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Turkish Flagged Drillship Fatih launched off-shore drilling operations on 3 May 2019.

The drilling area (Finike-1) lies:

- 75 km (42 nm) off the west coast of the Island of Cyprus,
- entirely within the TURKISH CONTINENTAL SHELF registered with the UN
- within the licence areas granted to TP by the Turkish Government in 2012

These licence areas were published in the Turkish Official Gazette in the same year.

- The drilling area is NOT located within the TC & GC licence areas
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Turkey’s Continental Shelf
We express grave concern over Turkey's announced intention to carry out drilling activities within the exclusive economic zone of Cyprus. Illegal action.

Turkish Drilling in Cypriot-Claimed Waters. Offshore drilling operations in an area claimed by the Republic of Cyprus as its EEZ.

We are quite dismayed that some countries are supporting GCs position in accordance with their political expediencies. Yet, this issue is about international law.
What are the legal means of maritime boundary delimitation?

- Negotiation leading to treaty.
- Conciliation
- Arbitration.
- Adjudication at an international court or tribunal.

- Courts/tribunals have played a major role in maritime delimitations.

Treaty Provisions on Maritime Boundary Delimitation

1982 UNCLOS - EEZ (art. 74) and CS (art. 83)

1. The delimitation of the exclusive economic zone between States with opposite or adjacent coasts shall be effected by agreement on the basis of international law, as referred to in Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in order to achieve an equitable solution.

2. If no agreement can be reached within a reasonable period of time, the States concerned shall resort to the procedures provided for in Part XV.

3. Pending agreement as provided for in paragraph 1, the States concerned, in a spirit of understanding and cooperation, shall make every effort to enter into provisional arrangements of a practical nature and, during this transitional period, not to jeopardize or hamper the reaching of the final agreement. Such arrangements shall be without prejudice to the final delimitation.

4. Where there is an agreement in force between the States concerned, questions relating to the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of that agreement.
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WHAT ARE THE FACTORS TO ASSESS WHETHER A MARITIME DELIMITATION LINE IS EQUITABLE OR NOT?

☐ A number factors may be taken into account. In bilateral negotiations, there is no limit to the factors which States may take into account.

☐ As for the Courts, not all factors may be taken into consideration.

☐ Courts tend to take into consideration factors or circumstances which they have a direct bearing or directly relevant to the delimitation.

Jurisprudence on Maritime Boundary Delimitation
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SPECIAL/RELEVANT CIRCUMSTANCES

GEOGRAPHICAL CIRCUMSTANCES

• Regional Geography ✓
  (including general characteristics and particular features of the region - ocean, enclosed, semi enclosed sea etc.)
• Configuration of the Coasts ✓
  (including adjacency and oppositeness, direction, comparative lengths, concave or convex shape)
• Basepoints ✓
  (including presence of ports, roadsteads, bays, river mouths, low-tide elevations, reefs)
• The presence of islands and rocks ✓
  (including their size and position in the context of general geographic configuration)

NON-GEOGRAPHIC CIRCUMSTANCES

• Geological and geomorphological factors
• Economic factors
  (Hydrocarbon resources, fisheries)
• Navigation
• Socio-economic and demographic factors X
• Defence and security
• Environment
• Historical rights ✓
• Presence of Third States ✓

OTHER FACTORS AFFECTING DELIMITATION

• Proportionality ✓
• Proximity ✓
The Role of Islands in Maritime Boundary Delimitation

Article 121

Regime of islands

1. An island is a naturally formed area of land, surrounded by water, which is above water at high tide.

2. Except as provided for in paragraph 3, the territorial sea, the contiguous zone, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf of an island are determined in accordance with the provisions of this Convention applicable to other land territory.

3. Rocks which cannot sustain human habitation or economic life of their own shall have no exclusive economic zone or continental shelf.
ENTITLEMENT OF ISLANDS TO CS/EEZ AREAS AND THEIR EFFECT TO MARITIME BOUNDARY DELIMITATION ARE TWO DIFFERENT ISSUES.

Islands in delimitation may have been given no weight in the construction of the relevant continental shelf or EEZ delimitation line.

The reason is not related to their entitlement or their potential capacity to create continental shelf or EEZ areas.

The reason is their distortive effect on equity.

In maritime boundary delimitation, islands may receive
- full effect
- partial effect
- full enclave or partial enclave
- no effect

either through state practice or in international urisprudence

In delimitation cases, involving islands competing with mainland coasts, equitable delimitation takes into account non-encroachment, avoidance of cut-off effects of islands and the avoidance of disproportionate results.
There has been a sustained trend in international jurisprudence towards awarding islands a reduced effect in maritime boundary delimitation.

This has proved to be especially the case where such islands are located at a considerable distance offshore and opposed to mainland coasts as they would create a disproportionate impact.

Some examples of jurisprudence and state practice where islands have received a reduced effect or been partially or wholly enclaved or even completely ignored.
CASES - 1985 Libya-Malta

1985 Libya-Malta

Reduced Effect

CASES – 1992 Canada-France (St Pierre and Miquelon)

1992 Canada-France (St Pierre and Miquelon)

Enclave and Reduced Effect
CASES – 1993 Denmark-Norway (Jan Mayen)

Reduced Effect

CASES – 1999 Yemen-Eritrea – Mixed

Full Effect

No Effect

Reduced Effect
Cases – 2009 Romania-Ukraine

No Effect

Cases – 2012 Nicaragua-Colombia

Partial Effect

Sketch-map No. 11: Course of the maritime boundary
This sketch-map has been prepared for illustrative purposes only.
Mercator Projection 112° 30' NO
State Practice – 1969 Iran-Qatar Agreement

State Practice – 1971 Tunisia-Italy Agreement
State Practice – 1973 Canada-Denmark (Greenland)

1973 Continental Shelf Boundary Line

Sovereignty Disputed yet overlooked in delimitation agreement

State Practice – 1988 USSR-Sweden Agreement

Reduced Effect (1/3)

Joint Fisheries Zone (112)
Australian Islands as close as few miles to Papua New Guinea lying on the “wrong side”

**SOLUTION**

1978 Torres Strait Treaty

- TS and CS boundary established
- Territorial sea limit fixed for 3NM
- Islands lying on the wrong side encalved
- Agreed on joint fisheries management
- Established a Joint Protection Zone
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As seen from these examples, there is no automacity in claiming that islands generate full maritime jurisdiction areas. This is not the case in international law.

Islands are given limited effect in maritime boundary delimitation if their location distorts equitable delimitation.

Based on international law, we have made our position clear since 2004 and registered our position in the United Nations.

We believe that the Island of Cyprus in the west of the Island and the Greek Islands in the area including Castellorizo cannot generate full EEZ/CS under international law as they distort the equitable delimitation.
Any delimitation exercise in the Eastern Mediterranean needs to take into account the legal rights and legitimate interests of Turkey.

The Turkish continental shelf to the west of Island of Cyprus is starting from longitude 32°16'18"E, then following the equidistance line between Turkish and Egyptian coastlines,

to a point to be determined to the west of 28°00'00"E, in accordance with the outcome of future delimitation agreements in the Aegean Sea and the Mediterranean among all relevant States taking into account all prevailing parameters and special circumstances.

The delimitation of continental shelf in a semi-enclosed sea like the Mediterranean should be effected by agreement respecting rights and interests of the countries concerned under international law, both customary and case-law.
As seen from these examples, there is no automacity in claiming that islands generate full maritime jurisdiction areas. This is not the case in international law.

Third parties should refrain from taking sides in overlapping maritime boundary claims and acting as a court in deciding on maritime boundaries.

The final maritime boundaries in that part of the Mediterranean can only be settled through agreements to be concluded between the coastal states based on international law and the equitable principle.

As far as Cyprus is concerned this would only be possible after the political settlement.

- EU has no competence in delimiting maritime boundaries.
- EU has never taken a side in supporting the claim of one side in overlapping maritime claims.
GC’s started off-shore drilling on 19 September 2011

- off-shore activities of TCs & GCs be ceased simultaneously until the settlement

- OR both sides should determine jointly the future course of off-shore oil/gas activities, including revenue sharing and funding of a possible settlement.
THE WAY AHEAD

- Overlapping Claims
  - Agree to Disagree
- Third Party Solutions
  - ICJ – Arbitration
- Bilateral
  - MBD Agreements
- Joint Management
  - Joint Development
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TURKEY & TRNC & GC OFF-SHORE LICENCE AREAS

- TR Licences
- TRNC Licences
- GC Licences
We will resolutely continue our survey and drilling activities in our continental shelf in the areas where our Government granted the Turkish Petroleum licenses in 2009 and 2012.

Likewise, unless the Greek Cypriots include the Turkish Cypriots, as the equal partners of the Island, into the decision making mechanisms regarding hydrocarbon resources or cease their unilateral hydrocarbon activities, we will continue to protect the continental shelf rights of the Turkish Cypriots as well.