LEGAL PROTECTION OF THE ECONOMICALLY WEAKER SPOUSE IN THE DIVISION OF JOINT MARITAL PROPERTY FOLLOWING DIVORCE IN NORTH MACEDONIA

Liridona UZEIRI

Independent researcher, LL.M. in Civil Law, North Macedonia
uzeiriliridona2@gmail.com

Abstract

The study addressed potential economic inequalities following divorce, particularly between spouses whose contributions during marriage differed in their financial and non-financial forms. This article examined the legal protection of the economically weaker spouse in the division of joint marital property following divorce in North Macedonia, focusing on the relationship between formal equality of property rights and their effective enforcement. The research applied doctrinal legal analysis of the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights, considered relevant international standards and used a structured hypothetical case to illustrate the application of domestic rules. It addressed the classification of joint and separate assets, the presumption of equal shares, the relevance of non-financial contributions and obstacles to obtaining necessary evidence. The analysis identified the equal-share presumption as an important safeguard, while indicating how incomplete information about assets, unequal access to documentation and procedural costs could impede the exercise of recognized rights. It further clarified that registration of an asset in one spouse's name does not necessarily establish exclusive ownership where the asset qualifies as joint property. On this basis, the article developed a practical analytical sequence for identifying and classifying assets, assessing relevant contributions and evaluating claims for unequal division under the statutory criteria. It concluded that transparent documentation, informed participation and reasoned judicial assessment could strengthen effective protection without altering the fundamental structure of the marital property regime.

Keywords: joint marital property; economically weaker spouse; non-financial contributions; equal-share presumption; legal protection.

1. Introduction

The dissolution of marriage involves not only the termination of the marital relationship but also the determination of property rights arising from assets acquired during the union. This process may become particularly complex when spouses have made different forms of economic contributions. While one spouse may have generated direct financial income, the other may have contributed through childcare, unpaid domestic work and household management. The absence of monetary compensation for such activities raises important questions about their recognition within the legal framework governing marital property.

The term economically weaker spouse refers to a position of relative financial disadvantage, which may involve limited independent income, reduced access to information or weaker bargaining power following divorce. It does not constitute a separate category of property ownership under Macedonian law and is not inherently gender-specific. This distinction is important because economic vulnerability does not automatically create an entitlement to a greater share of joint marital property.

In North Macedonia, the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights distinguishes between joint and separate property and establishes the presumption of equal shares in judicial division, while permitting departure from equality under specified conditions (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 66–75). The central concern is therefore not limited to the formal recognition of property rights, but extends to the conditions under which those rights can be effectively exercised.

Against this background, the research addresses the following question: To what extent does the Macedonian legal framework ensure effective protection of the economically weaker

spouse during the division of joint marital property following divorce? Particular attention is given to the classification of assets, the legal relevance of financial and non-financial contributions, and practical obstacles to enforcing property entitlements.
The study employs doctrinal legal analysis, supported by relevant international standards, scholarly literature and a structured hypothetical case. Its conclusions concern the interpretation and practical implications of the legal framework rather than empirical measurements of judicial outcomes.
Building upon existing scholarship addressing marital property division and its gender implications in North Macedonia (Metaj-Stojanova, 2024), this article adopts a more focused implementation-oriented approach. It develops a structured framework for identifying marital assets, assessing relevant evidence, applying the statutory presumption of equal shares and evaluating claims for unequal division. In doing so, the research seeks to connect substantive legal protection with practical mechanisms for the effective exercise of marital property rights.

2. The domestic legal framework

2.1. Classification of joint and separate property: The legal framework governing marital property in North Macedonia is primarily established by the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights. Article 66 distinguishes between joint and separate property, while Article 67 provides that property acquired by spouses during marriage constitutes their joint property. Conversely, Article 68 recognizes as separate property assets owned by a spouse before marriage, as well as property acquired through inheritance, legacy or gift. The same provision addresses items intended exclusively for the personal needs of one spouse, provided that their value is not disproportionately high in relation to the overall joint property (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 66–68).
This distinction is fundamental because the determination of each spouse's entitlement depends initially on the legal classification of the assets concerned. Property cannot be treated as exclusively belonging to the spouse who received employment income or whose name appears in the acquisition documents without examining the applicable statutory rules. Equally, the acquisition of an asset during marriage must be considered alongside any legally relevant basis for its classification as separate property.
For the economically weaker spouse, these provisions provide an essential starting point. They establish that the legal character of marital property is not determined solely by the spouses' respective levels of income. Nevertheless, classification and division remain separate legal questions: establishing that an asset forms part of joint property does not, by itself, resolve whether either spouse is entitled to a greater share.

2.2. Registration and its legal significance: Article 69 provides that ownership rights over immovable property constituting joint marital property are to be registered in the names of both spouses. Significantly, where only one spouse is registered as the owner of such property, the registration is deemed to have been made on behalf of both spouses. The provision further specifies that where both spouses are registered as co-owners of determined shares, those shares are regarded as having been established accordingly (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, art. 69).
The legal significance of this provision lies in the distinction between formal registration and the underlying property regime. Registration in the name of one spouse does not necessarily establish exclusive ownership when the relevant asset qualifies as joint marital property under Article 67. This protection is particularly important where one spouse had limited involvement in property transactions or administrative procedures during marriage.

Nevertheless, Article 69 does not eliminate the need to establish the factual and legal basis of acquisition. Its application requires consideration of whether the asset qualifies as joint property in the first place. The practical difficulties associated with obtaining the necessary documentation and proving relevant circumstances are examined separately in Chapter 4.

2.3. Management, agreement and court-ordered division: The Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights also regulates the management and disposition of joint marital property. Article 70 provides for joint and consensual management and restricts unilateral disposition of an undetermined share. Under Article 71, spouses may agree in writing that one of them will manage or dispose of joint property, subject to the statutory conditions. Article 72 requires the other spouse's consent, in the legally prescribed form, for acts exceeding ordinary management or disposition. Article 73 further provides for judicial measures concerning management where the spouses cannot reach an agreement under the specified circumstances (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 70–73).

Article 74 permits spouses to divide joint property by agreement during marriage or following its termination. Where an agreement cannot be reached, Article 75 provides for judicial division in non-contentious proceedings at the request of either spouse. In determining the respective shares, the court proceeds from the principle of equal division. A greater share may be awarded where the requesting spouse proves that their contribution to the joint property was manifestly and substantially greater than that of the other spouse (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 74–75).

The importance of Article 75 lies in the relationship between the presumption of equality and the evidentiary threshold required for departing from it. The provision does not establish an automatic entitlement to a larger share merely because one spouse received a higher salary. Nor does economic vulnerability alone determine the proportion to be awarded. Instead, the legal assessment must distinguish the existence of joint property from the comparative contribution required to justify an exception to equal division. The implications of unpaid domestic and caregiving contributions for this assessment are developed in Chapter 3.

Finally, the statute contains provisions governing the allocation of particular assets and the manner of division. Article 76 addresses, among other matters, objects used for a spouse's professional activity, while Article 78 allows the court, under the specified conditions, to order monetary compensation where one spouse is entitled to a substantially smaller share (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 76, 78). These provisions demonstrate that the practical implementation of division involves not only determining proportional entitlements but also deciding how those entitlements are to be satisfied.

3. Non-financial contributions and economic inequality

3.1. The economic significance of unpaid care work: Marital economic cooperation is not limited to the generation of employment income. Childcare, household management and the care of dependent family members may contribute to the functioning and economic stability of a household even when these activities are performed without remuneration. Such responsibilities can enable one spouse to pursue employment, professional training or career advancement while the other assumes a greater proportion of unpaid family work.

The economic significance of these arrangements is supported by international labour research. Addati et al. (2018) demonstrate the relationship between unpaid care responsibilities, labour-market participation and unequal economic opportunities. Their findings provide a broader socioeconomic context for understanding how differences in the allocation of family responsibilities may influence spouses' financial positions during and after marriage. They do

not, however, establish the circumstances of individual marital property disputes in North Macedonia.

The consequences of unpaid care may extend beyond the immediate household. A spouse who reduces working hours or interrupts employment to undertake family responsibilities may experience diminished professional opportunities, reduced independent savings and disadvantages in accumulating pension entitlements. These effects are not uniform and require consideration of the particular circumstances. Nevertheless, they demonstrate that the absence of direct income does not necessarily indicate an absence of economic contribution to the marital partnership.

3.2. The equal-share presumption and the assessment of contributions: The legal relevance of non-financial contributions must be considered within the statutory framework governing marital property division. Under Article 75 of the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights, the court begins with the principle that joint marital property is divided into equal shares. A departure from this presumption is possible upon the request of a spouse who demonstrates a manifestly and substantially greater contribution to the joint property (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, art. 75).

The significance of this provision is twofold. First, the equal-share presumption protects against the assumption that the spouse earning a higher income is automatically entitled to a correspondingly greater proportion of joint property. Second, the statutory exception requires an assessment of comparative contributions where a claim for unequal division has been properly raised and supported by evidence.

Article 75 does not expressly establish a monetary formula for evaluating childcare or domestic labour. Accordingly, the proposition that non-financial contributions should receive meaningful consideration is best understood as an interpretive approach to the statutory concept of contribution, rather than as a separate valuation mechanism expressly prescribed by the provision.

An assessment focused exclusively on salaries or direct financial transfers could overlook the economic relationship between paid employment and unpaid household responsibilities. At the same time, recognizing the significance of care work should not result in an automatic entitlement to a larger share for the spouse who performed it. The applicable legal question remains whether the statutory conditions for departing from equality have been established in the particular circumstances.

3.3. The limits of valuation and international interpretive guidance: A further difficulty concerns the distinction between demonstrating the economic importance of unpaid care and assigning it a specific value for the purposes of property division. Domestic activities differ in their duration, intensity and relationship to the acquisition or preservation of assets. Converting every hour of household work into a market wage could therefore create an appearance of mathematical precision without necessarily reflecting the statutory criteria governing division.

A more defensible analytical approach is to consider the nature, duration and circumstances of contributions without assuming that all forms of participation are directly interchangeable. This also requires distinguishing the origin of property from the spouses' contributions to the marital household. An asset acquired through inheritance or gift may fall within the separate-property rules of Article 68, irrespective of the broader history of cooperation between the spouses (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 68, 75).

Relevant international guidance reinforces the importance of this distinction. In General Recommendation No. 29, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women emphasizes the economic consequences of marital roles and calls for recognition of indirect and non-financial contributions when property accumulated during marriage is divided

(CEDAW Committee, 2013, paras. 45–47). The recommendation also addresses economic opportunities lost through the distribution of family responsibilities.
The resulting legal challenge is to recognize the economic significance of unpaid contributions without disregarding the statutory distinction between joint and separate property or weakening the evidentiary requirements for unequal division. This balance is essential to protecting the economically weaker spouse while respecting the rights of both parties.

4. Obstacles to the effective protection of rights

4.1. Asset discovery and evidentiary asymmetry: The effective exercise of marital property rights depends partly on the ability to establish which assets exist and the circumstances in which they were acquired. Difficulties may arise when one spouse has primarily managed financial transactions, property purchases or related documentation. In such circumstances, unequal access to information can complicate the economically weaker spouse's ability to substantiate a legally recognized entitlement.
Different legal questions require different forms of proof. Documents concerning acquisition dates, sources of financing and ownership may assist in determining whether property falls within the joint or separate regime established by Articles 67 and 68. Evidence concerning the spouses' respective contributions becomes relevant to a distinct question where a departure from equal division is requested under Article 75 (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 67–68, 75).
The difficulty is therefore not merely the absence of particular documents, but the possibility that unequal control over relevant information affects the parties' ability to present their respective positions. This concern is especially important where financial transactions are readily documented while unpaid household contributions are established through less conventional forms of evidence. It does not, however, establish that either category of evidence should automatically prevail.

4.2. Procedural costs and unequal bargaining positions: Economic disparities between spouses may also affect their decisions concerning settlement and litigation. A spouse with limited independent resources may experience greater pressure to reach an early agreement, particularly when continued proceedings involve legal expenses, uncertainty or a prolonged period without access to disputed assets.
Article 74 of the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights permits spouses to divide joint property by agreement during marriage or after its termination (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, art. 74). However, the legal availability of settlement does not necessarily imply that both parties possess equivalent financial information or negotiating capacity. An agreement reached under unequal economic circumstances should not automatically be presumed invalid, but those circumstances may be relevant when examining the practical conditions of informed participation.
These observations identify potential barriers rather than empirically established patterns in North Macedonian judicial practice. Their significance lies in demonstrating how financial vulnerability may influence the exercise of existing property rights without independently determining the substantive shares to which spouses are entitled.

4.3. The importance of reasoned judicial assessment: Judicial assessment becomes particularly significant where the spouses disagree about the legal classification of an asset or where one requests a greater share of joint property. Under Article 75, departure from equal division requires proof of a manifestly and substantially greater contribution by the requesting spouse (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, art. 75).

In evaluating such a request, an analytically transparent decision should distinguish the facts established by the evidence, the contributions attributed to each spouse and the reasons supporting the application or rejection of the statutory exception. Particular care is warranted where direct financial contributions are documented more extensively than unpaid domestic or caregiving activities.

A reasoned assessment should neither equate higher earnings automatically with greater overall contribution nor disregard financial evidence solely because one spouse performed substantial unpaid household work. The decisive question remains whether the circumstances proven in the particular case satisfy the applicable statutory test.

The emphasis on transparent reasoning is advanced here as a recommendation for consistent legal analysis, rather than as a conclusion derived from an empirical review of judicial decisions.

5. Application: a structured hypothetical case

To illustrate the practical application of the domestic legal framework, consider a hypothetical dispute involving spouses A and B, who were married for eighteen years. During the marriage, A was continuously employed, while B undertook most childcare and household responsibilities and worked intermittently. The spouses acquired a residential apartment, a vehicle and household equipment. Although the apartment was registered exclusively in A's name, both spouses used it as their family residence.

Following separation, A requests 70% of the apartment, arguing that the purchase price and mortgage repayments were primarily financed through A's employment income. B disputes this claim and seeks equal division, emphasizing the contribution made through unpaid care work and the management of family responsibilities. This hypothetical case is constructed solely for doctrinal analysis and does not represent an actual judicial decision.

The dispute initially requires identification and classification of the assets. The apartment's acquisition during marriage raises the application of Article 67, while its registration solely in A's name must be assessed in light of Article 69. The next question is whether A has established the conditions for departing from the equal-share presumption under Article 75. The fact that A earned the greater proportion of household income is relevant to the factual assessment but does not, without further examination, establish an entitlement to the requested 70% share. The distinction between these questions is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Application of the statutory framework to the hypothetical dispute

Stage	Legal question	Application to A and B
1. Identification	Which assets are subject to examination?	Apartment, vehicle, household equipment and associated financial obligations
2. Classification	Which assets qualify as joint property?	Acquisition dates and any claimed separate-property sources examined under Articles 67–68
3. Registration	Does the apartment's registration exclude B's interest?	Article 69 is considered in determining the significance of A's sole registration
4. Determination of shares	Has A justified departure from equality?	The 70% claim is assessed against Article 75 and the evidence of both spouses' contributions

5. Implementation	How should established entitlements be satisfied?	The allocation of identified assets is considered under the applicable rules, including Articles 76–78 where relevant

Source: Author's hypothetical case and analytical synthesis based on the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights (Republic of North Macedonia, 2001, arts. 67–78)

5.1. Testing alternative outcomes within the hypothetical case: The hypothetical case permits several alternative legal outcomes depending on the facts established and the statutory criteria applied.

First, if the apartment qualifies as joint property and A fails to prove a manifestly and substantially greater contribution, the equal-share presumption under Article 75 remains the starting point for division. A's higher employment income would not, by itself, justify the requested 70% share. B's unpaid household responsibilities would provide relevant context for understanding the spouses' respective contributions, without requiring their automatic conversion into a monetary percentage.

Second, if evidence establishes that a disputed asset was acquired through a legally recognized separate-property source, its classification would require reconsideration under Article 68. For example, the discovery that a particular asset had been received by one spouse through inheritance would raise a different question from the comparative contribution of the spouses to joint property. The determination would depend on the nature of the asset, the applicable legal rules and the evidence presented. This alternative demonstrates why classification must precede the calculation of shares.

Third, if A establishes a manifestly and substantially greater contribution to the joint property, Article 75 permits the court to consider an unequal division. Nevertheless, the requested 70% would not follow automatically: the determination must be supported by the established facts and the statutory requirement. The assessment should consider the competing contributions without equating financial income with the entirety of the marital economic relationship.

These alternative outcomes demonstrate that effective legal protection requires an evidence-based application of the statutory framework rather than an automatic preference for either spouse.

6. Discussion: national law and international guidance

The protection of marital property rights in North Macedonia must be examined within both the domestic legal framework and the broader principles of equality and property protection. Articles 9, 30 and 40 of the Constitution establish the constitutional foundations for equality before the law, ownership rights and the protection of the family (Republic of North Macedonia, 1991). However, these constitutional guarantees do not independently determine the distribution of assets following divorce. Their relevance lies in providing a broader legal context for interpreting and applying the statutory marital property regime.

An important question emerging from the analysis is whether formal equality sufficiently addresses the economic consequences of unequal responsibilities during marriage. The domestic equal-share presumption offers a significant substantive safeguard, but its practical value depends on the ability of both spouses to establish their legal entitlements. This distinction between formal rights and effective protection is consistent with CEDAW General Recommendation No. 29. In particular, paragraphs 45–47 emphasize equality in the economic consequences of marital dissolution and the recognition of indirect, including non-financial, contributions to property acquired during marriage (CEDAW Committee, 2013). These

principles provide an interpretive benchmark, although they do not displace the conditions for unequal division prescribed by Macedonian property law.
The relevance of international guidance is further reflected in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Target 5.4 calls for recognition and valuation of unpaid care and domestic work, while Target 5.a addresses equal rights to economic resources and ownership of property (United Nations, 2015). Similarly, international research highlights the relationship between family responsibilities, employment opportunities and economic security (Addati et al., 2018; UN Women, 2019). Nevertheless, these instruments and findings must be distinguished from enforceable rules governing individual property disputes. Their principal contribution to the present analysis is to clarify why legally neutral arrangements should also be examined in light of their practical consequences.
Building on existing scholarship concerning marital property division in North Macedonia (Metaj-Stojanova, 2024), this study contributes a structured approach to the practical application of existing property rights, without drawing unverified empirical conclusions about judicial outcomes.
The analysis therefore supports an approach that connects substantive property rights with the practical conditions necessary for their enforcement. International guidance reinforces this objective without replacing the statutory rules governing marital property division in North Macedonia.

7. Proposals for practice and further research

7.1. A four-step documentation protocol: To translate the preceding legal analysis into a practical approach, this article proposes a four-step documentation protocol for organizing information in marital property disputes. The protocol is an analytical recommendation rather than a mandatory procedure established by Macedonian legislation.
First, preparation of an asset inventory. Before negotiating division, the parties and their legal advisers should identify potentially relevant immovable and movable property, acquisition dates, ownership documentation, associated liabilities and any claims concerning separate-property sources. The inventory would serve as an organizational tool without predetermining the legal classification of individual assets.
Second, separation of documentary categories. Evidence concerning the acquisition and legal status of property should be distinguished from evidence concerning the spouses' contributions. This separation would help prevent documents demonstrating payment or registration from being treated as conclusive evidence of either exclusive ownership or entitlement to a larger share.
Third, application of a statutory checklist. The identified assets should be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights, particularly Articles 67–69 and 74–75. The checklist should distinguish questions of classification, registration, consensual division and judicial determination of shares. Its purpose would be to support systematic legal analysis, not to replace professional judgment or judicial assessment.
Fourth, preparation of a reasoned assessment. Where the spouses dispute the classification or division of property, the principal factual and legal issues should be identified explicitly. Particular attention should be given to explaining the evidentiary basis of any request for departure from the equal-share presumption. This proposed approach seeks to improve transparency without introducing additional statutory requirements.

7.2. Directions for future empirical research: The doctrinal findings identify issues requiring empirical investigation rather than establishing the frequency of particular outcomes in North Macedonia. Future research could examine how marital assets are documented; how financial

and non-financial contributions are presented and how claims for unequal division are evaluated.
Qualitative interviews with legal practitioners and the analysis of anonymized judicial decisions, subject to appropriate legal and confidentiality safeguards, could help identify recurring evidentiary and procedural challenges. The proposed documentation protocol could also be evaluated through practitioner feedback or case simulations.
Such research would provide a stronger evidentiary basis for determining whether practical guidance or further legal reforms are necessary.

7.3. Strengthening access to existing legal protection mechanisms: Improving awareness of existing legal assistance mechanisms represents an important practical recommendation. North Macedonia's Law on Free Legal Aid distinguishes between primary legal aid, including general legal information and initial advice, and secondary legal aid, which may provide professional representation in civil proceedings subject to statutory eligibility requirements (Republic of North Macedonia, 2019).
These mechanisms may be particularly relevant to economically weaker spouses who cannot independently finance legal advice or representation. Nevertheless, eligibility for secondary legal aid is not automatic and must be determined according to the applicable legal conditions. Providing accessible information about available services, application procedures and eligibility requirements could support more informed participation in marital property disputes. Future research should assess whether these mechanisms sufficiently address the practical barriers encountered by economically disadvantaged spouses.

8. Conclusions

This study concludes that the legal protection of the economically weaker spouse in North Macedonia depends not only on the recognition of joint marital property rights but also on the conditions necessary for their effective exercise. The statutory framework provides significant safeguards through the classification of joint property, the protection associated with unilateral registration and the presumption of equal shares. However, these protections may encounter practical limitations where financial dependence, informational inequality or evidentiary difficulties affect a spouse's ability to establish and defend their entitlements.
The analysis further demonstrates that economic vulnerability and legal entitlement must remain distinct considerations. Unpaid domestic and caregiving contributions are economically significant, but neither financial disadvantage nor higher employment income automatically determines a spouse's proportional share. Any departure from the statutory presumption must be assessed according to the applicable legal requirements and the evidence presented. The hypothetical case illustrates the importance of maintaining this distinction when examining competing property claims.
The principal contribution of this article is a structured documentation protocol intended to support more systematic identification of assets, organization of evidence and application of the relevant statutory criteria. Rather than advocating preferential property distribution or assuming deficiencies in existing judicial practice, the study emphasizes the effective implementation of recognized rights. Future empirical research examining verified judicial decisions and professional practice is necessary to assess the practical usefulness of the proposed approach and identify areas requiring further improvement.

References

[1] Addati, L., Cattaneo, U., Esquivel, V., & Valarino, I. (2018). *Care work and care jobs for the future of decent work*. International Labour Office. https://www.ilo.org/publications/major-publications/care-work-and-care-jobs-future-decent-work

[2] Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. (2013). *General recommendation No. 29 on article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: Economic consequences of marriage, family relations and their dissolution* (CEDAW/C/GC/29). United Nations. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/764504

[3] Metaj-Stojanova, A. (2024). The division of marital joint property: Legal framework and gender implications in North Macedonia. *SEEU Review, 19*(2), 122–140. https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2024-0029

[4] Republic of North Macedonia. (1991). *Constitution of the Republic of North Macedonia* (as amended through 2019). https://www.sobranie.mk/the-constitution-of-the-republic-ofmacedonia-ns_article-constitution-of-the-republic-of-north-macedonia

[5] Republic of North Macedonia. (2001). *Law on Ownership and Other Real Rights* [Закон за сопственост и други стварни права] (Official Gazette No. 18/2001; consolidated text, 2018). https://mioa.gov.mk/sites/default/files/pbl_files/documents/legislation/zakon_za_sopstvenost_i_drugi_stvarni_prava_konsolidiran_032018.pdf

[6] Republic of North Macedonia. (2019). *Law on Free Legal Aid* [Закон за бесплатна правна помош] (Official Gazette No. 101/2019, as amended by No. 194/2024). https://ldbis.pravda.gov.mk/PregledNaZakon.aspx?id=49111

[7] UN Women. (2019). *Progress of the world's women 2019–2020: Families in a changing world*. United Nations. https://doi.org/10.18356/696a9392-en

[8] United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (General Assembly Resolution A/RES/70/1). https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda