

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 | 317 |
|---------------------------------|-----|

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 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> | <i>649</i> |
| <i>Executive Summary (in Dutch).....</i> | <i>657</i> |
| <i>Bibliography.....</i> | <i>667</i> |
| <i>Table of Cases.....</i> | <i>701</i> |
| <i>Index.....</i> | <i>715</i> |
| <i>Curriculum Vitae.....</i> | <i>723</i> |