

CODIFICATION OF INSPECTION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CROATIA, SLOVENIA AND SERBIA

PAULA ŠAMANIĆ MATIJEVIĆ

University of Rijeka, Faculty of Law, Rijeka, Croatia, psamanic@uniri.hr

Accepted

5. 2. 2026

Revised

11. 3. 2026

Published

19. 6. 2026

KLARA BABIĆ

University of Rijeka, Faculty of Law, Rijeka, Croatia, kbabic@uniri.hr

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

psamanic@uniri.hr

Abstract Inspection is a key function of public administration in every legal system, as its implementation ensures that natural and legal persons act in accordance with the law. For inspection to fulfil its purpose, it is essential to ensure quality legal regulation. This paper analyses the contribution of codifying inspection rules to the more effective implementation of this procedure. Particular attention is given to the normative framework governing inspection in Croatia, which is currently regulated by numerous laws. Using a comparative legal method, the paper examines the legal frameworks in Slovenia and Serbia as examples of neighbouring countries where the rules on inspection have been codified. Based on the analysis conducted, the advantages of codifying inspection rules are assessed, and consideration is given to how the introduction of such codification could improve the quality of the legal regulation of inspection in the Republic of Croatia.

Keywords

inspection, codification,
quality of legal
regulation, legal certainty,
Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia

1 Introduction

The normative regulation of conduct through legal rules is one of the fundamental pillars of every social order. For lawmakers, its significance lies in the possibility of achieving established social and political objectives, as well as in guiding citizens' behaviour in accordance with prescribed rules. From the perspective of those subject to legal norms, regulation has a pronounced orientational and protective function. Specifically, through the clear stipulation of rights, obligations, and limitations, individuals gain knowledge of the boundaries of permissible conduct, the rights available to them, and the obligations they must fulfil (Kuvačić, 2004: 58). At the same time, legal regulation establishes sanctions for non-compliance with prescribed rules (Borković, 1996: 3). This approach is characterised by the systematic and clear prescription of rules of conduct. It enhances predictability and legal certainty, contributing to social stability, the orderly regulation of social relations, and consistency in the actions of both the state and its citizens (Pound, 1913: 759; Koprić, 2021: 21-22). Therefore, the functioning of every society today should be based on the existence of normatively clear and applicable laws, as a stable social order cannot be founded on arbitrary decision-making or the willfulness of individuals (Đerđa, 2019: 115).

The purpose of the law is fulfilled not only by its entry into force, but also by successful implementation and an effective system of oversight to ensure compliance with its provisions (Kovač, 2016c: 24; Vrban, 2006: 225; World Bank, 2022: 6). Effective and continuous oversight ensures that legal norms are applied equally to all addressees, thereby preventing selective application of the law. Consequently, supervision of the implementation of regulations is a necessary instrument for preserving the principles of legality and equality before the law (Koprić et al., 2021: 123; Lopižić, 2023: 39). Inspection is one form of supervision over the implementation and application of regulations in practice, and it often represents the primary point of interaction between regulatory authorities and regulated entities, meaning that the way inspection powers are exercised significantly shapes how regulation is experienced and understood in everyday business activity (Florentin, 2012: 7-8). Today, almost every modern state has established some form of such oversight. However, its effectiveness often varies between states. Despite these differences, the existence of inspection indicates its recognised importance in

ensuring legality and the proper application of regulations.¹ The importance of the normative regulation of the inspection procedure arises from the fact that the state normatively regulates all relationships relevant to its functioning, as well as to the conduct of its citizens (Krbek, 1952: 15). Without systematically organised oversight and effective control, achieving consistent application of laws and regulations is challenging, as normative regulation alone, without appropriate implementation and oversight mechanisms, cannot fully guarantee the desired level of legality in practice. Inspection, therefore, serves not only as an instrument of control but also as a key mechanism for maintaining citizens' trust in the legal order and state institutions, ensuring that the principles of the rule of law are realised not merely formally, but also in the actual practice of administrative action (Cordova-Novion, Sahovic, 2010: 7).

Inspection is the subject of numerous works in professional and scholarly literature worldwide. Globally, this topic is addressed primarily from a legal perspective, while also presenting many studies and relevant reports based on empirical research (including trend analyses, statistical data, and similar materials).² However, in Croatia, scholarly and professional literature on inspection is predominantly oriented towards a normative-legal approach, with an emphasis on the analysis of existing regulations, inspectors' powers, and inspection measures, most often focusing on individual administrative fields such as construction, maritime affairs, or healthcare (see e.g., Held, Lopžić, 2024; Šolman, 2016; Ljubičić, 2009). Consequently, Croatian literature still lacks a comprehensive and systematic account of inspection, as well as a comparative legal analysis.

This paper contributes by systematically examining the advantages of codifying the inspection procedure in Croatia, based on a comparative analysis of legal solutions in the neighbouring countries of Slovenia and Serbia, which have a unified legal framework governing inspection.³ The purpose of the paper is to assess whether, and to what extent, the codification of inspection rules could contribute to greater

¹ The effectiveness of inspection varies between states, as inspection is part of a broader legal and institutional framework. Its quality may depend, among other factors, on the powers granted to inspectors by law, the resources available to them, and the measures they are authorised to impose (World Bank, 2006: 1; Lipovčić, 2019: 112).

² The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is one of the key international organisations that systematically addresses issues of inspection through legal analyses and empirical research (see, e.g., OECD, 2014; OECD, 2018).

³ See Inspection Act (Zakon o inšpekcijskom nadzoru (ZIN)), Uradni list RS, št. 43/07 – uradno prečišćeno besedilo in 40/14. (Slovenian IA) and Inspection Act (Zakon o inšpekcijskom nadzoru), Sl. glasnik RS 36/15, 44/18 - dr. zakon i 95/18 (Serbian IA).

effectiveness and uniformity, and how it could address existing shortcomings in the Croatian system. In this context, the paper considers the impact of codification on the clarity and accessibility of procedural rules, the consistency of inspectors' conduct, and the level of legal certainty afforded to the addressees of inspection. To achieve the stated purpose, the paper methodologically relies on the positive-law method, analysing the existing Croatian legal framework and examining its characteristics and key shortcomings. By applying the comparative method, the models of inspection procedures in Slovenia and Serbia, which have adopted a codification approach, are compared to identify good practices that could be applicable in Croatia. Through the dogmatic method, conclusions are drawn from individual normative elements regarding the potential effects of codifying inspection procedures on the Croatian system. The author's objective is to enable a reasoned evaluation of the current state and to develop well-founded recommendations for improving inspection procedures in Croatia.

In the first part of the paper, the existing legal framework for inspection in the Republic of Croatia is analysed, with particular emphasis on the numerous regulations governing this oversight, and certain deficiencies in these regulations are identified. The subsequent part of the paper examines the general advantages of codification with the aim of achieving quality legal regulation, with particular focus on administrative law and inspection as one of its important fields. This is followed by an overview of the legal framework for inspection in Slovenia and Serbia – countries that have codified the rules of inspection, with their normative solutions serving as the basis for comparative analysis. The next chapter sets out the reasons for introducing the codification of inspection in Croatia, given the existing fragmentation of the normative framework and the identified regulatory shortcomings. Finally, the paper presents the main findings and considerations *de lege ferenda*.

2 Analysis of the normative framework of inspection in the Republic of Croatia

In the Republic of Croatia, there is no general legal act that regulates the inspection procedure in a uniform and systematic manner. Instead, this area is governed by a series of laws regulating individual administrative sectors, as well as by laws governing the organisation and operation of inspection bodies. This complexity and

fragmentation of the legal framework give rise to certain shortcomings, which will be analysed in this part of the paper.

2.1 Overview of the normative framework

In Croatia, the legal framework governing the conduct of inspection has undergone frequent changes over time, indicating that the legislator has not adopted a clear and consistent approach to the model for regulating inspection procedures. Since the independence of the Republic of Croatia in 1991, the legislative regulation of inspection has been subject to several organisational and normative changes, reflecting a gradual search for an optimal model of its structure and implementation. Under the Act on the System of State Administration of 1993,⁴ as well as the subsequent Act on the System of State Administration of 2011,⁵ inspection was carried out within a two-tier system, whereby county offices, and later state administration offices in the counties, were competent at first instance, while central state administration bodies decided at second instance (Džinić, Lopižić, 2022: 181-184).

Parallel to the aforementioned model, from 1999 onwards, the State Inspectorate of the Republic of Croatia (hereinafter: the State Inspectorate) was established as a specialised state administrative body responsible for inspection activities. This model remained in force until 2014, when the State Inspectorate was abolished, and inspection services were reintegrated into the line ministries. In 2018, the State Inspectorate was re-established through amendments to the Act on the Organisation and Scope of Ministries and Other Central State Administration Bodies.⁶ With the adoption of the State Inspectorate Act,⁷ an extensive normative rationalisation of the inspection system was carried out. As a result, certain laws that had previously regulated specific aspects of inspection ceased to be in force, while many other laws were amended in the parts relating to its implementation, reflecting the legislator's intention to consolidate and simplify the previously fragmented normative

⁴ Act on System of State Administration (Zakon o sustavu državne uprave), Narodne novine 75/93 (no longer in force).

⁵ Act on System of State Administration (Zakon o sustavu državne uprave), Narodne novine 150/11 (no longer in force).

⁶ Art 1 Act on Amendments to the Act on the Organisation and Scope of Ministries and Other Central State Administration Bodies (Zakon o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o ustrojstvu i djelokrugu ministarstava i drugih središnjih tijela državne), Narodne novine 116/18.

⁷ State Inspectorate Act (Zakon o Državnom inspektoratu), Narodne novine 115/18, 117/21, 67/23, 155/23 (SIA).

framework. Furthermore, in 2019, the state administration offices in the counties were abolished, resulting in the concentration of inspection services that had previously been organised within those offices under the competent line ministries (Džinić, Lopižić, 2022: 181–184; Stipić, 2017: 30).

Today, the Act on the System of State Administration provides the statutory basis and foundation for regulating and implementing inspection, designating it as a fundamental function of state administration.⁸ As prescribed by this Act, inspection includes supervisory procedures through which direct insight is obtained into general and individual acts, as well as the conditions and manner of operation of supervised legal and natural persons, for the purpose of establishing relevant facts and taking prescribed measures and actions to bring the established situation and activities into compliance with the law and other regulations.⁹ ASSA, in addition to defining the scope of inspection, prescribes the persons authorised to carry it out, the manner of their identification, their powers, and the obligation to comply with provisions governing the protection of personal data, as well as with special regulations concerning data confidentiality. It further regulates the measures an inspector must impose when illegality or irregularities are identified in the activities of the supervised party, the inspector's liability in the event of failing to impose such measures or exceeding statutory powers, the manner of drafting and serving inspection records, and the provision of assistance to inspectors in cases of physical resistance by the supervised party¹⁰ (Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 138).

The SIA regulates the competence, scope of authority, and organisational structure of the State Inspectorate and all inspection units established within it, as well as the management of inspections and the conditions for performing inspection activities. It also governs the duties and powers of inspectors to protect the public interest and public health in implementing regulations, the manner of collecting samples and data, the initiation of inspection proceedings, the imposition of administrative and misdemeanour measures in cases of identified illegality or irregularities and the supervision of their enforcement, the filing of criminal complaints, the conditions for the temporary seizure of objects and the handling of seized objects, the confiscation of pecuniary gain, and the keeping of records of conducted inspections, as well as special provisions on inspections carried out by individual inspection units

⁸ Art 3 (1) Act on the System of State Administration (*Zakon o sustavu državne uprave*), Narodne novine 66/19, 155/23 (ASSA).

⁹ Art 21 (1) ASSA.

¹⁰ See Arts 21-27, 33 ASSA.

within the State Inspectorate (Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 138). Although this Act regulates in considerable detail the powers and organisational structure of the State Inspectorate, it does not contain general procedural rules governing the conduct of inspections. In particular, it is evident that the legislator has not regulated the procedural rights of those subject to inspection, which would be necessary to ensure predictability and legal certainty in the implementation of such supervision.

Furthermore, on the basis of ASSA, the State Inspectorate adopted the Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the State Inspectorate.¹¹ This Regulation governs the internal organisational structure of the State Inspectorate, the titles and scope of competence of its internal organisational units, the manner of managing those units, the organisation and planning of work, working hours, the holding of official office hours, as well as the indicative number of civil servants and employees required for the functioning of the Inspectorate.¹² Thus, the Regulation governs only the organisation and scope of competence of the State Inspectorate, within which inspection bodies competent to conduct inspections are established, but does not regulate the course of the inspection procedure itself.

Although the SIA is the main legislative framework governing inspection activities in the Republic of Croatia, it is important to emphasise that it does not comprehensively regulate the inspection procedure. Its application is limited exclusively to inspections operating within the State Inspectorate, while inspections established within line ministries fall outside its normative scope. Furthermore, the Act does not regulate procedural issues of inspection at a general level, but primarily focuses on the organisation and competences of inspections within the State Inspectorate. Consequently, the procedure for conducting inspections in Croatia is regulated by special legislation governing individual administrative sectors. Numerous issues relating to inspection are therefore regulated by a wide range of sector-specific regulations, which address the particularities of inspection in different administrative fields. For example, the Act on Forests prescribes the powers of forestry inspectors and the tasks of forestry inspection, the conditions for performing inspection activities, the manner of proving official status, the conduct

¹¹ Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the State Inspectorate (Uredba o unutarnjem ustrojstvu Državnog inspektorata), Narodne novine 11/25. Pursuant to Article 54 (1) ASSA, the internal organisational structure, the titles and scope of competence of internal organisational units, the manner of management and the indicative number of civil servants and employees within individual organisational units, the manner of work planning, working and office hours, office days, and other matters of particular importance for the operation of state administration bodies are regulated by a government regulation.

¹² Art 1 Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the State Inspectorate.

of inspection, the powers of forestry inspectors in regional offices and at the central office of the State Inspectorate, the measures to be taken by inspectors following the identification of illegality or irregularities, as well as the inspectors' competences.¹³ The Construction Inspection Act regulates the organisation of construction inspection, the conduct of inspections in the field of construction, the powers and duties of construction inspectors, the obligations of parties and public authorities, the inspection procedure, inspection measures, the enforcement of decisions ordering the removal of buildings through third parties, and the costs of enforcement.¹⁴ The Hospitality Industry Act sets out the powers of tourism inspectors, the removal of identified deficiencies and irregularities, and the actions to be taken by inspectors in relation to committed misdemeanours.¹⁵ Finally, it is important to note that, regarding certain procedural issues not regulated by special legislation, the General Administrative Procedure Act applies *mutatis mutandis*.¹⁶ Application of the GAPA is necessary for determining and protecting the procedural rights of parties, as such rights are clearly, comprehensively, and systematically regulated in administrative procedure, whereas in the regulations governing inspection, they are most often only partially regulated or not elaborated at all (see Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 141, 146).

The analysis of the legislative framework governing inspection in the Republic of Croatia shows that the regulation of this field is marked by frequent changes and ongoing reassessment of suitable solutions, indicating a lack of a clear and consistent legislative approach. Furthermore, the current fragmentation of the legal framework does not enhance the quality of inspection regulation, even though such coherence is a necessary condition for effective implementation.

2.2 Certain shortcomings of the normative framework

The following section analyses identified shortcomings in the normative regulation of inspection in the Republic of Croatia. Particular attention is given to the Croatian regulatory framework governing inspection lies in the frequent inconsistency of the

¹³ See Arts 72-80 Act on Forests (Zakon o šumama), Narodne novine 68/18, 115/18, 98/19, 32/20, 145/20, 101/23, 145/23, 36/24 i 145/24.

¹⁴ See Arts 1-41 Construction Inspection Act (Zakon o građevinskoj inspekciji), Narodne novine 153/13, 115/18.

¹⁵ See Arts 42-44, 46-52, 63 Hospitality Industry Act (Zakon o ugostiteljskoj djelatnosti), Narodne novine 85/15, 121/16, 99/18, 25/19, 98/19, 32/20, 42/20, 126/21, 152/24.

¹⁶ General Administrative Procedure Act (Zakon o općem upravnom postupku), Narodne novine 47/09, 110/21 (GAPA).

provisions governing inspection and to the fact that inspectors' powers are often insufficiently clearly defined (Staničić, 2019: 71). Such a normative framework hinders the consistent application of the law, leads to divergent interpretations of the scope of inspection powers, and may result in inconsistent practice in similar or identical factual situations. For example, the previous Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports¹⁷ provided that local self-government units, specifically communal wardens, were responsible for the protection and maintenance of the maritime domain in general use, without a clear delineation of competences between communal wardens and maritime domain inspectors. This led in practice to overlaps and even conflicts of jurisdiction (Babić, 2023: 20).¹⁸ With the adoption of the new Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports in 2023, certain tasks relating to the management of the maritime domain, and corresponding responsibilities for its protection and accountability, continue to be entrusted to units of regional and local self-government.¹⁹ A new institution of maritime wardens has been introduced – officials of the administrative bodies of local self-government units tasked with supervisory duties – reflecting the legislator's intention to explicitly define competence for supervising the lawful and proper use of the maritime domain in general use, an issue that had not been clearly regulated under the previous Act.²⁰ At the same time, since the Republic of Croatia, in exercising authority over the maritime domain, manages, protects, and disposes of it, the new Act confers the power to supervise the general use of the maritime domain, as well as the power to supervise order on the maritime domain, on maritime domain inspectors, who are employees of state administration bodies.²¹ This situation effectively gives rise to an overlap of competences, both between the Republic of Croatia and units of local self-government, and between the powers of maritime wardens and maritime

¹⁷ Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports (*Zakon o pomorskom dobru i morskim lukama*), Narodne novine 158/03, 100/04, 141/06, 38/09, 123/11, 56/16, 98/19, 83/23 (no longer in force).

¹⁸ See, for example, the judgment of the High Administrative Court of the Republic of Croatia, Us-10215/2009-8 of 28 March 2012. Under the former Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports, it was not clearly specified which officials were competent to supervise the lawful and proper use of maritime domain in general use. Rather, the Act merely stated that units of local self-government were responsible for the regular management of maritime domain. As no other specifically systematised positions responsible for the protection of maritime domain existed within local self-government units, it was reasonable to conclude that this role was performed by communal wardens, even though the Act did not prescribe any specific powers for them in this area. By contrast, the powers of maritime domain inspectors were regulated in considerable detail.

¹⁹ Art 9 Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports (*Zakon o pomorskom dobru i morskim lukama*), Narodne novine 83/23 (AMDS).

²⁰ See Art 151 AMDS.

²¹ See Art 183 AMDS.

domain inspectors. In addition, the Act entrusts inspection duties to the Port Captaincies.²² However, an overlap of competences is also evident in relation to the Act on Port Captaincies, which provides that port captaincy inspectors are authorised to supervise and protect the maritime domain in its entirety²³ (see Vlahović, 2025: 534-535). The above example illustrates the persistent problem of inconsistent normative regulation and insufficient clarity in defining inspectors' powers in the field of inspection.

Furthermore, although it is understandable that individual administrative sectors are regulated by sector-specific legislation, a significant shortcoming is the lack of unified procedural rules governing inspections, particularly regarding the rights of parties, which should be consistent regardless of the sector in which supervision is conducted. In this context, particular concern arises over the right of the party to be informed of the initiation of an inspection, a matter not clearly regulated within the existing normative framework. In most laws governing inspection, such as the Construction Inspection Act and the Hospitality Industry Act, the legislator has not specified whether there is an obligation to notify the addressee of supervision that inspection proceedings have commenced. Certain laws, such as the SIA, leave the decision on whether to inform the party of the initiation of inspection entirely to the inspector's discretion, which further contributes to inconsistent practice.²⁴ However, some laws, such as the Cableways Act and the Sports Inspection Act, expressly provide that an inspector must not notify the supervised party of the commencement of inspection if the inspector considers that such notification would reduce the effectiveness of its implementation.²⁵ Accordingly, the examined normative solutions show that the party's right to be informed of the initiation of inspection is not regulated systematically, but rather depends on the specific administrative sector.

Within the current Croatian normative framework governing inspection, there is no clear normative determination of its legal nature. Specifically, no regulation expressly defines whether inspection constitutes an administrative procedure or another special form of action by public authorities. Neither academic nor professional literature offers a uniform position on this issue (see, e.g., Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 139–

²² Art 181 (1) AMDS.

²³ See Art 41 Act on Port Captaincies (*Zakon o lučkim kapetanijama*), Narodne novine 118/18, 155/23.

²⁴ See Art 59 SIA.

²⁵ See Art 27 (2) Cableways Act (*Zakon o žičarama*), Narodne novine 96/18 and Art 18 Sports Inspection Act (*Zakon o sportskoj inspekciji*), Narodne novine 72/25.

146; Staničić, 2019: 68; Stipić, 2009: 150–151; Rems, 2008: 27–28). Such legal uncertainty may place the addressees of inspection at a disadvantage, as the scope and content of the procedural rights of parties differ depending on whether the rules of administrative or non-administrative procedure apply. The determination and normative definition of the legal nature of inspection is therefore particularly important because of the differing extent of parties' rights in administrative and non-administrative procedures. From a theoretical perspective, if inspection were classified as an administrative procedure, the rules of the GAPA would apply, guaranteeing parties all procedural rights provided for under that Act. In such a case, administrative procedure is always and exclusively concluded by the adoption of a decision, against which the party is entitled to lodge an appeal or initiate administrative judicial review. By contrast, under the current legislative framework of the Republic of Croatia, inspection is, as a rule, concluded by means of an inspection record, as prescribed by most sector-specific laws. Since an inspection record does not constitute an administrative act by which rights, obligations, or legal interests of the addressees of supervision are directly determined, no legal remedies may be pursued against it. At the same time, within the Croatian legal system, an inspection record cannot impose obligations on the supervised party or order the application of any measures (see Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 157–158). Although the legal nature of inspection is not clearly determined in legislation or legal scholarship, the protection of the procedural rights of parties in inspection proceedings is, to a significant extent, left to the application of the GAPA, since such rights are only partially regulated or not elaborated at all in the regulations governing inspection. However, inspectors are merely required to apply certain provisions of GAPA *mutatis mutandis*, which in practice results in a lower level of legal protection for supervised parties (Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 156).

Finally, it is also necessary to address the absence of explicit provisions concerning the preventive dimension of inspection. While inspection is generally understood to rely on both repressive and preventive functions, the Croatian legislative framework predominantly emphasises the former. The normative framework is largely oriented towards *ex post* intervention, sanctioning and corrective measures, whereas the preventive role of inspection, aimed at ensuring compliance through guidance, early intervention and deterrence, remains insufficiently articulated. Such an imbalance suggests a predominantly reactive conception of inspection, rather than a model grounded in proactive regulatory governance (Blanc & Faure, 2020: 1405). Modern inspection systems aim to improve compliance through cooperation, transparency

and communication with the parties, while coercive powers remain only one element of the regulatory relationship (Jacobs, Cordova, 2006: 4). Preventive supervision functions as an *ex ante* regulatory instrument designed to secure compliance before violations occur, thereby shifting the emphasis from sanctioning towards anticipatory alignment with legal standards. In this sense, inspection does not merely react to established irregularities but operates as a compliance-inducing mechanism that generates regulatory feedback, enabling authorities to detect systemic deficiencies and refine regulatory responses before harmful consequences materialise (Macrocy, 2006: 15, Borković, 2002: 114). The prevailing Croatian framework, however, continues to reflect a predominantly repressive understanding of inspection as unilateral and corrective intervention. This approach contrasts with contemporary regulatory models that emphasise risk-based supervision, proportionate enforcement measures, and the promotion of compliance through guidance and cooperation with the parties (Blanc, Faure, 2020: 1405).

In light of the above, the identified normative shortcomings indicate the need to adopt a general and systematic act on inspection, which would regulate fundamental procedural issues uniformly. At the same time, such codification should ensure that the supervisory function of inspection is aligned with contemporary developments in regulatory governance and the principles of good administration, in which inspection serves not only as a control mechanism but also as an instrument for promoting compliance. Accordingly, the following section of the paper examines the codification of inspection as a means of achieving quality legal regulation in this field.

3 Codification in the field of administrative law

In every democratic state founded on the rule of law, regulations are the main instrument for shaping public policy and governance (Karpen, Xanthaki, 2020: 1–2). Therefore, states seek to establish a quality legal framework based on mutually coherent and harmonised legal norms (Đerđa, Šamanić, 2022: 731). As all natural and legal persons are required to comply with the law, it is essential that legal norms are intelligible and accessible. Since antiquity, the principle *leges ab omnibus intelligi debent* has been recognised, according to which laws must be intelligible to all (Cormacain, 2017: 159). A legal norm is considered intelligible if its addressees can easily understand or interpret its content. In this regard, it should be emphasised that

each legal norm must be comprehensible to those to whom it is directly addressed.²⁶ Furthermore, legal norms must be accessible to their addressees. For a law to be accessible, it must not only be physically available (whether in printed or electronic form), but also structured so that addressees can easily navigate the legal framework and identify the relevant legal norm applicable to a specific situation. In addition, accessibility implies that addressees have a complete and accurate overview of the legal norms in force at a given moment and within a particular legal context (see Cormacain, 2017).

Although legal norms should be intelligible and accessible to their addressees, contemporary states face the problem of “legislative inflation”, which causes the legal framework to become increasingly extensive and complex (Đerđa, Šamanić, 2022: 731).²⁷ Consequently, the large number of regulations in force often leads to inconsistencies and mutually contradictory legal norms, as well as unequal treatment in identical situations. This reduces the intelligibility and accessibility of legal norms and, indirectly, the level of legal certainty and predictability. For this reason, the quality of legal norms must occupy a central place in every legal system, as good legislation is one of the key elements of good governance (Karpen, Xanthaki, 2020: 23). One means by which the quality of the legal framework is improved is the codification of legal rules. Moreover, according to Braibant, codification represents the first step on the path toward better legislation (Duprat, Xanthaki, 2017: 114).²⁸ Codification is the systematisation of legal rules belonging to one or more branches of law into a single legal act (most commonly a statute book or code), thereby creating a coherent legal whole based on the fundamental principles of the respective

²⁶ Laws that apply to all citizens, such as the Criminal Code, must be intelligible to an average, reasonably informed person. In contrast, laws addressed to a limited group of addressees, namely professionals in a particular field (for example, architects or medical doctors), may employ technical or professional terminology, as such addressees possess the requisite specialised knowledge (see Đerđa, 2019: 137).

²⁷ Increasing challenges and transformations in modern society have led to significant growth in the number of regulations and greater complexity in the legal framework of most contemporary democratic states. Technological and scientific developments, modern ethical challenges (such as sustainable development and biotechnology), and global economic and social trends increase societal complexity and require the state to play an active role in adopting new regulations to ensure stability and fairness. The growth in regulations accompanies social development and evolving societal needs. However, it also poses a threat to the stability of the legal order. This phenomenon is referred to in the literature as “legislative inflation”. The tendency towards an increasing number of regulations may be compared to economic inflation, where the quantity of money increases while its value simultaneously declines. Similarly, in the context of legislative inflation, the proliferation of regulations leads to increasingly complex legislation and a higher likelihood of contradictory norms, thereby diminishing overall quality (for more information, see Šulmanec, 2011).

²⁸ Braibant, G. (1996). Utilité et difficultés de la codification. *Droits* n. 24, p. 72.

legal field (Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2007: 592). Codification offers several advantages. Primarily, it consolidates legal rules that are scattered across various regulations, significantly simplifying the identification of applicable law, as addressees, instead of confronting numerous different legal texts, may access the entirety of the law governing a particular field through a single document (Steiner, 2018: 26, 32). Furthermore, codification contributes to the elimination of contradictory norms, the removal of obsolete provisions, and the closing of legal gaps within the legislative framework (Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2007: 592). This enhances the effectiveness of the application of legal norms and, consequently, the impact of legislation on social relations (Ivanchenko, 2022: 26). Ultimately, codification ensures the accessibility and intelligibility of the law, as well as the consistency of legal norms, thereby achieving a higher quality of legal regulation, which is a fundamental objective of every society (Steiner, 2018: 32; Michel, 2023: 431).

The field of administrative law is characterised by numerous laws and subordinate regulations, which are particularly important to citizens as they govern legal relationships between public authorities and individuals. Through administrative law regulations, many individual rights are realised, while obligations are imposed and prohibitions prescribed as necessary for the proper functioning of the community, whether public authority is exercised at the state, regional, or local self-government level (Đerđa, 2019: 116). Procedural rules in administrative law are now codified in most European states to ensure the lawful and efficient conduct of administrative procedures. Codification of procedural rules in administrative law ensures their accessibility, equality of treatment, and contributes to legal certainty and the stability of legal relationships. However, it is also important to allow a certain degree of flexibility in specific areas. Accordingly, departures from general rules may be permitted in particular situations, as some administrative fields require a different regulatory approach to specific issues (for example, providing that an appeal does not suspend the enforcement of a decision in certain urgent inspection measures) (Kovač, 2016a: 4).²⁹ In laws governing specific administrative fields, repetition of provisions already covered by the general law should be avoided. Although such repetition may at first seem acceptable, or even useful for emphasising certain rules within a specific context, duplicating identical provisions across two or more laws

²⁹ See, e.g., Art 92(7) Croatian Labour Market Act (Zakon o tržištu rada), Narodne novine 118/18, 32/20, 18/22, 156/23, 152/24.

does not enhance legal certainty. On the contrary, it increases the risk of legal inconsistency. This is particularly problematic when one law is amended while another remains in force in its original form, resulting in discrepancies in the legal regulation of the same issue (Đerđa, 2019: 121). Moreover, the practice of repeating numerous provisions of general laws in laws governing specific administrative fields is not desirable, as it may lead to uncertainties regarding the application of other provisions of the general law that have not been explicitly incorporated into the sector specific law (Kovač et al., 2026: 48).

As previously emphasised, an important area within administrative law is inspection, which is one of the fundamental tasks of state administration and serves to ensure that all persons act in compliance with the law. Given the significance of inspection for the protection of the public interest, it is essential to ensure quality legal regulation of this procedure. Staničić notes that, without a well-organised system of inspection, there is no guarantee of the proper application of the law, consumer protection, or the protection of market competition (Staničić, 2019: 70). For inspection to be conducted effectively, it is necessary that the rules governing this procedure are intelligible and accessible both to inspectors and other authorised officials (with powers equivalent to those of inspectors) who impose administrative or misdemeanour measures prescribed by law in the exercise of public authority, as well as to the supervised parties, that is, the parties subject to inspection, whose rights must be adequately protected. It is also important to ensure that inspection, while respecting the diversity of the activities subject to supervision, is carried out equally with regard to all supervised parties (Staničić, 2019: 70). With this objective in mind, some states have codified the rules governing inspection by adopting a general legal act that regulates the inspection procedure in a uniform manner. In Croatia, however, the inspection procedure has not been codified. Instead, the relevant rules are set out in various laws governing specific administrative fields or the organisation and operation of inspection services (Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 138). The following section analyses the legal regulation of inspection supervision in selected states that have implemented codification and subsequently compares it with the legal framework in Croatia, where the rules are fragmented, in order to assess whether the codification of inspection contributes to the effectiveness of this procedure.

4 Codification of inspection in Slovenia and Serbia

To achieve clear, unambiguous, and coherent legal regulation of both procedural and substantive norms governing inspection (Kovač, Mučič, 2015: 27), Slovenia and Serbia have codified inspection rules by adopting a comprehensive law that establishes a general legal framework for inspection applicable across all administrative fields.

Although inspection in these states is regarded as a special administrative procedure³⁰ and the law governing general administrative procedure applies subsidiarily,³¹ that law does not provide a comprehensive or adequate normative framework for the specific features of inspection activities. The solutions of the general administrative procedure cannot fully compensate for the absence of specific rules governing inspection, which, as a special administrative procedure in these states, displays particular characteristics that require autonomous statutory regulation.³² In addition to the comprehensive law, procedural issues are further regulated by special sector-specific laws governing inspection activities in particular fields of inspection. These sector-specific laws always take precedence over the general law governing administrative inspections, while the law regulating general administrative procedure applies subsidiarily only in procedural matters (Kovač, 2024a: 48).

In Slovenia, the State Administration Act stipulates that the state administration conducts inspections of the implementation of regulations, and that inspection is to be regulated by a special law.³³ This special law, which systematically regulates inspection, is the Slovenian IA, which entered into force in 2002 as one of the key reform laws during the process of accession to the European Union (Kovač, Mučič, 2015: 25). The IA applies to all inspection authorities, whether they operate at the state or municipal level, to all fields of supervision, and to all forms or categories of regulated entities (external or internal, private or public institutions, natural or legal persons) (Kovač, 2016a: 2). The Act contains three types of provisions: procedural, organisational, and substantive. Procedural matters are further regulated by sector-

³⁰ In Serbian and Slovenian scholarly and professional literature, inspection supervision is described as a special administrative procedure (see Marinković, 2024: 157; Lilić, Toskić, 2021: 126; Kovač, Mučič, 2015: 27).

³¹ See General Administrative Procedure Act (Zakon o splošnem upravnem postopku (ZUP)), Uradni list RS, št. 24/06 – uradno prečiščeno besedilo, 105/06 – ZUS-1, 126/07, 65/08, 8/10, 82/13, 175/20 – ZIUOPDVE in 3/22 – ZDeb (Slovenian GAPA) and General Administrative Procedure Act (Zakon o opštem upravnem postopku), Sl. glasnik RS 18/16, 95/18 - autentično tumačenje i 2/2023 - odlika US (Serbian GAPA).

³² Explanatory Memorandum to the Inspection Act of the Republic of Serbia.

³³ Art 10 State Administration Act (Zakon o državni upravi) (ZDU-1), Uradni list RS, št. 113/05 – uradno prečiščeno besedilo, 89/07 – odl. US, 126/07 – ZUP-E, 48/09, 8/10 – ZUP-G, 8/12 – ZVRS-F, 21/12, 47/13, 12/14, 90/14, 51/16, 36/21, 82/21, 189/21, 153/22, 18/23 in 83/25 – ZOUL.

specific laws governing individual inspection services (*leges speciales*), as well as by the law governing the general administrative procedure (Rakar, 2016: 254). The Slovenian GAPA constitutes the *lex generalis* in relation to the IA, meaning that it applies to all procedural matters not regulated by the IA or by a special law, as well as to the adoption of administrative decisions (Prah, 2023: 53).

The primary objective of adopting the Slovenian IA was to enhance the effectiveness and consistency of inspection activities, increase transparency, and ensure compliance with the general principles governing the operation of public administration.³⁴ Kovač notes that the IA established a common normative framework enabling more effective and harmonised inspection activities, mainly by strengthening inspection powers, improving mutual coordination, providing more appropriate regulation of the specific features of inspection procedures, and emphasising preventive action (Kovač, 2016b: 15).

The Slovenian IA defines inspection as a special administrative procedure intended to oversee the implementation of, and compliance with laws and other regulations, conducted by inspectors as officials vested with specific powers and responsibilities.³⁵ In addition to applying the general principles of the general administrative procedure, the IA sets out specific principles governing inspection activities, including the independence of inspectors in performing supervision, the protection of the public interest while safeguarding private interests, the transparency of inspection work, and proportionality in the exercise of powers and measures. The Act also establishes the organisational framework of the inspection system, including the structure of inspection authorities, the role of the chief inspector, mechanisms for coordination among inspection bodies, and the planning of inspection supervision to ensure effectiveness. The legal status of inspectors is regulated in particular detail, covering their rights, duties, limitations, responsibilities, guarantees of independence, and the conditions for performing inspection duties. The Act comprehensively defines the powers of inspectors during supervision, including access to premises, examination of documentation, collection of evidence, and ensuring the unobstructed conduct of inspection activities. It also regulates the procedure for conducting inspection, including the handling of reports (including anonymous ones), the status of participants in the procedure, the rights and

³⁴ Predlog Zakona o spremembah in dopolnitvah Zakona o inšpekcijskem nadzoru, available at: [http://84.39.218.201/MANDAT13/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/fb317bd7f427d541c1257ca0002c6604/\\$FILE/ZIN_18_3.pdf](http://84.39.218.201/MANDAT13/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/fb317bd7f427d541c1257ca0002c6604/$FILE/ZIN_18_3.pdf).

³⁵ Art 2 Slovenian IA.

obligations of the supervised party, the suspension of proceedings, procedural costs, and the general rule that an appeal against an inspector's decision does not suspend its enforcement. The Act further provides for a system of inspection measures, ranging from preventive warnings to more stringent enforcement measures in cases of non-compliance, imminent danger, or repeated violations, as well as special measures to protect the rights of third parties. Finally, the Slovenian IA regulates the liability of the state or local self-government units for damage caused by the unlawful conduct of inspectors, with the possibility of recourse liability for inspectors in cases of intent or gross negligence

The Republic of Serbia adopted the IA in 2015,³⁶ which constitutes a special law in relation to the Serbian GAPA.³⁷ This means that, for matters not regulated by the IA, the provisions of the GAPA apply. Conversely, the IA has a general character in relation to special laws governing procedures in specific fields of inspection (Milovanović, 2016: 45). The Serbian IA was adopted to systematically regulate the methodology of inspection, the powers and obligations of inspection subjects, the coordination of inspection services, and the more efficient use of their resources (Vasiljević, 2015: 169).

The Serbian IA defines inspection as a public administration activity carried out by state administrative bodies, bodies of the autonomous province, and bodies of local self-government units, aimed at ensuring the legality and safety of the operations and conduct of supervised parties through preventive action or the ordering of measures, as well as preventing or eliminating harmful consequences to goods, rights, and interests protected by law and other regulations.³⁸ The Act regulates the types and forms of inspection, the monitoring of conditions, risk assessment, and the planning, harmonisation, and coordination of inspection. Furthermore, the Act details the conduct of inspection by prescribing the preventive activities of inspection authorities, the preparation and implementation of inspection, including the initiation of proceedings, the timing of inspections, and the rights and obligations of supervised parties, as well as the powers of inspectors to establish the facts. The Act also governs inspection measures that may be imposed by inspectors, the procedure in special situations (for example, regarding unknown or unregistered entities), the keeping and content of inspection records, the adoption and

³⁶ The Serbian IA was drafted on the model of the Slovenian IA (see Kovač, 2016c: 26-27).

³⁷ In the course of conducting an inspection, the inspector acts in accordance with the principles and procedural rules governing the general administrative procedure. Art. 4(2) Serbian IA.

³⁸ Art 2 Serbian IA.

enforcement of inspection decisions, legal remedies, and the relationship between inspection and misdemeanour and criminal proceedings. In addition, the Act provides for records on inspection, annual reporting, and indicators of inspection effectiveness. Finally, the Serbian IA regulates the legal status of officials authorised to conduct inspections. In this regard, it sets out the conditions and powers for performing inspection duties, including the management of inspection authorities, the appointment of inspectors, the passing of the inspector's examination, and the possibility of entrusting certain tasks to other authorised officials. It also regulates the principle of inspectors' independence, their professional training, official identification, the liability of officials and the handling of complaints, as well as mechanisms of internal supervision of the legality of inspection activities.

Sectoral general codification of inspection, as applied in Slovenia and Serbia, allows inspectors to find the rules governing inspection in one place. It also improves the accessibility and clarity of the rules for parties, who may often be involved in different procedures within the same field (for example, the same person may be subject to various types of inspection, such as sanitary, market, and labour inspections) (Kovač, 2016a: 4-5). If each procedure is governed by different rules, parties may find it difficult to navigate the system, and procedures become non-transparent. By harmonising procedural rules, inspection procedures become more predictable, parties know what to expect, and legal uncertainty is reduced.

5 The Need for Codification and the Contemporary Development of Inspection in Croatia

As analysed earlier in this paper, inspection in Croatia is regulated by numerous legal acts. Although the entry into force of the SIA in 2019 reduced the number of regulations governing the conduct of inspectors (Džinić, Lopižić, 2022: 188), a unified and systematic legal framework for this field is still lacking. Regulations governing inspection often contain inconsistent provisions, and the powers of inspectors are frequently unclear (Staničić, 2019: 71). Furthermore, under the current legal framework, the rights of supervised parties are not sufficiently protected, as laws regulating the implementation of inspection generally do not address the procedural rights of the parties (Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 139). Although inspectors apply certain provisions of the GAPA to procedural matters not regulated by special inspection laws, the legal nature of the inspection procedure has not been clearly

determined (Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 138). This creates legal uncertainty for both supervised parties and inspectors.

In light of the foregoing, it may be concluded that codifying inspection in Croatia, specifically through the adoption of a comprehensive inspection act modelled on the solutions implemented in Slovenia and Serbia, would enhance legal certainty. Such a law would address existing legal gaps and resolve the outstanding and contested issues and ambiguities that currently arise in practice.³⁹ The adoption of a comprehensive general inspection act would not preclude the regulation of specific issues relating to particular inspection authorities through special substantive laws. This would also require aligning the currently applicable special laws governing inspection in specific fields with the general law. In this context, it is particularly important that the competences of inspectors in individual administrative fields are clearly and precisely defined by special laws.

A comprehensive inspection act should define the legal nature of the inspection procedure and clearly regulate its relationship with the GAPA. The act should also strengthen the procedural protection of parties' rights, as these are currently not adequately regulated (see Đerđa, Babić, 2025: 139). For example, the act should establish a general rule on whether a person must be notified of the initiation of inspection proceedings, as the current legal framework in Croatia is inconsistent in this respect. Furthermore, certain technical issues should be regulated by implementing regulations within a single, consolidated instrument. Currently, special laws governing inspection procedures confer powers to adopt implementing regulations in each individual field, resulting in matters that should be uniform being regulated by numerous different by-laws. For example, there are many different ordinances governing the form of official identification cards and the appearance of inspectors' badges⁴⁰ (Stipić, 2017: 25). This makes the legal order complex and

³⁹ The need to codify inspection procedures has already been noted by certain Croatian authors (see Stipić, 2017). It is noteworthy that, during the preparation and adoption of the State Inspectorate Act of 1999, some advocated for a separate law on inspections. However, the prevailing view was that inspection is a classical function of state administrative bodies and that it would therefore not be appropriate to regulate these relationships separately from other functions of state administration (Stipić, 2017: 30).

⁴⁰ See, e.g., Ordinance on the Official Identification Card and Badge of Inspectors of the State Inspectorate (Pravilnik o službenoj iskaznici i znački inspektora Državnog inspektorata), Narodne novine 84/19, 123/19, 36/20; Ordinance on the Form of the Official Identification Card and the Shape and Appearance of the Official Badge of Fire Protection Inspectors (Pravilnik o obrascu službene iskaznice, obliku i izgledu službene značke inspektora zaštite od požara), Narodne novine 48/21; Ordinance on the Form of the Identification Card, the Shape of the Badge, Equipment, and Official Uniform of Road Transport Inspectors and Road Inspectors (Pravilnik o obrascu iskaznice, obliku značke, opremi i službenoj odjeći inspektora cestovnog prometa i inspektora cesta), Narodne novine 128/09, 22/14, 118/25; Ordinance on the Form of the Official Identification Card and the Shape and

difficult to navigate, hindering the practical application of the rules. Therefore, a general law should confer the authority to adopt a single, unified implementing regulation that would, for example, regulate in greater detail the appearance and content of official identification cards and inspectors' badges.

Finally, to improve the system of inspection and enable it to fully realise its fundamental function in shaping and implementing public authority, it is necessary to emphasise the role of inspections within the context of good governance. The objectives of inspection are evolving in line with contemporary social and governance changes. Although the primary objective of inspection is to ensure legality, that is, compliance with applicable regulations, its function also includes collecting feedback that can serve as a basis for improving supervised activities and for drafting higher-quality regulations (the so-called regulatory feedback loop) (Kovač, 2024a: 20–23). In this context, the authorities carrying out supervision, particularly inspection bodies, should play a greater role in reviewing existing legislation.⁴¹

Furthermore, in accordance with the model of good governance and good administration, inspection should not be viewed exclusively as a repressive mechanism. Rather, a more preventive and partnership-based approach should be developed. This implies a gradual shift in emphasis from repressive measures to incentive-based mechanisms, that is, towards empowering supervised entities and encouraging their compliance with regulations instead of relying solely on punishment (Kovač et al., 2026: 20). In line with this, greater use should be made of risk-based inspections, which are based on the principle that the scope and intensity of supervision should correspond to the assessed level of risk. This means that inspection is conducted according to the priorities of specific activities and the estimated level of risk that certain entities pose to the public interest (Kovač, 2024b: 221–222; Blanc, 2018: 191–192).

Accordingly, the codification of inspection should be adapted to the contemporary social and governance context, taking into account its current function, which

Appearance of the Official Badge of Inspectors Supervising Private Security Activities (Pravilnik o obrascu službene iskaznice i obliku i izgledu službene značke inspektora za nadzor djelatnosti privatne zaštite), Narodne novine 48/21; Ordinance on the Form and Content of the Official Identification Card and the Form and Content of the Badge of Radiological and Nuclear Safety Inspectors (Pravilnik o obliku i sadržaju obrasca službene iskaznice i obliku i sadržaju značke inspektora za radiološku i nuklearnu sigurnost), Narodne novine 48/21.

⁴¹ For example, in France, General Inspectorates, in addition to conducting inspection in specific areas of public policy (police, justice, social affairs etc.), also have a broader remit that includes auditing, advising and even *ex post* evaluation of public policies (Gilberg, 2020: 190).

extends beyond a purely procedural dimension to include a broader regulatory and governance role within the system of public authority. Only such an approach can ensure effective and proportionate inspection that contributes to legal certainty and the realisation of the fundamental principles of the rule of law.

6 Conclusion

An analysis of the legal framework for inspection in the Republic of Croatia reveals frequent organisational and legislative changes in the field of inspection, indicating normative instability and the absence of a long-term, consistent legislative approach. Since 2019, the new SIA has been in force. However, it has a limited scope of application, as it applies exclusively to inspections organised within the State Inspectorate, while inspection oversight in other administrative fields is regulated by special legislation. This renders the existing legal framework highly fragmented, resulting in certain nomotechnical and substantive deficiencies in the regulation of inspection. Due to the complexity of the legal framework, inconsistent provisions are evident, and inspectors' powers are often unclear. The rights of supervised parties in inspection proceedings are insufficiently protected, as the laws governing the conduct of inspection generally do not regulate the procedural rights of the parties. This grants inspectors broad discretionary powers in matters crucial to the legal position of supervised parties. Finally, in Croatian legal theory, there are doubts regarding the legal nature of inspection proceedings, which further undermines legal certainty. In light of the above, the question arises whether codification could improve the quality of the legal framework governing inspection in Croatia.

Codification contributes to greater accessibility and intelligibility of regulations, particularly when the legal framework becomes increasingly extensive and complex. A significant part of the legal framework in every state consists of administrative law regulations, which are of particular importance to individuals, as it is through administrative law that they exercise their rights within society and are required to fulfil numerous obligations that contribute to the functioning of the community in which they live. Accordingly, procedural rules in the field of administrative law in most European states are now codified, with the aim of ensuring transparency, equality, and legal certainty. Inspection constitutes an important segment of administrative law and is one of the fundamental tasks of public administration. Its importance is reflected in the key role it plays in society, as it ensures that natural and legal persons act in accordance with applicable regulations. Precisely because of

this significance, inspection, as a distinct area of administrative law, requires legal regulation that is intelligible and accessible to its addressees.

Certain states, such as Slovenia and Serbia, have codified the rules of inspection by adopting a general law that regulates this procedure in a uniform manner. In addition to the general law governing inspection, the law regulating the general administrative procedure applies subsidiarily. In view of the specificities of individual administrative fields, certain inspection services are further regulated by special sector-specific laws. By establishing a unified normative framework for inspection in these states, the rules governing inspection procedures have been regulated more clearly. Moreover, these rules have become more accessible, as inspectors can find the relevant procedural rules in one place, as can supervised parties, which must have effective legal mechanisms for the protection of their rights.

On the basis of the foregoing, it can be concluded that inspection should be regulated in a uniform manner, irrespective of the field of supervision, with the inspection procedure being conducted systematically and consistently across all administrative areas. By codifying the inspection procedure in Croatia, following the examples of Slovenia and Serbia, inspection procedures would be harmonised and coordinated, legal gaps would be filled, and open and contentious issues, as well as practical uncertainties, would be addressed. At the same time, it is important that the codification of inspection in Croatia is not limited solely to the systematisation of procedural rules, but also reflects the contemporary role of inspection. Inspection should not be viewed exclusively as an instrument of repressive control of legality, but also as a mechanism for preventive action, risk management, and the collection of feedback aimed at improving existing regulations and supervised activities. Such an approach would ensure greater legal certainty and provide better protection for the rights of supervised parties.

References

- Babić, K. (2023). Nadležnosti i ovlasti komunalnih redara. In: *Zbornik radova 13. međunarodne konferencije „Razvoj javne uprave”* (pp. 14-23). Veleučilište Lavoslav Ružička.
- Blanc, F., Faure, M. (2020). Smart enforcement in the EU. *Journal of Risk Research* (pp. 1405-1423).
- Blanc, F. (2018). *From Chasing Violations to Managing Risks: Origins, Challenges and Evolutions in Regulatory Inspections*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788112499>

- Florentin, B. (2012). *Inspection Reforms: Why, How and With What Results*. OECD.
- Borković, I. (1996). *Nomotebnika*. Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Splitu, Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Osijeku.
- Borković, I. (2002). *Upravno pravo*. Zagreb: Narodne novine.
- Cordova-Novion, C., Sahovic, T. (2017). *Inspections reforms : do models exist? (English)*. World Bank Group. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/216181471587685722>
- Cormacain, R. (2017). *Legislative Drafting and the Rule of Law*. (Doctoral dissertation, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London). <https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/6693/1/Cormacain%2C%20R%20-%20-%20IALS%20-%202018.pdf>
- Duprat, J.-P., Xanthaki, H. (2017). Legislative Drafting Techniques/Formal Legistics. In Karpen, U., Xanthaki, H. (eds.) *Legislation in Europe: A Comprehensive Guide For Scholars and Practitioners* (pp. 109-129). Oxford, Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing.
- Džinić, J., Lopizić, I. (2022). Novo uređenje upravnog i inspekcijskog nadzora u hrvatskoj državnoj upravi - problemi i otvorena pitanja. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu*, 59(1), 173-193. <https://doi.org/10.31141/zrpf.2022.59.143.173>
- Derđa, D. (2019). Kvaliteta propisa upravnog prava u Hrvatskoj: Ocjena stanja i prijedlozi za unaprjeđenje. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci*, 40(1), 113-143. <https://doi.org/10.30925/zpfsr.40.1.5>
- Derđa, D., Šamanić P. (2022). Pravila izrade pravnih propisa u hrvatskom i usporednom pravu. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci*, 43(3), 717-735. <https://doi.org/10.30925/zpfsr.43.3.10>
- Derđa, D., Babić, K. (2025). Prava stranaka u provedbi inspekcijskog nadzora. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci*, 46(1), 135-160. <https://doi.org/10.30925/zpfsr.46.1.7>
- Gilberg, K. (2020). Legislation in European Countries. In Karpen, U., Xanthaki, H. (eds.) *Legislation in Europe: A Country by Country Guide* (pp. 181-197). Oxford, New York: Hart Publishing.
- Held, M., Lopizić, I. (2024). Inspekcijski nadzor u području gradnje. In Barbić, J. (ed.), *Očuvanje načela zakonitosti u postupcima prostornog uređenja i gradnje* (pp. 77-122). Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Ivanchenko, O. M. (2022). The essence and legal nature of the systematization of legislation. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*. 23-27. [10.24144/2788-6018.2021.04.4](https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2021.04.4)

Jacobs, S., Cordova, C. (2006). *Good Practices for Business Inspections: Guidelines for Reformers*. World Bank.

Karpen, U., Xanthaki, H. (2020). Legislation in European Countries. In Karpen, U., Xanthaki, H. (eds.) *Legislation in Europe: A Country by Country Guide* (pp. 1-34). Oxford, New York: Hart Publishing.

Kovač, P., et al. (2026). *Komentar Zakona o šolski inšpekciji (Z.Soll-1)*. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo, <https://doi.org/10.59132/9789610310211>

Kovač, P. (2024a). Sistemska analiza problematike ureditve in izvajanja inšpekcijskega nadzora v Sloveniji in EU. In Kovač, P. (ed.) *Inšpekcijski nadzor: Razprave, sodna praksa in komentar zakona, nova, dopolnjena izdaja* (pp. 18-63). Ljubljana: Uradni list Republike Slovenije.

Kovač, P. (2024b). Izhodišča za ureditev inšpekcijskega nadzora *de lege ferenda*. In Kovač, P. (ed.) *Inšpekcijski nadzor: Razprave, sodna praksa in komentar zakona, nova, dopolnjena izdaja* (pp. 217-242). Ljubljana: Uradni list Republike Slovenije.

Kovač, P. (2016a). Inspection Regulation between General Procedural Codification and Field Specifics – a Case Study of Slovenia. *DANUBE: Law and Economics Review*, 7(1), 1-17. [10.1515/danb-2016-0001](https://doi.org/10.1515/danb-2016-0001)

Kovač, P. (2016b). Dosezi i manjkavosti upravnih reformi u Sloveniji. *Političke analize*, 7(26), 13-17. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/167366>

Kovač, P. (2016c). Sistemska analiza problematike ureditve in izvajanja inšpekcijskega nadzora v Sloveniji in EU. In Kovač, P. (ed.) *Inšpekcijski nadzor: Razprave, sodna praksa in komentar zakona* (pp. 19-48). Ljubljana: Uradni list Republike Slovenije.

Kovač, P., Mučič, S. (2015). Učinkovitost inšpekcijskega nadzora v slovenski teoriji in praksi. *Javna uprava*, 51(3-4), 25-38.

Koprić, I., Marčetić, G., Musa, A., Đulabić, V., Lalić Novak, G. (2021). *Upravna znanost- javna uprava u suvremenom europskom kontekstu*. Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Krbek, I. (1952). *Prilog teoriji o pojmu prava*. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Kuvačić, I. (2004.). *Uvod u sociologiju*. Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga.

- Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža. (2007). *Pravni leksikon*. Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža.
- Lilić, S., Toskić, K. (2021). Inspekcijski nadzor i kolektivna zaštita potrošača u upravnom postupku: Studija primera na slučaju Supernova. In Ivančević, K. (ed.), *Zaštita kolektivnih interesa potrošača* (pp. 123-141). Pravni fakultet Univerziteta Union.
- Ljubičić, I. (2009). Inspekcijski nadzor stranih brodova u lukama Republike Hrvatske. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu*, 46(4), 829–843.
- Lipovčić, S. Z. (2019). Inspekcijski nadzor kao instrument borbe protiv faktičkog rada u domaćem i međunarodnom pravu. *Strani pravni život: teorija, zakonodavstvo, praksa*, 63(3), 107–117.
- Lopižić, I. (2023). Inspekcijski nadzor: Međunarodni standardi, dobre prakse i hrvatska državna uprava. In Barbić, J. (ed.) *Pravno uređenje i provedba nadzora u hrvatskoj javnoj upravi* (pp. 39–58). Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Macrory, R.B. (2006). *Regulatory Justice: Making Sanctions Effective, Final report*. London: Better Regulation Executive.
- Marinković, R. (2024). Načela i pravila opšteg upravnog postupka u postupku vršenja inspekcijskog nadzora: Sa primerima iz sudske prakse Upravnog suda, prakse Ustavnog suda i ESLJP. In Trifunović, P. (ed.), *Aktuelni problemi u radnom, građanskom, privrednom i procesnom pravu* (pp. 153–183). Glosarijum.
- Michel, J. (2023). La codification, vecteur de l'amélioration de la qualité de la norme: L'exemple du Code général de la fonction publique. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu*, 60(2), 431-439. <https://doi.org/10.31141/zrpf.2023.60.148.431>
- Milovanović, D. (2016). Odnos opšt(ij)eg i posebn(ij)ih upravnoprocesnih zakona. *Polis, časopis za javnu politiku*, 11, 42-47.
- OECD. (2014). *Regulatory enforcement and inspections: OECD best practice principles for regulatory policy*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2018). *OECD regulatory enforcement and inspections toolkit*. OECD Publishing.
- Prah, K. (2023). Inšpekcijski upravni postopek v povezavi z inšpekcijskim prekrškovnim postopkom. In *Zbornik 18. Dnevi prekrškovnega prava* (pp. 52-63), Ljubljana, GV Založba.

- Pound, R. (1913). Legislation as a social function. *American Journal of Sociology*, 18(6), 755–768.
- Rakar, I., Doljak, E., Tičar, B. (2016). Inšpekcijski nadzor na državni in lokalni ravni ter njegov prispevek k varnosti v občinah. *Varstvoslojje*, 18(3), 251–269.
- Rems, V. (2008). Inšpekcijski nadzor u zakonodavstvu Republike Hrvatske – osnovna načela i postupak inspekcijskog nadzora (kao bitan segment vladavine prava), *Pravo i porezji*, 17(11), 23-29.
- Staničić, F. (2019). Uloga inspekcijskog nadzora u osiguravanju provedbe propisa. *Elektronički zbornik radova Veleučilišta u Šibeniku*, 13(1-2), 61-74. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/223010>
- Steiner, E. (2018). *French Law: A Comparative Approach* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198790884.001.0001>
- Stipić, M. (2009). Opći upravni postupak i postupak inspekcijskog nadzora – odnos općeg upravnog postupka i posebnih procedura. In Koprić, I. (ed.) *Novi Zakon o općem upravnom postupku – praktična pitanja i problemi primjene* (pp. 141-172). Narodne novine and Institut za javnu upravu.
- Šolman, S. (2016). Uloga inspekcije cestovnog prometa u implementaciji uredbi i direktiva EU-a u Republici Hrvatskoj. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu*, 66(2–3), 421–438.
- Špoljar, B. (2014). Inšpekcijski nadzor - odstupanja od pravila općeg upravnog postupka. *Hrvatska pravna revija*, 66-76.
- Stipić, M. (2017). Inšpekcijski nadzor - doseg najavljenih izmjena. *FIP - Financije i pravo*, 5(2), 7-34, <https://hrcak.srce.hr/193149>
- Šulmane, D. (2011). “Legislative Inflation” - An analysis of the Phenomenon in Contemporary Legal Discourse. *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics*, 4(2), 78-101. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10076-011-0013-4>
- Vasiljević, D. (2015). Inšpekcijski nadzor u Republici Srbiji– Stanje, ciljevi i pravac reforme u ovoj oblasti. *Pravni život*, 64(10), 159-171.
- Vlahović, E. (2025). Nadzor nad upotrebom pomorskog dobra. In *Zbornik radova 15. međunarodne konferencije „Razvoj javne uprave”* (pp. 525–538). Veleučilište Lavoslav Ružička u Vukovaru.
- Vrban, D. (2006.). *Sociologija prava*. Golden marketing - Tehnička knjiga.

World Bank, Small and Medium Enterprise Department. (2006). *Good practices for business inspections*. World Bank.

Legal sources

Republic of Croatia. Act on Amendments to the Act on the Organisation and Scope of Ministries and Other Central State Administration Bodies (*Zakon o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o ustrojstvu i djelokrugu ministarstava i drugih središnjih tijela države*), Narodne novine 116/18 (no longer in force).

Republic of Croatia. Act on Forests (*Zakon o šumama*), Narodne novine 68/18, 115/18, 98/19, 32/20, 145/20, 101/23, 145/23, 36/24, 145/24.

Republic of Croatia. Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports (*Zakon o pomorskom dobru i morskim lukama*), Narodne novine 158/03, 100/04, 141/06, 38/09, 123/11, 56/16, 98/19, 83/23 (no longer in force).

Republic of Croatia. Act on Maritime Domain and Seaports (*Zakon o pomorskom dobru i morskim lukama*), Narodne novine 83/23.

Republic of Croatia. Act on Port Captaincies (*Zakon o lučkim kapetanijama*), Narodne novine 118/18, 155/23.

Republic of Croatia. Act on System of State Administration (*Zakon o sustavu državne uprave*), Narodne novine 75/1993 (no longer in force).

Republic of Croatia. Act on System of State Administration (*Zakon o sustavu državne uprave*), Narodne novine 150/11 (no longer in force).

Republic of Croatia. Act on the System of State Administration (*Zakon o sustavu državne uprave*), Narodne novine 66/19, 155/23.

Republic of Croatia. Cableways Act (*Zakon o žičarama*), Narodne novine 96/18.

Republic of Croatia. Construction Inspection Act (*Zakon o građevinskoj inspekciji*), Narodne novine 153/13, 115/18.

Republic of Croatia. General Administrative Procedure Act (*Zakon o općem upravnom postupku*), Narodne novine 47/09, 110/21.

Republic of Croatia. Hospitality Industry Act (Zakon o ugostiteljskoj djelatnosti), Narodne novine 85/15, 121/16, 99/18, 25/19, 98/19, 32/20, 42/20, 126/21, 152/24.

Republic of Croatia. Labour Market Act (Zakon o tržištu rada), Narodne novine 118/18, 32/20, 18/22, 156/23, 152/24.

Republic of Croatia. Ordinance on the Official Identification Card and Badge of Inspectors of the State Inspectorate (Pravilnik o službenoj iskaznici i znački inspektora Državnog inspektorata), Narodne novine 84/19, 123/19, 36/20.

Republic of Croatia. Ordinance on the Form of the Official Identification Card and the Shape and Appearance of the Official Badge of Fire Protection Inspectors (Pravilnik o obrascu službene iskaznice, obliku i izgledu službene značke inspektora zaštite od požara), Narodne novine 48/21.

Republic of Croatia. Ordinance on the Form of the Identification Card, the Shape of the Badge, Equipment, and Official Uniform of Road Transport Inspectors and Road Inspectors (Pravilnik o obrascu iskaznice, obliku značke, opremi i službenoj odjeći inspektora cestovnog prometa i inspektora cesta), Narodne novine 128/09, 22/14, 118/25.

Republic of Croatia. Ordinance on the Form of the Official Identification Card and the Shape and Appearance of the Official Badge of Inspectors Supervising Private Security Activities (Pravilnik o obrascu službene iskaznice i obliku i izgledu službene značke inspektora za nadzor djelatnosti privatne zaštite), Narodne novine 48/21.

Ordinance on the Form and Content of the Official Identification Card and the Form and Content of the Badge of Radiological and Nuclear Safety Inspectors (Pravilnik o obliku i sadržaju obrasca službene iskaznice i obliku i sadržaju značke inspektora za radiološku i nuklearnu sigurnost), Narodne novine 48/21.

Republic of Croatia. Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the State Inspectorate (Uredba o unutarnjem ustrojstvu Državnog inspektorata), Narodne novine 11/25.

Republic of Croatia. Sports Inspection Act (Zakon o sportskoj inspekciji), Narodne novine 72/25.

Republic of Croatia. State Inspectorate Act (Zakon o Državnom inspektoratu), Narodne novine 115/18, 117/21, 67/23, 155/23.

Republic of Serbia. General Administrative Procedure Act (Zakon o opštem upravnom postupku), Sl. glasnik RS 18/16, 95/18 - autentično tumačenje i 2/2023 - odluka US.

Republic of Serbia. Inspection Act (Zakon o inspekcijskom nadzoru), Sl. glasnik RS 36/15, 44/18 - dr. zakon i 95/18.

Republic of Slovenia. Inspection act (Zakon o inšpekcijskem nadzoru), Uradni list RS, št. 43/07 – uradno prečiščeno besedilo in 40/14.

Republic of Slovenia. General Administrative Procedure Act (Zakon o splošnem upravnem postopku), Uradni list RS, št. 24/06 – uradno prečiščeno besedilo, 105/06 – ZUS-1, 126/07, 65/08, 8/10, 82/13, 175/20 – ZIUOPDVE in 3/22 – ZDeb

Republic of Slovenia. State Administration Act (Zakon o državni upravi) (ZDU-1), Uradni list RS, št. 113/05 – uradno prečiščeno besedilo, 89/07 – odl. US, 126/07 – ZUP-E, 48/09, 8/10 – ZUP-G, 8/12 – ZVRS-F, 21/12, 47/13, 12/14, 90/14, 51/16, 36/21, 82/21, 189/21, 153/22, 18/23 in 83/25 – ZOUL.

High Administrative Court of the Republic of Croatia. Judgment Us-10215/2009-8 of 28 March 2012.

Official Documents

Explanatory Memorandum to the Inspection Act of the Republic of Serbia

Predlog Zakona o spremembah in dopolnitvah Zakona o inšpekcijskem nadzoru, available at:

[http://84.39.218.201/MANDAT13/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/fb317bd7f427d541c1257ca0002c6604/\\$FILE/ZIN_18_3.pdf](http://84.39.218.201/MANDAT13/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/fb317bd7f427d541c1257ca0002c6604/$FILE/ZIN_18_3.pdf).

Povzetek članka v slovenskem jeziku (abstract in Slovene language):

Inšpekcija je ključna funkcija javne uprave v vsakem pravnem sistemu, saj njeno izvajanje zagotavlja, da fizične in pravne osebe delujejo v skladu z zakonom. Da bi inšpekcija izpolnila svoj namen, je nujno zagotoviti kakovostno pravno ureditev. Ta članek analizira prispevek kodifikacije inšpekcijskih pravil k učinkovitejšemu izvajanju tega postopka. Posebna pozornost je namenjena normativnemu okviru, ki ureja inšpekcijo na Hrvaškem, ki je

trenutno urejena s številnimi zakoni. S pomočjo primerjalno-pravne metode članek preučuje pravne okvire v Sloveniji in Srbiji kot primerih sosednjih držav, kjer so bila pravila o inšpekciji kodificirana. Na podlagi opravljene analize so ocenjene prednosti kodifikacije inšpekcijskih pravil ter napravljena razprava o tem, kako bi uvedba takšne kodifikacije lahko izboljšala kakovost pravne ureditve inšpekcije v Republiki Hrvaški.

Acknowledgement

This paper has been written within the scope of the project “*Existing Anthropogenic Protection of Convention Rights as a Chilling Effect*” (uniri-iz-25-69), funded by European Union – NextGenerationEU via the Croatian National Recovery and Resilience Plan 2021-2026, in conjunction with the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Law Programme Financing. The views and opinions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

