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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASBOs</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Criminal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Code of Criminal Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Constitution of the Italian Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Child Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Crown Prosecution Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Child Welfare Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;YP</td>
<td>Children and Young Persons Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTO</td>
<td>Detention and Training Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAW</td>
<td>European Arrest Warrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHR</td>
<td>European Convention on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECtHR</td>
<td>European Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME</td>
<td>forensic medical examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Hoge Raad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Juvenile Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASPO</td>
<td>Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Nederlandse Jurisprudentie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Police and Criminal Evidence Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNDs</td>
<td>Penalty Notices for Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOM</td>
<td>victim-offender mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YJA</td>
<td>Youth Justice Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
<td>Youth Offending Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPA</td>
<td>Youth Protection Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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