships?	607
13.1.1.	Different paths, different paces, but similar direction	607
13.1.2.	Equal treatment vs. traditional notions of marriage and the family	608
13.1.3.	The comparability issue and the equalisation imperative	610
13.1.4.	Parental rights for same-sex couples: gradual shift to best interests of the child	612
13.1.5.	How was change brought about? Typification of (legislative and judicial) processes	614
13.1.6.	Resumé and outlook	616
13.2.	The cross-border picture – Legal responses to cross-border movement . . .	616
13.2.1.	Warding off	617
13.2.1.1.	Restrictions on access to marriage and civil partnership	618
13.2.1.2.	Non-recognition or downgrading of foreign civil status and parental links	619
13.2.1.3.	Observations	621

13.2.2. Accommodation.....	622
13.2.2.1. Providing access to marriage and registered partnership.....	622
13.2.2.2. Recognition of foreign civil status and parental links ...	623
13.2.2.3. Observations.....	625
13.2.3. Outsourcing, adaptation and backing out.....	626
13.2.4. Resumé and outlook.....	627
 CONCLUSIONS.....	 629
 Chapter 14.	
Conclusions.....	631
 14.1. Morally sensitive issues and cross-border movement in the EU.....	 631
14.1.1. Balancing exercises in morally sensitive issues.....	631
14.1.2. Legislative and judicial processes in morally sensitive issues ...	634
14.1.3. Morally sensitive issues before the European Courts.....	635
14.1.3.1. Very careful, at times evasive, Courts.....	635
14.1.3.2. The ‘in for a penny, in for a pound’ approach.....	637
14.1.3.3. Variations on the margin of appreciation in the ECtHR’s case law.....	639
14.1.3.4. Resumé and outlook.....	640
14.1.4. Legal responses to cross-border movement in respect of morally sensitive matters.....	640
14.2. Observations.....	642
14.2.1. Limited substantive European standard-setting, but nonetheless...	642
14.2.2. Implications for (the variety in) national moral choices.....	644
14.2.3. Reality outpaces and dictates the law, particularly in cross-border cases.....	646
14.2.4. The cross-border dimension of multilevel jurisdictions.....	647
 <i>Executive Summary.....</i>	 649
<i>Executive Summary (in Dutch).....</i>	657
<i>Bibliography.....</i>	667
<i>Table of Cases.....</i>	701
<i>Index.....</i>	715
<i>Curriculum Vitae.....</i>	723