

Distr.: General
18 June 2020
Arabic
Original: English

الجمعية العامة



مجلس حقوق الإنسان

الدورة الثالثة والأربعون

24 شباط/فبراير - 20 آذار/مارس 2020

البند 2 من جدول الأعمال

التقرير السنوي لمفوض الأمم المتحدة السامي لحقوق

الإنسان وتقارير المفوضية السامية والأمين العام

مذكرة شفوية مؤرخة 18 آذار/مارس 2020 موجهة من البعثة الدائمة
لتركيا لدى مكتب الأمم المتحدة في جنيف إلى مفوضية الأمم المتحدة
السامية لحقوق الإنسان

تهدي البعثة الدائمة لجمهورية تركيا لدى مكتب الأمم المتحدة والمنظمات الدولية الأخرى في جنيف تحياتها إلى مفوضية الأمم المتحدة السامية لحقوق الإنسان، وتشرف بأن توافيها بنسخة رسالة من نائب رئيس الوزراء وزير خارجية الجمهورية التركية لشمال قبرص، الأستاذ قدرت أوزرساي (انظر المرفق)، تبين رأي القبارصة الأتراك في تقرير مفوضية الأمم المتحدة السامية لحقوق الإنسان عن مسألة حقوق الإنسان في قبرص (A/HRC/43/22) الذي قُدم إلى مجلس حقوق الإنسان في دورته الثالثة والأربعين.

وستكون البعثة الدائمة لجمهورية تركيا ممتنة إذا عُممت هذه المذكرة الشفوية ومرفقها* باعتبارها وثيقة من وثائق الدورة الثالثة والأربعين لمجلس حقوق الإنسان.

* استُنسخ المرفق كما ورد، وباللغة التي قُدم بها فقط.



الرجاء إعادة الاستعمال

GE.20-08066(A)



* 2 0 0 8 0 6 6 *

Annex to the note verbale dated 18 March 2020 from the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Letter dated 13 March 2020 of H. E. Prof. Kudret Özersay, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus addressed to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Excellency,

I have the honour to refer to Your Excellency's Report on the "Question of human rights in Cyprus", dated 31 January 2020 (A/HRC/43/22), which covers the period from 1 December 2018 to 30 November 2019, and convey to Your Excellency, the factual comments and assessments of the Turkish Cypriot side as well as the various factual errors and omissions in Report.

As the Turkish Cypriot side, we have worked closely throughout the preparation of the draft Report with Your Office and conveyed an extensive written document entitled "Contributions of the Turkish Cypriot side to the upcoming Report on the Question of Human Rights in Cyprus". In this regard, I would like to express our appreciation for the opportunity given to us by your esteemed Organisation to convey our views as one of the co-owners of the island of Cyprus, at first-hand regarding the situation of human rights in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) as well as the human rights concerns of the Turkish Cypriot people relating to the issues included in the Report.

However, to our great dismay, we have observed from the published Report that the factual information put forth by the Turkish Cypriot side have been disregarded to a great extent. It seems that in an effort to appease known Greek Cypriot reactions, the author opted to refrain from directly criticizing a so-called member of the United Nations, namely, the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus, allowing political considerations triumph over human rights concerns.

Direct link made in the Report between the so-called "division" of the island and the difficulties faced on the implementation of international human rights standards throughout the island is too hasty an approach. In fact, it is not the absence of a political settlement but the refusal of the Greek Cypriot side to communicate and cooperate between the two sides on issues of mutual concern, including human rights issues that is causing difficulties. Moreover, international organisations also fall short of communicating and cooperating with the Turkish Cypriot side even on humanitarian matters, due to the Greek Cypriot political propaganda and pressure, and this is also contributing to the difficulties in this regard. A case in point is the visit of the H.E. Prof Kudret Özersay, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the TRNC, to Geneva, Switzerland, between the dates 2-5 July 2019, for various meetings, including with heads of some UN bodies, with a view to mainly discuss human rights and humanitarian issues. Nevertheless, despite confirmed meetings, as a result of the Greek Cypriot administration's initiatives and efforts, some of these meetings were cancelled at the last minute or were downgraded. Unfortunately, since the pressure exerted by the Greek Cypriot administration produces results, the said administration pursues such policies even more aggressively violating one of the basic rights of the Turkish Cypriot people, as an equal co-owner of the island, namely to be heard.

The selective references in the Report to certain documents and findings of international sources such as the UN Secretary-General's reports on the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and the consideration of the judgements of European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), not only fall short of reflecting the true picture as a whole but leading to biased implications as regards the issues dealt with, overshadowing impartiality of the Report. In this respect, it is most unfortunate that the

author chose to make direct references to quotations from the Greek Cypriot statements and documents provided during the third Universal Periodic Review (UPR) on Cyprus. This approach which in many instances culminated in advocating Greek Cypriot political positions, not only casts a serious shadow on the objectivity of the Report but undermines the UN human rights mechanisms and other independent sources which level their findings with Greek Cypriot allegations.

Employing the wording imposed by the Greek Cypriot authorities in relation to the Universal Periodic Review and referring to Turkish Cypriots along with Roma community in various parts of the Report gives the impression that the Turkish Cypriots are a “minority group” in Cyprus, which is untrue and unacceptable. As also enshrined in the 1960 international Treaties governing Cyprus, there are two politically equal communities in Cyprus, namely the Turkish Cypriot people and the Greek Cypriot people. As known, it is in line with this undeniable fact that the UN sponsored negotiations to find a settlement to the Cyprus issue are conducted between the two politically equal sides on the island.

The reference in paragraph 6, to the Greek Cypriot side’s baseless claim of “illegal occupation” is an unacceptable factual error which has no place in a report on human rights. In fact, the only occupation in Cyprus remains, after more than 50 years, the occupation of the seat of government of the 1960 partnership Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot administration which ejected by force of arms the Turkish Cypriot partner from all state organs. Turkey rightfully and legally intervened on the Island in July 1974 in accordance with its rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, with a view to putting an end to violence and suppression perpetrated against the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot side between 1963 and 1974, as well as preventing annexation of the Island to Greece. Moreover, it should be remembered that none of the United Nations Security Council resolutions on Cyprus refers to the legitimate and rightful intervention of Turkey in 1974 as “invasion or occupation”. Hence, this language, which is not used in any UN document but has been directly quoted by the author from the Greek Cypriot statements and documents provided during the Universal Periodic Review should have not been employed in any manner in the Report.

We welcome the reference in paragraph 11 to the UN Secretary-General’s assessment on increased cooperation as well as the reference to the isolation on the Turkish Cypriot people. However, both issues should have been more effectively dealt with in a report on human rights. As also encouraged by the UN at the highest level, the direct communication and cooperation not only between the two sides but with each side and the international actors, leading to building of trust and interdependence, would, amongst all, result in effectively addressing the issues of human rights concerns affecting both peoples of the island. The isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriot people constitutes a fundamental human rights violation as it restricts the rights of Turkish Cypriot people in all fields of life ranging from trade to travel, from culture to sports. In this regard, the reference to the unjust and inhuman isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriot people as a mere “concern” is unacceptable. Isolation is a reality, not a concern, faced daily by the Turkish Cypriot people. This reference is also unjust in view of the fact that UN officials in Cyprus are everyday witnesses to the hardship endured by the Turkish Cypriot people as a result of isolation.

The Report, in paragraphs 15 and 16, disappointingly fails to reflect the truth as regards the issue of landmines and opts to assign equal responsibility on both sides in an attempt to appease the Greek Cypriot administration. As elaborated in the annexed document under the heading “Demining” (pages 30-31), the Turkish Cypriot side is committed to achieving a mine-free island and has made concrete constructive proposals to that end in 2014, 2015 and 2018 which have all been turned down by the Greek Cypriot side. Unfortunately, the Report refrains from openly stating that it is the Greek Cypriot side’s delaying tactics and lack of cooperation which hinders progress towards achieving a mine-free island, in general, and delivering on the agreement of 26 February 2019, in particular. Furthermore, the Report fails to state, when referring to 4 minefields within the buffer-zone, 3 of which are on the Greek Cypriot side, that the said areas are included in the proposal of the Turkish Cypriot side for a mine-free island, which is repeatedly refused by the Greek Cypriot administration.

Paragraph 19, contains serious factual mistakes. It is most disappointing that the author, once again, opted to communicate developments regarding the work of the CMP with totally erroneous terminology deliberately employed by the Greek Cypriot side as part of its efforts to imply that its counterpart on the issue is Turkey, which is wrong.

The Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus (CMP) was established as a tripartite UN committee with a Turkish Cypriot, a Greek Cypriot and a third member appointed by the UN Secretary-General with a specified mandate and principles of operation. Accordingly, the requests for access to all areas of excavation in North Cyprus and South Cyprus as well as the arrangements for carrying out the excavation are respectively made by the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot members with the relevant Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot authorities.

In this connection it should be noted that the Turkish Cypriot authorities exercise sovereignty and jurisdiction within their own territory, i.e. North Cyprus and thus the sole authority to grant permission for excavations in North Cyprus is the Turkish Cypriot side.

Hence, I would like to stress that CMP carried out excavations in 30 military areas in North Cyprus as per the agreement and arrangements made by the relevant Turkish Cypriot authorities. Similarly, Turkish Cypriot authorities granted the Committee access to 30 additional military areas.

The Report, in paragraph 26, refers to “internally displaced persons”, which is in line with the archaic Greek Cypriot propaganda. As explained in the annexed document, under the heading “Non-Discrimination” (pages 24-25), the *Voluntary Exchange of Populations Agreement*, at the inter-communal talks held on 2 August 1975, in Vienna, was agreed between the two sides in the aftermath of which Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots were respectively transferred to North Cyprus and South Cyprus under the auspices of the UN. As a result, for more than 50 years, the Turkish Cypriot people as well as the Greek Cypriot people have been living peacefully side by side in their own areas. Within these circumstances, referring to Turkish Cypriots living in North Cyprus and Greek Cypriots living in South Cyprus as displaced is inappropriate. I would like also underline that there are cases around the world where similar voluntary population exchange agreements were reached and implemented, however, in none of these cases the people who moved as a result of such agreements are referred as “displaced”.

It is unfortunate that the Report refers, in paragraph 29, to the finalization of criminal prosecutions against a number of the Greek Cypriots who attacked vehicles belonging to Turkish Cypriots in 2015, as if this is an adequate development. This approach overlooks the fact that it took four years to bring some of the perpetrators of only one incident to justice, while some other perpetrators are still to be brought to justice. Moreover, there is no mention of the fact that this late judgement is the first of its kind and that there exist tens of other incidents perpetuated against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriots, which are either not investigated. The recent attack on 5 July 2019 on a Turkish Cypriot bus driver in Larnaca airport, which occurred during the reporting period, clearly demonstrates that the Greek Cypriot administration has no will to put in place an effective plan of action in order to tackle the persistent racially motivated attacks against Turkish Cypriots. Such attacks in South Cyprus are threat to personal security of Turkish Cypriots which amount to violation of right to life. It is a serious shortcoming of the Report that the recent attack against a Turkish Cypriot bus driver, the details of which were provided to OHCHR and are also contained herewith in the annex (page 29), is not included in the relevant section, namely “Non-discrimination”.

As regards the section on freedom of movement and especially paragraph 32, it should be stressed that the opening of crossing points in 2003 was a unilateral decision by the Turkish Cypriot side initiated by the Founding President Rauf Raif Denktaş. As the party taking initiative towards enhancing the freedom of movement across the island, the Turkish Cypriot side imposes no restrictions on freedom of movement on anyone crossing between North Cyprus and South Cyprus. What is impeding the freedom of movement on the island is the discriminatory and arbitrary policies employed by the Greek Cypriot side against some Turkish Cypriots and third party nationals in this regard. Please see the section entitled “Freedom of Movement” in the annex (pages 23-24) for extensive

illustration of the problems pertaining to the freedom of movement on the island. It is disappointing that these problems which occurred during the reporting period have not been included in the Report.

In paragraph 35, the Report rightly but inadequately refers to the fact that the Greek Cypriot Council of Ministers approved an amendment on the Code for the implementation of the Regulation of the European Council (866/2004/EC) on the Green Line. While the Report infers the conclusion that the amendment will result in restrictions on the freedom of movement on the island, it unfortunately falls short of elaborating the underlying motive behind such amendment, that is to harm the tourism sector and economy of the Turkish Cypriot people with the sole aim of intensifying the inhuman and unjust isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriot side. It should further be emphasized that the obstructionist actions of the Greek Cypriot side are not only confined to this recent individual example but perpetuated in many other areas during the reporting period. A non-exhaustive list can be found in the annexed document under the heading of “Various Examples of Violations of Human Rights of Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriot side in 2019” (pages 27-30), none of which have been reflected in the relevant sections of the Report, despite the fact that OHCHR was made aware of them.

In paragraphs 36 and 37, the Report, once again, adopts a biased approach influenced by Greek Cypriot figures and findings provided within the context of the Universal Periodic Review, and attributes responsibility on the Turkish Cypriot for the increased number of asylum applications filed to the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus. As is known and as is extensively elaborated in the annex (pages 25-26), the Turkish Cypriot side took the initiative and established a working mechanism in coordination with the Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in South Cyprus in order to facilitate the safe passage of eligible persons to South Cyprus to ease their plight as well as eliminating the risk of refoulement. It is only fair to expect that the Report of the OHCHR would reflect the existence of this mechanism which could be confirmed by the UNHCR authorities and shed light on the fact that a considerable number of people crossing to South Cyprus through this mechanism, though are approved for crossing by the Greek Cypriot side, is included in the Greek Cypriot figures of irregular crossings for political propaganda purposes. In view of this fact, it also adds insult to injury that the new visa regime introduced for purely humanitarian reasons in line with international rules and standards, as explained in detail in the relevant section of the attached annex, is reflected as a measure with negative implications. Given the fact that the aforementioned visa regime entered into force only five months before the end date of the reporting period, it would be difficult to gather factual evidence supporting the self-assumed deduction included in the Report as regards this action.

Albeit the fact that we had provided to the OHCHR an extensive contribution as regards the issue of property rights and the effective remedy mechanism on the Turkish Cypriot side as also included herewith in the annex (pages 16-21), the author opted to elaborate in length solely on the property rights of one of the two peoples on the island, namely the Greek Cypriot people, in the relevant paragraphs of the Report. On the other hand, the Report, in paragraph 41, merely confines itself to mentioning the “Custodianship Law” in South Cyprus but fails to elaborate that the existence of this law deprives Turkish Cypriots of their rights to property since it is not an effective remedy mechanism as explained in the attached annex (pages 16-21). Omission to mention the difficulties Turkish Cypriots experience in this regard cast a serious shadow on the impartiality of the Report. We welcome the fact that the Report refers to the friendly settlements before the IPC number of which is, in fact, 974.

The wording employed in paragraph 42 which refers to the Greek Cypriots living in North Cyprus as “enclaved” is a misrepresentation. Greek Cypriots who chose to live in North Cyprus has, unfortunately, become a constant subject of political exploitation by the Greek Cypriot side through its well-known political rhetoric. The Greek Cypriots and Maronites who have chosen to reside in North Cyprus enjoy access to religious, educational and health facilities in North Cyprus, are able to benefit from all health, municipal, etc., services that are afforded to TRNC citizens, are free to travel anywhere like any other inhabitant of our island and they themselves deny the claim that they are “enclaved” as

elaborated in the annex under the heading “Non-Discrimination” (pages 24-25). Moreover, no such terminology has ever been employed by the UN when referring to Greek Cypriots living in North Cyprus. In this regard, the wording in paragraph 29, which refers to the various activities of UNFICYP towards the Greek Cypriot and Maronite communities and individuals living in North Cyprus as “humanitarian” is also factually incorrect. It is a disappointment that these factual mistakes were not rectified in the Report.

Another shortcoming of the Report is the failure to include in paragraph 45 any of the information provided to OHCHR as regards the fenced area of Maraş and is included herewith in the annex (pages 31-34), particularly the fact that rights of possession of former inhabitants of Maraş will be protected as also called for in the relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions. Furthermore, it is wrong and unfortunate that the OHCHR misled by Greek Cypriot leadership’s political propaganda, calls for the immediate cessation of the steps by my Government as regards the fenced area of Maraş, the aim of which is to grant former inhabitants including Greek Cypriots of the said area right to possession. With this call OHCHR, a human rights institution, is, in effect, taking a step aimed at preventing any action which would enable former inhabitants of the fenced area of Maraş to realise their right to possession.

As regards paragraph 48, it should be borne in mind that everyone residing in the TRNC has freedom of access, both individually and collectively, to places of worship regardless of their religious belief. It is also internationally accepted fact that providing for mass religious ceremonies for people residing outside one’s borders is not a responsibility or obligation vis-à-vis freedom of religion. This being the case, the wording employed in the Report which portrays this issue as if it is a matter of religious freedom and as if it only concerns Greek Cypriots, can only be regarded as one-sided. In addition, the Report fails to reflect the actual number of religious services facilitated in North Cyprus. The actual number of religious services facilitated by the Turkish Cypriot side during the reporting period is 155 not 87, and this number is increasing each year. Furthermore, the Report omits to state that access of the Turkish Cypriots to the religious sites in South Cyprus remains strictly restricted and unchanged as elaborated in the annex under the heading of “Religious Freedom” (pages 3-9). Despite our calls for reciprocal respect, there are only 8 mosques that are open for prayer in South Cyprus, some of which lack ablution/bathroom facilities, as opposed to the 78 churches open for individual or collective worship in North Cyprus. Despite these realities, it is disappointing that the Report fails to reflect the realities on the ground in a just manner.

In paragraph 61, the Report refers to the divergent school curricula in Cyprus but overlooks the fact that the Turkish Cypriot side has revised its school books a few years back, removing all negative language in the textbooks while the Greek Cypriot side has been refusing to revise the elements of enmity and discrimination contained in the school books used in Greek Cypriot schools in South Cyprus. Moreover, in paragraph 63, the Report refers to the issue of appointment of Greek Cypriot teachers to the Greek Cypriot school in the Karpaz region but omits to provide the justified reasons behind our objection to the appointment of certain teachers. The objection of the Turkish Cypriot side to the appointment of certain teachers is not on an arbitrary basis but rather in line with the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), especially in Article 26. Unfortunately, some of the Greek Cypriot teachers appointed to the Greek Cypriot schools in North Cyprus use racist, offensive and chauvinistic language against Turkish Cypriots/Turks. In cases where this behaviour is established beyond doubt and/or in cases where a new nominee is established to have a chauvinistic background with such tendencies, the appointment of these teachers are naturally not approved by the Turkish Cypriot authorities. Furthermore, the Report, unfortunately, fails to underline the fact that a Turkish Cypriot school is yet to be established in Limassol in South Cyprus for the past 23 years, in complete violation of the right to education in one’s mother tongue and in spite of the official recommendation by former UN Secretary-General and the acceptance by the Greek Cypriot authorities to follow his recommendation. In view of the fact that this continued violation has been regularly included in the relevant reports of the UN Secretaries-General, and most recently in the report of the present UN Secretary-General issued within the reporting period (S/2019/37, para.32), it is unacceptable that this prevailing violation is not included in the Report.

In the interest of reflecting a more objective and balanced account of the situation vis-à-vis the issue of human rights in Cyprus, I hope and trust that the facts and views conveyed in this letter as well as the enclosed annex will duly be taken into consideration and be reflected accordingly in the upcoming Report. I kindly request the letter and its annex to be circulated as a document of the forty-third session of the Human Rights Council under agenda item 2. I also deem that a meeting between Your Excellency and myself would be positive and beneficial in terms of deliberating on human rights issues in Cyprus face-to-face.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Prof. Kudret Özersay
Deputy Prime Minister and
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Attachment

Contributions of the Turkish Cypriot side to the report on the question of human rights in Cyprus (A/HR/43/22)

Introductory comment

Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots are the two equal co-owner peoples of the island. The fact that the negotiations to reach a settlement to the longstanding Cyprus problem have always been between the two sides, namely the Turkish Cypriot side and the Greek Cypriot side, for the past 51 years is also testimony to the fact that the island of Cyprus is comprised of two distinct peoples and administrations. By virtue of this, it should be borne in mind that almost all issues relating to Cyprus, including issues of freedom of religion, cultural rights, right to property and missing persons, equally affect both peoples of the island.

Nevertheless, despite this reality, international community's predisposition, as is the case in the OHCHR's report on the question of human rights in Cyprus, in opting to prioritise issues concerning Greek Cypriots and at times even acting oblivious to issues relating to Turkish Cypriots is disappointing and casts a shadow as regards the sincerity and objectivity of such reports. We hope that the OHCHR, in its upcoming report pertaining to Cyprus will duly consider this fact when addressing issues of human rights affecting both peoples of the island, which it has failed to do so in the present Report.

The Turkish Republic Northern Cyprus (TRNC) is committed to promoting and upholding human rights in North Cyprus. However, the Greek Cypriot side has been politicizing even highly sensitive humanitarian issues for false propaganda purposes to defame the Turkish Cypriot side, at international platforms, where the Turkish Cypriot side is not present. In view of this fact, direct cooperation and communication with the Turkish Cypriot side is of utmost importance in terms of the objectivity and factual correctness of international reports.

In this connection, please find below, a detailed, albeit non-exhaustive account of the views of and realities pertaining to the Turkish Cypriot side within the framework of human rights

Unjust and inhuman isolation of the Turkish Cypriot People

It is very disappointing that the reports of the OHCHR to date have failed to highlight the most important human rights violation on the island, namely the unjust and inhuman isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus since 1963, by merely referring to it as a "concern" of the Turkish Cypriot people. The unjust and inhuman isolation is a concrete reality affecting the daily lives of the Turkish Cypriot people ranging from travel to trade, sports and culture to political representation and the main element poisoning the relationship between the two peoples of the island, thus, rendering a negotiated settlement in Cyprus elusive for all these years. This reference is unjust and unacceptable in view of the fact that UN officials in Cyprus are everyday witnesses to the hardship endured by the Turkish Cypriot people as a result of the isolation and calls into question the objectivity and impartiality of the UN on the matter.

As a matter of fact, the continuation of the isolation is also unjustified in view of the political will displayed by the Turkish Cypriot side in terms of a negotiated settlement in Cyprus throughout the 50 years of negotiations, as evidenced most notably in 2004 as well as in the process which started in 2008 and collapsed in 2017 during the Cyprus Conference at Crans-Montana, Switzerland. In this connection, the then Secretary-General's Report, dated 28 May 2004 (S/2004/437), should be recalled where it is stated that "there exists no rationale for pressuring and isolating the Turkish Cypriots".

In fact, the call of the UN Secretary-General, in his report on Cyprus (S/2019/562), (corresponding to the reporting period of the OHCHR Report) to *the two sides, local and*

international actors to cooperate, without clinging to surmountable obstacles, such as recognition and non-recognition, which was approved by the UN Security Council in its resolution 2483, demonstrates that it has also become the UN's expectation for the international actors and the Greek Cypriot side to cooperate with the Turkish Cypriot side even before achievement of a negotiated settlement. This is in effect a call by the said UN bodies to eliminate the unjust and inhuman isolation. Such a situation will, no doubt, also eliminate the existing mistrust and create interdependency between the two sides, thus acting as an important factor facilitating a negotiated settlement in Cyprus.

In view of the above and in particular the said call by the UN Secretary-General, removal of inhuman isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriot people, which reinforces the unacceptable status quo on the island, remains a moral responsibility of the international community. In this regard, we hope and trust that the OHCHR in its upcoming report on the "Question of Human Rights in Cyprus", will objectively refer to the unjust and inhuman isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriot people thus, giving the impetus for the elimination of this most important human rights violation on the island.

Religious freedom

North Cyprus

- Irrespective of the political climate on the island as regards the Cyprus issue, the Turkish Cypriot side has always attributed utmost importance to inalienable human rights and fundamental freedoms, including religious freedom, as well as to building trust between the two sides, particularly on humanitarian matters.
- As regards religious freedom, everyone residing in the TRNC, whether on an individual or mass basis, has freedom of access to places of worship regardless of their religious belief. For example, different religious groups in the TRNC, such as Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant, Anglican, Alevi, Jehovah's Witnesses, have their own places of worship. To name a few:
 - Maronite Roman Catholics: They worship at the Ayios Georgios (Koruçam), Timios Stavros (Karpasha), Banaiyas Mariadis Church (Hisarköy)
 - Greek Orthodox: They worship at Apostolos Andreas Monastery (Dipkarpaz), Saint Mamas Church (Güzelyurt/Morphou), Saint Barnabas Church (Famagusta), Church of Agia Triada (Sipahi-Agia Triada), Church of Agios Synesios (Dipkarpaz), Church of Agia Triada (Dipkarpaz)
 - Russian-Orthodox: Saint Georgios Church in Kyrenia (Alsancak) and Saint Banaia Church in Arapköy are open for individual visits and mass services on Sundays without any prior notice or application. Saint George Church in Kyrenia (Old Turkish Quarter) is subject to prior notice only because it is located in a privately owned premise.
 - Latin Catholics: St. Elizabeth of Hungary Church in Girne is open for individual visits and mass services without any prior notice or application since 2004.
 - Anglicans: The Panaia/Trachonas Church in Lefkoşa (Kızılbaz) is open for individual visits and mass services on Sundays without any prior application. The Nigerian community regularly uses this Church.
 - Protestants: Saint Andrew's Church in Girne city centre has been open for individual worshippers and mass services without any prior application since 2003.
- Furthermore, Ayios Yeorgios Church (Famagusta) located within the Eastern Mediterranean Campus is open for prayer at all times for Christian students from different denominations (Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant).
 - Alevi: The Cemevi Culture Complex construction in Cihangir (Lefkoşa) was completed recently and is now open for prayers to Alevi community.

- Jehovah's Witnesses: The group has two places of worship in Nicosia and Famagusta in line with the decision of TRNC Council of Ministers dated 19 February 2003 (E-338-2003).
- Bahai: Bahai Center in Lefkoşa is the centre for prayer of Bahai followers.
- It should be noted that individuals whether they come from abroad or are living in TRNC freely exercise their religious beliefs.
- Moreover, although people residing abroad, including in South Cyprus, are free to carry out their religious beliefs within their own borders, the TRNC upholds a policy of additionally enabling them to come and practice their religious beliefs in North Cyprus to the greatest extent possible.
- However, it should be borne in mind that as it is the case anywhere else in the world, TRNC has no responsibility or is under no obligation to provide for the mass religious ceremonies for people coming from abroad because the said people reside in another country, i.e. South Cyprus, and exercise their religious freedom where they live. Hence, this issue should not be portrayed as if it is a matter of religious freedom since it is a gesture of goodwill, a unilateral confidence building measure on the part of the Turkish Cypriot side.
- Anyhow, Turkish Cypriot side in goodwill does its utmost to accommodate the requests of the Greek Cypriot people coming from abroad, including from South Cyprus, for mass ceremonies.
- In this regard, mass religious ceremonies to be conducted by the followers of different faiths on either side of the island are regulated by the relevant authorities of both sides, as part of the established practice.
- The related regulation in the TRNC is only applied for requests from persons living outside of the TRNC who wish to hold mass ceremonies. As stated above, there are no requirements for individuals who wish to fulfil their religious beliefs, whether they come from Southern Cyprus or are living in the TRNC.
- The Turkish Cypriot side facilitates the requests of the Greek Cypriots and Maronites coming from South Cyprus to conduct mass religious services at religiously significant Churches and Monasteries which are open for worship and the necessary facilitation is undertaken by the Deputy Prime Ministry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.
- In this vein, the Turkish Cypriot side established a mechanism where permission is readily granted, provided that the application is in line with the determined objective criteria and the right channels are used.
- In this framework, the Turkish Cypriot side evaluates the requests by Greek Cypriots and Maronites from South Cyprus for mass religious ceremonies based on 6 objective criteria:
 - i) The day of the requested service has to be a religiously significant day (Easter, Christmas or Name Day of the Church);
 - ii) The physical condition of the religious site should be suitable to host a religious service (whether it is safe and secure to accept visitors);
 - iii) The site should not already be in use for another purpose (i.e. museum, cultural centre, library etc.)
 - iv) The religious site should not be situated in a military zone. (However, there are many cases where access to religious sites in military zones are regularly granted);
 - v) There should not be complaints from the local Turkish Cypriot residents living in the vicinity of the church where a religious service will be conducted (there are cases where requests are made to hold religious services in villages where mass ethnic-cleansing by the Greek Cypriots has taken

place in the past, i.e. Taşkent and Muratağa Sandallar, thus Turkish Cypriot villagers, are very sensitive and refuse to have such services in their villages);

- vi) Security measures need to be taken in the vicinity in order to enable smooth delivery of the religious services. However, depending on the number of people attending the religious service, the Police Department might not be able to assign the required number of police officers to the vicinity each time. In these cases, permits shall not be granted.
- The number of mass religious services conducted by persons not residing within the TRNC which have been facilitated by the Turkish Cypriot side have increased each year. While a total number of 38 religious services were approved in the year 2013, this number was 71 in 2014, 96 in 2015, 109 in 2016, 83 in 2017 and 119 in 2018.
- In addition to this, as it can be seen from the enclosed list, the number of approved religious services conducted in the religious sites situated in the Turkish Cypriot side already reached 156 for the period of 1 January 2019 – 29 December 2019 (Annex I). For the reporting period (1 December 2018 – 30 November 2019) the number of approved religious services is 155.
- The fact that the TRNC has regularly increased the number of services that are facilitated in North Cyprus has also been acknowledged in the most recent UNFICYP report dated 10 July 2019 (S/2019/562) as well as in the recent US State Department International Religious Freedom Report.
- It is of utmost importance to highlight the fact that there are 78 churches to which permission is granted for worship in the TRNC (for 5 of which permission has been granted in 2019 for the first time) and this number has been increasing each year. (Annex II)
- Please refer to the table below in order to see the list of churches in North Cyprus which are not subject to the abovementioned criteria and which are open for worship by the Greek Cypriots and Maronites living in North Cyprus as well as those coming from outside of the TRNC (i.e. from South Cyprus):

	<i>Name of the Church</i>	<i>Procedure/Requirements</i>
1*	Monastery Apostolos Andreas (Dipkarpaz-Rizokarpaso- Greek Cypriot)	These sites are open for individual visits and prayers everyday (the hours of Apostolos Andreas are at the discretion of the Greek Cypriot priest who has a key to the site, while St. Mamas and St. Barnabas are open during working hours). Prior notification is required only for masses in order to enable preparations.
	Saint Mamas Church (Morphou, Greek Cypriot)	
	Saint Barnabas Church (Famagusta, Greek Cypriot)	(Always facilitated)
2	Church of Agia Triada (Sipahi-Agia Triada –Greek Cypriot)	Religious services in these Churches are not subject to notification.
3	Church of Agios Synesios (Dipkarpaz-Rizokarpaso-Greek Cypriot)	
4	Church of Agia Triada (Dipkarpaz-Rizokarpaso-Greek Cypriot)	
5	Church of Archangelos Michael (Özhan-Asomatos-Maronite)	Religious services are subject to prior notification on Sundays.
6	Church of Agios Georgios (Koruçam-Kormakitis-Maronite)	Religious services in these Churches are not subject to notification.

	<i>Name of the Church</i>	<i>Procedure/Requirements</i>
7	Church of Timios Stavros (Karpaşa-Karpasia-Maronite)	
8	Church of Panagia (Hisarköy-Kampyli-Maronite)	

*These are three of the most religiously significant sites for Christians on the island

South Cyprus

- As opposed to 78 churches which are open for worship in North Cyprus, there are only 8 mosques that are open to worship by Turkish Cypriot Muslims in the Greek Cypriot side, albeit during museum hours, which is not enough to fulfil the requirements of the Islamic faith. Moreover, of these 8, 2 do not even have the ablution/bathroom facilities in order to perform the ablution ritual prior to prayer required by the Islamic faith.
- Despite this huge gap in the number of places of worship to which access is granted by the two sides on the island, the Report's persistent concentration on North Cyprus, whilst the Turkish Cypriot side is doing its utmost and the Greek Cypriot is not putting in the necessary effort on this issue, is unjust.
- Despite our calls for reciprocal respect to the rights of Muslims in South Cyprus, Greek Cypriot administration's restrictions on freedom of religion and belief as well as access to religious sites in South Cyprus continue.
- Many Muslim places of worship in South Cyprus continue to be locked up at all times with no known procedures for applying for individual or collective access and/or religious pilgrimages, as was also mentioned by the UN Special Rapporteur in the Field of Cultural Rights, Ms. Karima Bennouna, in her preliminary conclusions and observations at the end of her visit to Cyprus on 6 June 2016.
- As mentioned, some mosques in South Cyprus continue to lack the necessary ablution facilities, while others, instead of being registered as "places of worship", are registered as "ancient monuments", and yet continue to be treated as museums which large numbers of tourists can visit at any time, even during prayers, which is obstructive.
- These small number of mosques to which limited access is given include the holy Hala Sultan Tekke Mosque, one of the holiest places of worship for Muslims around the world.
- Hala Sultan Tekke Mosque, registered by the Greek Cypriot department of antiquities as an "ancient monument" is treated as a regular "museum" with restricted access to the site within "working hours"; i.e. 08.30 – 17.00 in winter and 08.30 – 19.30 in summer. Needless to say, the current restricted working hours are far from satisfying the requirements of the Muslim faith, which calls for prayer five times throughout the 24-hour day.
- Furthermore, the Greek Cypriot side does not provide the designated Imam of Hala Sultan Tekke with a key to the site, the way that the Turkish Cypriot side provides a key to a designated Greek Cypriot priest, who resides in Karpaz, to access Apostolos Andreas Monastery in the TRNC – one of the holiest sites for the Orthodox faith - whenever he deems necessary.
- Although Hala Sultan Tekke is a Muslim religious site, it is kept closed by the Greek Cypriot side on three religiously significant days for Christians, namely Christmas, New Years and Easter, unless one of these days falls on a Friday, in which case special permission must be received in order to have the site open for worship. Needless to say, this limits our access to this site – which is one of the holiest sites for Muslims in the world - even further.

- Moreover, the Greek Cypriot administration has constructed highways passing through the land belonging to the Tekke in total disregard of the fact that the land belongs to the Evkaf.
- Turkish Cypriot side has continued to demonstrate its commitment to the protection of cultural heritage on the island in 2019 and supported the work of the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH), namely restoration work of Panagia Church in Paşaköy/Ashia and Church of Ayios Artemios in Gaziköy/Afania which are to be completed very soon.
- On the other hand, it is unfortunate that the condition of Muslim cultural heritage in South Cyprus is not adequately respected. Field studies conducted by our experts and the information gathered from Turkish Cypriots visiting South Cyprus have indicated that out of more than 130 mosques in South Cyprus, 32 of them have been left to collapse while the majority of the remaining are in extremely poor condition. Furthermore, all the movable cultural objects from these monuments, namely hundreds of manuscript Holy Korans, prayer rugs, Holy Koran reading desks and pieces of Islamic iconography have been destroyed or looted.
- Notwithstanding the above mentioned facts about mosques in South Cyprus, the practice by the Greek Cypriot antiquity department pertaining to the removal of historical additions made during the Ottoman time to the churches hundreds years ago is unacceptable. One of the prominent examples of this is the mosque in Poli. It should be noted that this practice is in contravention of the international restoration ethics and rules.
- It is very unfortunate that the Report fails to refer to the abovementioned facts.

Issue of missing persons

- Contrary to the perception deliberately created by the Greek Cypriot side, the issue of missing persons in Cyprus affects both the Turkish Cypriot side and Greek Cypriot side and, in fact, has begun affecting Turkish Cypriots in 1963, way before the Greek Cypriots. Between 1963 and 1974 hundreds of Turkish Cypriots were kidnapped from their work places, homes or roads never to be seen or heard of again. Hence, a considerable amount of Turkish Cypriots went missing before the events of 1974.
- It is also a known fact, supported by available statistical data, that the majority of the 493 Turkish Cypriot missing persons since 1963 are civilians, whereas the majority of the 1508 Greek Cypriot missing persons are military personnel.
- In the view of above, the Report should have reflected the fact that this is an issue affecting both peoples, however, failed, once again, to do so.

Proactive steps taken by the Turkish Cypriot side as regards the issue of Missing Persons

- The Turkish Cypriot side does its utmost on this humanitarian issue affecting both sides to assist and contribute to the work of the Committee of Missing Persons (CMP) so that CMP successfully delivers its mandate.
- In this connection, the Turkish Cypriot side continues to provide new information to the CMP to locate places of burial. As it is also recorded in the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council dated 1 December 2000 (S/2000/1138, para. 14), all the information at the disposal of the Turkish side has been shared with the CMP back in 1998. However, any new information that comes to light is shared with CMP. To this end, on 29 January 2019, TRNC police gave to the Turkish Cypriot Member of the CMP remains found in the Şirinevler-Göçeri area so that they check whether they belong to a missing person on the CMP's list.
- Upon finding evidence on potential burial places, the Turkish Cypriot side accommodates the access of the CMP to any area throughout the TRNC, be it by

interrupting the construction of a major road or giving access to those military areas CMP asks for according to its work plan. In June 2019, access to 30 additional suspected burial sites in military areas in North Cyprus was granted. Excavations will be done according to the excavation planning of the CMP. In North Cyprus, a total of 1050 exhumations were conducted by the CMP, 992 in the civilian areas and 58 in the military areas.

- Furthermore, an Archive Committee was established in 2016 in Northern Cyprus, which is comprised of military authorities, police authorities, experts from the Ministry of Health and National Archives as well as other relevant units of the Government, to examine the relevant archives for the information requested by the CMP regarding the location of missing persons. The Committee has been actively cooperating to respond to the information requests of the CMP. In this connection, access was given to the Turkish Cypriot Member's Office to check the aerial photos dating 1974. This practice is in line with the practice of the UN to give UN staff access to its archives concerning missing persons in Cyprus.
- TRNC Presidency has also set up a new investigation unit to support the Turkish Cypriot Member's Office investigation team.
- The Turkish Cypriot Member's Office has its own team who is doing research in various state archives, including those of the TRNC Presidency, former President Denktaş etc.
- According to the most recent statistics CMP published, up to 30 November 2019, CMP exhumed 1230 missing persons and identified a total of 965 missing persons, 269 of whom are Turkish Cypriots and 696 of whom are Greek Cypriots.
- The Turkish Cypriot side has also established a special unit, namely the Missing Persons Unit (MPU), which deals with the cases of the Greek Cypriot missing persons whose remains have been found, identified and returned to their families. The Missing Persons Unit conducts criminal investigations into the cases of the identified missing persons under the supervision of the constitutionally independent TRNC Attorney-General's Office. The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) as well as the Committee of Ministers of Council of Europe, which have been examining these investigations periodically within the context of "Cyprus v. Turkey" and "Varnava and Others v. Turkey" judgments, consider the ongoing investigations to be advancing in the right direction.
- Concerning the second phase of the investigation process, the Turkish Cypriot side has been giving detailed information about the criminal investigations being conducted by the Missing Persons Unit and the Attorney-General's Office of the TRNC.
- Until today, CMP conveyed 685 case files to the Missing Persons Unit and the said unit started its criminal investigations. MPU finalized 306 files and sent them to the TRNC Attorney-General's office. This office reviewed the criminal files, completed 199 criminal files and prepared the File Reports for the relatives of missing persons. Missing Persons Unit is currently working on 379 investigation files which are at different stages of investigation.
- On 21 September 2017, Committee of Ministers- Human Rights Meeting¹ (CM-DH) took note of these developments with interest². Progress has also been made in the criminal investigations conducted into the death of Greek Cypriot missing persons.
- Both the TRNC and Turkey continue to support CMP financially. In addition to annual financial contributions to the budget of the Turkish Cypriot Member, the Turkish Cypriot side made an additional donation in the amount of EUR 75,000 on 30 January 2019 to CMP. Turkey, on the other hand, has made a contribution of \$100,000 (EUR 88,500) to CMP in July 2019, bringing the total contribution by Turkey to EUR

¹ Comité des Ministres-Droits de l'Homme

² CM/Del/Dec (2017)1294/H46-30.

\$998,000 over the past twelve years. The UN Secretary-General also considered provision of financial assistance will enable CMP to accelerate its work.

Individual Cases

- Among the 9 missing persons in the *Varnava* case, 3 had been found and the investigation concerning Andreas Varnava and Savvas Kalli Hadjipanteli had been completed. Investigation of Savvas Apostolides, another missing person in the *Varnava* case, is in progress.
- *Varnava vs. Turkey* case is another solid example of how the Greek Cypriot side displays clear intent to divert the focus of work undertaken by the Committee through politicising the issue before the European Parliament, the Council of Europe and the European Court of Human Rights. This intent harms the whole mandate of the CMP, agreed by Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders, by promoting a culture of distrust and is detrimental to prospective constructive endeavours of the Committee which has achieved considerable progress since its establishment. It is clearly evident that the Turkish Cypriot side has demonstrated cooperation and due effort to accommodate any request of excavation by CMP.
- Report, unfortunately, disregarded most of the above information, which should have been included.

Greek Cypriot side is failing to do its part on the issue of Missing Persons

- As evidenced above, Turkish Cypriot/Turkish side is doing its part in ensuring that the CMP functions in the most efficient way. However, the cooperation of all parties involved, including Greek Cypriot/Greek side, is necessary to ensure CMP functions in the most efficient way. This is the reason why the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) in its resolution 2483 (2019) calls upon all parties to expeditiously enhance cooperation and provide full access to all areas to enable CMP to accelerate its work.
- As for supporting the work of the CMP, the Greek Cypriot side has, unfortunately, always dragged its feet as regards solid investigations and responses and chosen to concentrate on receiving information from other sources as a means of blaming others for lack of progress.
- Moreover, to this day, the Greek Cypriot side has failed to reciprocate in terms of facilitating access to all military areas.
- Also, the Greek Cypriot side is yet to give any response to the call of the CMP to search their military or police reports, log books, medical reports or any other document that may include information about burial sites or remains belonging to missing persons. None of the criminal investigations conducted into the deaths of Turkish Cypriot missing persons resulted in either the identification of the perpetrators or the prosecution of those identified. The Greek Cypriot side did not provide the families of the Turkish Cypriot victims with any redress, including adequate compensation and psychological rehabilitation. The attached Table, in **Annex III**, shows the total number of cases that were to be decided by the Attorney-General of the Greek Cypriot side, however, in most cases files were closed with no prosecution.
- Furthermore, it should be noted that the 1963-64 were the years of mass atrocities against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriots, mainly with involvement of the Greek Cypriot police. However, the Greek Cypriot side has not been forthcoming on this. Hence, it should have been underlined in the Report that access to the archives of the Greek Cypriot police is crucial to achieve progress in the work of CMP.
- Despite the above, the Report has failed to mention that Greek Cypriot side has not been pursuing a proactive approach to providing the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus with the necessary assistance to help CMP in achieving tangible results.
- The OHCHR in its reports should bear in mind that, as the Minister's Deputies are responsible for the supervision of the execution of judgements of the ECtHR, the

absence of judgements from the ECtHR, due to procedural reasons, have been preventing the Council of Europe organs from examining whether the Greek Cypriot side is conducting any effective investigation into the whereabouts and fate of the missing Turkish Cypriots. Hence the Minister's Deputies is not in the best position to assess what the other responsible parties (i.e. the Greek Cypriot side) are doing to help CMP achieve tangible results.

- In fact, when the jurisprudence of Greek Cypriot “courts” is examined, it becomes clear that the Greek Cypriot side denies its procedural obligation under Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights. For example, in appeal no. 381/2010³, the Greek Cypriot “Supreme Court”, held that the Convention did not impose any obligation on the Greek Cypriot side to locate, excavate and exhume the bodies of missing persons. In other words, the Greek Cypriot side denies the obligation to cooperate with the CMP to discover the bodies of missing persons and to assist with exhumations and excavations when it comes to its investigations into the fate of missing persons. This outright rejection of obligation is now before the European Court of Human Rights as the relatives of the missing person brought an application before the Court and it was communicated to the Greek Cypriot side on 21 November 2017 (Application no. 58699/15, “Georgia VASSILIOU and others v. Cyprus”).
- These omissions are also contrary to the calls of the UN Human Rights Committee as stated in paragraph 10 of its Concluding Observations in the Fourth Periodic Report on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights where the Human Rights Committee asked the Greek Cypriot side to “... *provide support to the Committee on Missing Persons and take immediate steps to investigate all outstanding cases of missing persons from both the Greek and Turkish communities in an effective, transparent, independent and impartial manner*” and “...*also ensure that the families of the victims obtain appropriate redress, including adequate compensation and psychological rehabilitation, and that the perpetrators are prosecuted and punished as appropriate.*”⁴ In addition to this, the UN Committee against Torture, under the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, has also made a similar call to the Greek Cypriot side in its concluding observations in its 4th report on Cyprus, in paragraph 21, stating that “ *The State party should redouble its efforts to guarantee that the relatives of missing persons identified by CMP receive appropriate redress, including the means for their psychological rehabilitation, compensation, satisfaction and for the implementation of the right to truth...*”⁵
- Hence, the Report should have also referred to the above-mentioned facts which clearly show that as one of the main sides to the issue of Missing Persons, the Greek Cypriot side is failing its responsibility and obligations in this regard.
- Last but not least, the Report wrongfully refers to the Turkish Cypriot authorities as the “Turkish authorities”, as if to imply that the counterpart of the Greek Cypriot side in Cyprus is Turkey. This is factually incorrect and should be rectified in upcoming report. Turkish Cypriot authorities exercise sovereignty and jurisdiction within their own territory, i.e. North Cyprus. Moreover, the fact that the negotiations to find a settlement to the Cyprus issue are also conducted between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot sides is testimony to the fact that the only counterpart of the Greek Cypriot side is the Turkish Cypriot side.
- Some statistical data for the reporting period (1 December 2018 - 30 November 2019)
 - There have been excavations in 70 burial sites by CMP.
 - Estimated number of 21 persons were recovered in these 70 burial sites.

³ Pashias v AGR (civil appeal 381/2010)

⁴ CCPR/C/CYP/CO/4, 30 April 2015, para. 10.

⁵ CAT/C/CYP/CO/4, 16 April 2014, para. 21

- As a result of the examination of these (21 persons), 17 are considered to belong to Greek Cypriots, 2 are considered as unidentified and C14 test results are running for the remaining 2.
- In total, 59 persons from the official list of missing persons has been successfully identified. Of these 59 persons, 29 are Turkish Cypriots and 30 Greek Cypriot identified as missing persons.
- There has also been exhumation and identifications of 15 Greek Cypriots and 2 Turkish Cypriots who were not considered to be missing persons and not reported in the official list of missing persons.
- As of 30 November 2019, according to CMP statistics, the Committee has exhumed the remains of 1,230 persons on both sides of the island as referred to in the Report. To date, the remains of 965 missing persons, 696 of whom Greek Cypriot and 269 of whom Turkish Cypriot, of a total of 2,002, have been identified and returned to their respective families.
- Since 30 November 2018, there have been excavations in 3 military areas in North Cyprus. As a response to the request of the Committee in 2019, permissions for access was granted to 30 new military areas in North Cyprus and permission for excavation was granted to 33 coordinates.
- In North Cyprus, a total of 1050 exhumations were conducted by the CMP, 992 in the civilian areas and 58 in the military areas.

Property

- Report, unjustly concentrates solely on the property rights of one of the two peoples on the island, namely the Greek Cypriot people, whilst ignoring the situation on the ground in South Cyprus concerning the property rights of the Turkish Cypriot people.
- The property issue in Cyprus, as is the case with all issues relating to Cyprus, does not solely affect the Greek Cypriot people but also the Turkish Cypriot people. In fact, Turkish Cypriot people's property dilemma had begun well before that of the Greek Cypriot people. Since the forcible expulsion of the Turkish Cypriot people from the 1960 partnership Republic of Cyprus in early 1960's, many Turkish Cypriots were forced to abandon their properties in South Cyprus.

No effective remedy mechanism in South Cyprus

- Turkish Cypriots who had to abandon their property in South Cyprus are still unable to claim any sort of compensation or any other effective remedy due to the "Custodianship Law" in South Cyprus. Under the "Custodianship Law" in South Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot administration acts as the "Custodian" of Turkish Cypriot properties, preventing their restitution, exchange or compensation to Turkish Cypriots. Two eminent examples are the very land where the Larnaca and Paphos Airports in South Cyprus are built, on which Turkish Cypriot owners have property claims.
- With regard to the property claims of Turkish Cypriots in the Greek Cypriot side, the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) did not find the "Turkish-Cypriot Properties Law 139/1991", which was passed by the Greek Cypriot Parliament, to be an accessible and effective framework of redress in respect of the complaints about interference with the property owned by Turkish Cypriots.⁶ However, in declaring the Turkish Cypriot applications inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies, the ECtHR said that the compliance of the amendment "Law" with the European Convention on Human Rights could not be excluded in light of the fact

⁶ European Court of Human Rights, "*Kazali and Others v. Cyprus*" (application No. 49247/08), decision of 6 March 2012, para. 153.

that the “amendment of 7 May 2010” enabled the Turkish-Cypriot property owner in the Greek Cypriot side to lodge a case in the Greek Cypriot District Court in cases of violation of Convention rights.

- Since the decisions of the ECtHR regarding the applications lodged by Turkish Cypriot property owners, no Turkish Cypriot property owner has been successful in obtaining a judgment from the Greek Cypriot “Supreme Court” that would enable them to exhaust domestic remedies in the way directed by the ECtHR before resorting to the ECtHR for an assessment of the compatibility of the said “amendment Law” with the European Convention on Human Rights.
- The absence of a judgment by the ECtHR or an inquiry by any other monitoring organ enables the Greek Cypriot side to continue to deny providing any redress for the violation of Turkish Cypriot property rights. This is because the said “Law” deprives the Turkish Cypriot property owner from the possession of their properties and transfers possession to the Greek Cypriot “Minister of Interior” without the consent of their Turkish Cypriot owners. The “Guardianship Law” in South Cyprus therefore hinders the rights of Turkish Cypriot property owners, because it relinquishes these rights to the Greek Cypriot administration as the “caretaker” of these properties pending a political settlement in Cyprus.
- New elements are frequently introduced to the “Custodianship Law” which lead to more and more Turkish Cypriot properties being transferred to the custodianship of the Greek Cypriot administration. The absence of clear definition regarding “what a Turkish Cypriot is” and “what properties are Turkish Cypriot” under the Custodianship Law is also problematic since it is restrictive and arbitrary. For example, on 2 June 2019, the Greek Cypriot Supreme Court held that the Greek Cypriot Custodian’s refusal of the sale by a British national property owner, who received the property by donation from his father, was justified as the owner who emigrated to the UK even before the establishment of the 1960 Republic of Cyprus and did not acquire “nationality” was nevertheless a “Turkish Cypriot” for purposes of the Custodianship Law (Appeal No: 219 / 2012). We hope that this fact will find its place in future reports.
- The express provisions of the said “Law” prohibit payment of compensation for the value of the Turkish Cypriot properties, even in cases of requisition and expropriation, and payment of compensation for loss of use for deprivation of possession.
- The lifting of custodianship that would enable the return of properties to their Turkish Cypriot owners is being denied in an arbitrary manner. While the “amendment Law” empowers the Greek Cypriot Minister to deny lifting of Custodianship for ownership of former Greek Cypriot properties in the TRNC, it does not exchange the title of such properties in North Cyprus to the Turkish Cypriot owner.⁷ Instead, Turkish Cypriots in such cases could even be prosecuted under section 281 of the “Criminal Law”. The few cases where the Greek Cypriot “Minister of Interior” lifted custodianship, was to enable the Turkish Cypriots to sell their properties, far below their market value, to Greek Cypriots without any payment of loss of use by the Greek Cypriot side.
- The Greek Cypriot side’s publication of data regarding Turkish Cypriot properties via a website is insufficient to address the serious violations against the Turkish Cypriots regarding the issue of property. Moreover, the data for the Turkish Cypriot properties is published in Greek language which represents the insincere intention of Greek Cypriot side. Maintaining complete control and alleged ownership of Turkish Cypriot properties under the “Custodianship Law” is a clear violation by the Greek Cypriot side of the right to possession and property of Turkish Cypriot owners.
- It is disappointing that the Report turns a blind eye to the above-mentioned facts.

⁷ See, for example, the “judgment” of the Greek Cypriot “Supreme Court” exercising its revisional jurisdiction, (Case no. 1079 /2012), dated 22 June 22, 2015.

Effective Remedy Mechanism on the Turkish Cypriot side

- Unlike the Greek Cypriot side, which does not provide an effective remedy mechanism for Turkish Cypriot properties in South Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriot side recognises and respects the right to property including that of Greek Cypriots, who left properties in North Cyprus and hence, has formed an effective domestic remedy mechanism, namely the Immovable Property Commission, to handle the claims of Greek Cypriots in accordance with the rulings of the European Court of Human Rights.
- The Immovable Property Commission has been declared as ‘an effective domestic remedy’ by the European Court of Human Rights in its decision of *Demopoulos v. Turkey*⁸ which states that it “provides an accessible and effective framework of redress in respect of complaints about interference with the property owned by the Greek Cypriots”. Property claims by the Greek Cypriots are being duly addressed by the said domestic mechanism in line with the European Court of Human Rights.
- As of 24 December 2019, 6,649 applications have been lodged with the Commission and 974 of them have been concluded through friendly settlements and 33 through formal hearing⁹. The Commission has ordered the payment of GBP 303,877,517.- to the applicants as compensation. Moreover, it has ruled for exchange and compensation in two cases, for restitution in 3 cases and for restitution and compensation in 7 cases. In one case it has delivered a decision for restitution after the settlement of Cyprus issue, and in one case it has ruled for partial restitution.
- Immovable Property Commission is the general measure that satisfies the requirements of the ECtHR’s judgments both in the Xenides-Arestis group, which consists of individual property cases found admissible by the ECtHR before the Demopoulos decision, including the *Loizidou*, *Alexandrou* and *Tymvios* judgments, as well as, the displaced persons cluster in the “Cyprus v. Turkey”. It is expected that CM-DH will conclude its supervision of the general measures in these judgments upon concluding its analysis of the information given on the implementation of the avenues provided within the Immovable Property Commission framework that address the issue of unlawful sales and exploitation of properties in the TRNC.
- Although the Secretariat responsible for execution of judgments in the Council of Europe and a majority of Delegations in the CM-DH also confirm that individual measures in the cases of *Loizidou*, *Alexandrou* and *Tymvios* have been adopted and their examination could be closed, the Greek Cypriot side, supported by a few Delegations, prevented the adoption of Final Resolutions for the closure of these three judgments during the June 2019 CM-DH meeting. Availability of the Immovable Property Commission also addresses the claims of the remaining individual applicants in the Xenides-Arestis group.
- Nevertheless, the CM-DH could not adopt decisions following the examination of the Xenides-Arestis group nor the displaced persons cluster of “Cyprus v. Turkey” in the June 2019 CM-DH meeting because, unfortunately, the Greek Cypriot side keeps politicising the property issue and preventing the closure of supervision of these cases before the CM-DH. The last report merely noted that the closure of supervision for a number of relevant cases under the Ministers’ Deputies in the Council of Europe (CM-DH) could not be realised, failing to state the reason for this non-closure which gives the impression that Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey have failed to realise their responsibilities. In fact, the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey have fulfilled the necessary individual measures and there is no obstruction for closure as determined by the Secretariat, however, the process could not, yet, reach its natural closure due to the Greek Cypriot side’s persistent pressure on voting

⁸ *Demopoulos v. Turkey*, App. Nos. 46113/99, 3843/02, 13751/02, 13466/03, 10200/04, 14163/04, 19993/04, 21819/04 (Eur. Ct. H.R. 2010), para. 127:

⁹ <http://www.tamk.gov.ct.tr/>

countries in the Committee, preventing achievement of sufficient vote to close the said supervision. This should be highlighted in the upcoming report.

- There has been some progress with respect to the property rights of Karpaz residents and their heirs. In September 2019, the CM-DH while recalling its decision that appreciated the measures taken in its decision 1236th meeting in the “Cyprus v. Turkey” case in September 2015, noted the measures taken and decided to resume consideration of this cluster with a view to considering whether to close their supervision in June 2020 in light of the information given on the number of applications before the Immovable Property Commission by Greek Cypriots covered by this part of the judgment¹⁰. The measures that were welcomed in the CM-DH decision were those taken by the Turkish Cypriot authorities to ensure the Greek Cypriot Karpaz residents keep their properties by maintaining minimum contacts upon permanent departure from North Cyprus, and to recognize the property rights of their heirs, as well as, the redress provided by the Immovable Property Commission as a last resort. In its independent assessment, the Secretariat confirmed that this positive evaluation of the Ministers’ Deputies of the Council of Europe made in 2015 continues to be valid today¹¹.
- Unfortunately, the Report fails to reflect the above-mentioned facts.

Right to education

- Turkish Cypriot students’ right to a school providing education in their mother tongue Turkish is non-existent in South Cyprus. In spite of the official recommendation by the then UN Secretary-General and the acceptance by the Greek Cypriot authorities to follow his recommendation stated in the Report of the then UN Secretary-General dated 7 June 1996 (S/1996/411), a Turkish school has not been established in Limassol in South Cyprus for the past 23 years in complete violation of the right to education in one’s mother tongue.
- On the other hand, in North Cyprus, there is a Greek Cypriot school in the Karpaz area, which provides primary, secondary and high school education where Greek Cypriot students are taught by Greek Cypriot teachers appointed by the Greek Cypriot Ministry of Education and teaching material and books are sent by the Greek Cypriot Ministry of Education.
- It is high time that the Greek Cypriot authorities are called upon to respect the rights of the Turkish Cypriot students residing in South Cyprus, which are in greater numbers than Greek Cypriot students in North Cyprus, and provide them with the option to study at a Turkish school in South Cyprus. We hope that this fact is addressed in the upcoming report.
- In line with the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) Article 26, the content of the text books are examined and the appointment of teachers are made to the Greek Cypriot school in Karpaz region in order to ensure “full development of the human personality and the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups”.
- Unfortunately, there are numerous cases where the textbooks included inappropriate content, archaic propaganda and enmity, as well as offensive, chauvinistic and racist language against Turkish Cypriots and Turks, such as referring to them as “barbaric”, which is clearly harmful to the development of young children, poisoning the perceptions of future generations towards the Turkish Cypriot people.
- To give an example, out of 310 school books presented for 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 by the Greek Cypriot side to be taught at the school in Karpaz, 34 contained animosity and hatred against Turkish Cypriots and Turks. (As noted by UNFICYP,

¹⁰ CM/Del/Dec(2019)1355/H46-25

¹¹ Ministers’ Deputies, Notes on the Agenda, CM/Notes/1331 dated 20 November 2018

these school books are valid for two years and therefore the delivery of the said school books which was made in 2018 covers two consecutive years (i.e. 2018-2019 and 2019-2020)).

- In these cases, the Turkish Cypriot side has informed UNFICYP, in writing, most recently on 17 October 2018, that the rejected books include “inappropriate content that can be harmful to the development of young children and negatively affect the perceptions of future generations towards the other community” as we did so previously on 25 September 2017 and 21 September 2016 also requesting that the books are revised accordingly to ensure the principles enshrined in the UDHR Article 26 are respected.
- For instance, one of the aforementioned first-grade books contained the statement that the “Turks slaughtered the Greek Cypriots, as they have done throughout history”. Another high-school book contained the statement “the Turks were horrible, they would kill Christians for the smallest reasons”. These statements are far from being factual historic and objective accounts and are clearly chauvinistic and racist.
- Hence, the Report should have made reference to the reason behind the rejection of some books, thus not leading to an impression that the Turkish Cypriot side is denying the said books on an arbitrary basis, which is untrue.
- Unfortunately, some of the Greek Cypriot teachers appointed to the Greek Cypriot schools in Northern Cyprus also use racist, offensive and chauvinistic language against Turkish Cypriots/Turks. Hence, the appointment of these teachers is rejected by the Turkish Cypriot authorities on this basis.
- As of October 2019, 13 new teacher appointment applications were made by the Greek Cypriot side and only 3 were refused appointment. Aforementioned applications were refused on the grounds that they have been known to use racist, offensive and chauvinistic language against Turkish Cypriots/Turks and again the UN has been informed towards this end. Hence, the Report should have referred to the just grounds for the refusal of the said teachers.
- On a more general note, it should be noted that the Greek Cypriot side has been refusing to revise the school books used in Greek Cypriot schools in South Cyprus in order to remove enmity and discriminatory language against the Turkish Cypriots. TRNC has revised its school books a few years back, removing all elements of enmity and discrimination in the language of the textbooks.
- Last but not least, Turkish Cypriot students have limited access to European Union exchange and educational programmes. This limitation is very extensive, and includes total exclusion from access to the most important educational programmes of the European Union, such as the Erasmus Programme and Bologna Process, as a result of the Greek Cypriot side’s obstructionist actions which politicize the issue of education.

Freedom of movement

- Report is devoid of the facts which represent the problems regarding freedom of movement on the island. While TRNC imposes no restriction on freedom of movement on anyone crossing between North Cyprus and South Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot side pursues a policy of discrimination against some Turkish Cypriots and third party nationals as regards the freedom of movement.
- Some Turkish Cypriot citizens are prevented from crossing to South Cyprus with their Turkish Cypriot ID cards, whether for miscellaneous purposes or in order to fulfil their religious beliefs, on the basis of their ethnic origin or the origin of their ancestors, namely Turkey. This Greek Cypriot policy is not only discriminatory on the basis of ethnic origin, but also constitutes a violation of freedom of movement and access to religious sites in South Cyprus as well.

- It should not be forgotten that all Turkish Cypriot citizens, regardless of their origin, voted at the separate and simultaneous referenda for the comprehensive Cyprus settlement plan (known as the Annan Plan) in 2004, and will also do so in an eventual referendum on a future settlement plan. This arbitrary Greek Cypriot policy which refuses crossings of the said Turkish Cypriot citizens to South Cyprus only serves to damage the confidence between the two peoples of the island.
- The Greek Cypriot administration also inhibits freedom of movement on the island of third-country nationals who arrive in South Cyprus via Greek Cypriot airports/ports and who declare intent to cross to and stay in hotels in North Cyprus. Various memoranda by the Greek Cypriot Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as circulars by the Department of Migration are issued which warn foreign nationals against travelling to North Cyprus, citing the “disputed property” issue. It is very hypocritical that the Greek Cypriot side attempts to dissuade tourists from staying in the very hotels that so many of their own citizens frequently stay at without any problem. Furthermore, following from the said Greek Cypriot mentality, tourists using Larnaca and Paphos airports in South Cyprus should not do so since the very land these properties are built on are owned by Turkish Cypriots.
- It should be noted that the only reason EU citizens are able to cross from South to North and from North to South without any hindrance is because the EU Commission has warned the Greek Cypriot administration that it will not tolerate restrictions on freedom of movement of EU nationals in Cyprus.
- The Greek Cypriot administration also limits freedom of movement of third country nationals entering the island from North Cyprus, not allowing them to cross to South Cyprus and at times arresting them at the crossing points or when they travel to South Cyprus via other means.

Non-discrimination

- As known, at the inter-communal talks held, on 2 August 1975, in Vienna, *the Voluntary Exchange of Populations* was agreed between the two sides and Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots were respectively transferred to the North and the South of the island under the auspices of the UN. As a result, for more than 50 years, the Turkish Cypriot people, as well as the Greek Cypriot people, have been living peacefully side by side in their own areas.
- It should be noted, however, that some chose to remain in North Cyprus, such as the Greek Cypriots and Maronites who currently reside in Karpaz, Karpaza, Koruçam, Özhan, Sipahi, Hisarköy, and a number of Turkish Cypriots chose to remain in South Cyprus.
- The Greek Cypriot administration unfortunately politicizes the Greek Cypriots and Maronites living in North Cyprus by referring to them as the “enclaved”. In reality, the Greek Cypriots and Maronites who have chosen to reside in Northern Cyprus are not enclaved as they enjoy access to religious, educational and health facilities in the North and are able to benefit from all health, municipal, etc., services that are afforded to TRNC citizens. They themselves deny the claim that they are enclaved, as was voiced in an interview conducted with the Greek Cypriot residents in Karpaz. When the reporter mentioned that the purpose of his visit was to see the “enclaved people” in the region, the subjects replied “Enclaved? We are not enclaved!” (Politis newspaper, 10 October 2017).
- TRNC Government through different Ministries and their relevant departments, including the Deputy Prime Ministry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs is in constant and continuous communication with the representatives of Maronite community living on the island, effectively addressing any request or concern of the Maronite community.
- It should be noted that, following the Voluntary Exchange of Population in 1975, Maronites living in North Cyprus left their homes and chose to live in South Cyprus,

however, ownership of the properties remained with the Maronite owners. TRNC Government took a decision, on 26 July 2017, to implement the return of Maronites living in South Cyprus to their former villages in the TRNC; starting with Karpasa (Karpasia). The said decision, which has bureaucratic, financial and legal aspects, is currently being processed step by step. In this connection, in June 2019, TRNC Government announced that the tendering process in Karpasa village, the first village where the former Maronite inhabitants will return to, has been completed and the project for the relocation of the people living in Karpasa village is to be finalised very soon, which will enable the former Maronite inhabitants to return to their houses in the said village.

Coordination and cooperation with the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Cyprus

- From the outset, the TRNC has been open and willing for cooperation on this humanitarian issue despite the absence of any international technical or financial assistance. In this regard, in order to provide assistance to refugees arriving to North Cyprus, the Deputy Prime Ministry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs has established a working mechanism with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in South Cyprus.
- Within the framework of this mechanism, details of those arriving at Ercan airport and/or seaports claiming to be refugees are communicated to the UNHCR representatives in Cyprus which conveys those details to their implementing partner, namely SOS Children's Village Association in North Cyprus. Upon receiving the said information, representatives of the SOS Children's Village Association carry out interviews with the refugees at the port of entry in order to decipher their status. Following this, the Turkish Cypriot side facilitates the safe passage of eligible persons to South Cyprus. This mechanism where the principle of non-refoulement is also respected, has enabled UNHCR to act in a timely manner to assess the international protection needs of the persons concerned.
- After the establishment of this mechanism, a large increase in the number of refugees, especially of Syrian citizens, arriving at Ercan Airport has been witnessed. The already existing reception room became insufficient in terms of capacity in the face of the increase in the number of refugees, therefore, a bigger building was restored and put into use to serve as an alternative reception room where all the expenses were incurred by the Turkish Cypriot authorities.
- Despite our request and the fact that the Office of the UNHCR in Cyprus implied that it would contribute, the UNHCR has not made any contributions to help the Turkish Cypriot side in this regard. On the other hand, Greek Cypriot administration has received around 75 million euros in aid from the EU to tackle the migration issue in general and refugee issue in specific for the period of 2014-2020.
- Another problem fuelling the difficulties in accommodating the refugees was the fact that UNHCR was not able to carry out these interviews on time which consequently led to overcrowding at the reception room.
- Nevertheless, this mechanism, which was established as a result of an agreement between Turkish Cypriot authorities and the UNHCR in Cyprus solely with the purpose to offer humanitarian assistance to and ease the plight of Syrians, has unfortunately been politically manipulated by Greek Cypriot administration to direct criticism/discredit the Turkish Cypriot side, going too far even to allege complicity of Turkish Cypriot side in trafficking of refugees to South Cyprus.
- In view of the above, TRNC Council of Ministers had to introduce, on 21 June 2019, a visa regime for Syrian citizens. Since the inception of the visa regime for Syrian citizens, the number of applicants who arrive at our ports to seek refugee status from South Cyprus has fallen drastically.
- It is unfortunate that the Report fails to reflect these realities.

Various examples of violation of human rights of the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot side in 2019, which the report failed to include, are as follows;

- Following the Turkish Cypriot vote in favour of the Annan Plan referendum in 2004, EU Council concluded, on 26 April 2004, that "the Council is determined to put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community". However, despite this, the European Union has failed to keep its promise and Direct Trade Regulation (DTR) has shamefully been kept in the dusty shelves of the EU for the past 15 years due to pressure by the Greek Cypriot administration, which unilaterally, illegally and unjustly joined the EU. Upon the instigation of the Greek Cypriot administration, there was an attempt in the EU, following the European Parliament (EP) elections in May 2019, to drop the DTR from the agenda of EP's Committee on International Trade (INTA). However, this attempt has been curtailed on 16 October 2019 and the DTR continues to be on the agenda of EP's INTA, albeit being frozen.
- H.E. Prof Kudret Özersay, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the TRNC, visited Geneva, Switzerland, between 2-5 July 2019, for various meetings, including with heads of some UN bodies, with a view to mainly discuss humanitarian issues. Nevertheless, despite confirmed meetings, as a result of the Greek Cypriot administration's initiatives and efforts, some of these meetings were cancelled at the last minute or were downgraded. Unfortunately, since the pressure exerted by the Greek Cypriot administration produces results, the said administration pursues such policies even more aggressively violating one of the basic rights of the Turkish Cypriot people, as an equal co-owner of the island, namely to be heard.
- The Futsal European Federation, was communicated letters, in February 2019, propagated by the Greek Cypriot administration, which entailed groundless and defamatory claims about North Cyprus, including allegations regarding the airport and seaports of TRNC referring to them as "illegal ports of entry" and warning participants to refrain from using these ports or attend the Futsal Men's Champions League between 27 May – 2 June 2019, with the sole intention of preventing this international sports event from taking place in North Cyprus. In this connection, it should be noted that the Greek Cypriot administration, which is an EU member, is acting contrary to the position of the EU and calling on others to do so when the most recent statement by the European Commission, dated 11 December 2018, reiterated that *"... in 1974, the "government of the Republic of Cyprus" has declared the sea ports in the northern part of Cyprus prohibited and close for all vessels. ... It is the Commission's understanding that there is no prohibition under general international law to enter and leave sea ports in the northern part of Cyprus ..."*
- Representative of the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus in Bucharest, Romania, sent a letter, dated 28 August 2019, to the Secretary-General of the Balkan Medical Union containing baseless allegations and misrepresentations with a view to dissuade the holding of the "22nd Balkan Medical Days" event in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) between the dates of 22-29 September 2019.
- Representative of the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus in Paris, France, has communicated a letter, dated 3 April 2019, to the United Federation of Travel Agents' Associations (UFTAA), containing baseless allegations and misrepresentations, with a view to dissuade the holding of their next Congress in TRNC.
- The Greek Cypriot representative in Berlin, with a view to dissuade German tourists from visiting North Cyprus, has communicated a letter, dated 25 February 2019, to a German travel agency containing false and defamatory allegations about North Cyprus at large and tourism sector in particular as part and parcel of the efforts of the Greek Cypriot side to isolate the Turkish Cypriot people in all fields of life, in an

attempt to stifle the Turkish Cypriot people economically, politically and socially, in this case through deterring tourists from visiting Northern Cyprus.

- In the reporting period, Greek Cypriot authorities continued their practice of denying entry, like in previous years, to tourists from third countries travelling to North Cyprus via Larnaca airport in South Cyprus. Most were interrogated, denied entry and deported back to their country. Some concrete examples regarding this practice can be seen below;
 - Dr. Tomotako Kitamura, an academician from Japan, who was to participate in a Physics Conference at a TRNC university, was denied entry, on 20 March 2019, at Larnaca Airport, when expressed his intention to travel to North Cyprus. He was deported by the Greek Cypriot administration after being interrogated and detained for 9 hours at the airport. Denying a person entry to the island thus violating freedom of travel on the grounds that a person's intention is to visit North Cyprus, particularly for a purely non-political purpose, is unacceptable.
 - Another solid example is that of 30 Israeli tourists who arrived at Larnaca airport with the intention to cross to the TRNC to spend their New Year's holiday. They were interrogated and deported to their country causing financial damages and distress to the said tourists who merely wished to spend their holiday in North Cyprus.
- This inappropriate and hostile practice, which has no legal ground is totally arbitrary and inconsistent with both international law, as well as the UN and European values and principles.
- Racially motivated hate attacks towards Turkish Cypriot vehicles continued in the reporting period as a result of Greek Cypriot leadership's ongoing mentality of intolerance and policy of impunity. On 5 July 2019, a Turkish Cypriot commercial bus which was supposed to carry tourists from Larnaca Airport in South Cyprus to hotels in North Cyprus was attacked by a group of Greek Cypriots who attempted to push the Turkish Cypriot driver off the road and threw rocks and water bottles to the vehicle while tourists were on board. The tourists as well as the Turkish Cypriot bus driver were terrorised and traumatised by this grave incident. Once again, the Greek Cypriot leadership/judicial system failed to take any solid action against the perpetrators in order to bring them to justice.
- In April 2019, a Turkish Cypriot citizen was arrested by the Greek Cypriot authorities for illegally crossing to South Cyprus. He was sent to prison in South Cyprus for six months and his family members, who were also TRNC citizens, were not allowed to visit him during his 6 months long sentence in prison due to the fact that they are of Turkish descendant. Upon serving his 6-month sentence, instead of being immediately released to North Cyprus, the said person was transferred to a refugee camp in Larnaca and held in detention to be deported to Turkey, via Athens, simply because of his Turkish origins.
- In April 2019, Greek Cypriot Archbishop Chrysostomos, who is very influential in Greek Cypriot politics, in his statement on the occasion of Easter celebrations, characterized Greek Cypriots who shop in North Cyprus and use Ercan Airport in TRNC as people whose "national" and "religious" values have both suffered erosion. Such statements unfortunately infuse hatred, racism and intolerance against the Turkish Cypriot people. Unfortunately, the Greek Cypriot political elite never reacts to these statements by the Archbishop which is a usual occurrence, thus giving the message that it is condoning it.
- The above-mentioned examples should also be highlighted in the upcoming report so as to prevent the recurrence of these state-sponsored violations against the Turkish Cypriot people

Demining

- The Turkish Cypriot side is committed to achieving a mine-free island, as demonstrated by the concrete constructive proposals made in 2014, 2015 and 2018 towards this end, which have all been turned down by the Greek Cypriot side.
- The Greek Cypriot side, instead of accepting these proposals for a mine-free island, has, once again, in 2018, opted to submit a request for an extension of its deadline to fulfil its mine clearance obligations stemming from Article 5 of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, to 2022.
- In this connection, the Greek Cypriot side's claim that it has "cleared all minefields in the area under its effective control, including within the buffer zone, by the 1st July 2013", as well as that "the demining program within the Buffer Zone was completed on the 20th of January 2011" is perjury.
- The following non-exhaustive examples demonstrate this fact:
 - The UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus report, dated 6 July 2018 (S/2018/676), confirms that "the two sides have not begun clearance of the four known minefields in the buffer zone, of which three belong to the National Guard and one to the Turkish forces. While the Turkish Cypriot side has indicated that it would accept the clearance of all four areas as a package, the Greek Cypriot side maintains that its three minefields are required to counter a perceived threat".
 - In July 2014, UNFICYP informed the TRNC military authorities that the Greek Cypriot "National Guard" had commenced a demining operation in an area which falls within the jurisdiction of the Greek Cypriot administration near the village of Pile/Pyla. It was also reported that the operation started in June 2014 and continued until July 2014, and approximately 15 anti-personnel mines were cleared on a daily basis. A similar activity of the Greek Cypriot side was also observed in the same area in 2018.
- This very hypocritical approach of the Greek Cypriot side confirms that its main purpose is to politicise this sensitive and humanitarian issue, ignoring the danger and suffering the mines can cause.
- As a result of Greek Cypriot side's rejection of clearance of all mines throughout the island, the UN made a proposal for clearance of a certain number of suspected hazardous areas from both sides. In this connection, on 26 February 2019, the two sides agreed to the reciprocal clearance of 9 suspected hazardous areas on each side of the island, yet another testimony to our good will and constructive approach on this issue.
- Nevertheless, despite the agreement that the cancellation as regards the 18 suspected hazardous areas, 9 on each side, was to begin in May 2019, it could not commence due to the delaying tactics and lack of cooperation of the Greek Cypriot side with UNFICYP. As a result, the work plan regarding the way forward was only conveyed to the Turkish Cypriot side on 9 July 2019- 2 months after the intended start date of cancellation activities. Moreover, according to the initial agreed work plan, the cancellation works were to be completed within 10 days, that is to say in May 2019. However, due to the delay caused by the Greek Cypriot side's stance, the work completed in December 2019.
- The Turkish Cypriot side maintains its view that the entire island should be cleared of all mines. Nevertheless, we hope that this step will be the first towards the eventual clearance of all mines and that it will not be used as a tool by the Greek Cypriot side to prevent demining of the whole island whilst politicising the issue on international platforms.
- In the view of above, it is unfair and wrong that the Report directs its call on both sides as regards demining of the island, when in fact the Turkish Cypriot side has a

standing proposal calling for demining of the island starting with the buffer zone and the Greek Cypriot side has a standing rejection.

Maraş (varosha)

- As known, Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) has taken a decision to undertake steps on the fenced area of Maraş, in an evolutionary manner, starting with a scientific inventory survey. In view of the said decision of the TRNC Government, the Greek Cypriot side has, unfortunately, stepped up its propaganda campaign based on misrepresentations and defamation in the international fora which should not be taken into consideration.

The facts regarding steps taken by TRNC Government on Maraş are as follows:

- Maraş Inventory Commission, composed of specialists and experts, has been tasked to conduct a scientific inventory survey, identifying and studying the condition of the moveable and immovable properties and the environmental risks, which would allow a “big picture” as regards the fenced area of Maraş, thus facilitating the determination of any future steps, including changing of the military status of the said area so as to realise the rights of its former inhabitants.
- These steps are in line with international law, first and foremost protecting and respecting the rights of possession of former inhabitants of this town as also called for in the relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions.
- It should be stressed, at the outset, that the pretext for the Greek Cypriot archaic propaganda had, in fact, collapsed, particularly following the rejection by the Greek Cypriot leadership of the Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) as regards the fenced area of Maraş on numerous occasions, including in 1994, as well as the overwhelming rejection of the comprehensive settlement plan for Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot side in 2004 and the breakdown of Cyprus Conference in 2017, Crans Montana, Switzerland- at the crux of all of which is the unwillingness of the Greek Cypriot side to share power and prosperity with the Turkish Cypriot side (S/2004/437).
- In this connection, it needs to be borne in mind that some UN Security Council resolutions on the matter had been taken years ago within the framework of a particular political conjuncture relating to a particular period of time, namely the 1992 Set of Ideas followed by CBMs that included fenced area of Maraş- all rejected by the Greek Cypriot side as also stressed by former Greek Cypriot Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Rolandis in various articles and interviews - and, therefore, are null and void and irrelevant.
- The unacceptable status quo on the island, which is also valid for the fenced area of Maraş (Varosha), have continued for all these decades due to political considerations and propaganda, instigated by the Greek Cypriot leadership, to the detriment of the said area and, more importantly, at the expense of its former inhabitants, including the Greek Cypriots and Evkaf.
- The fact that the Greek Cypriot leadership’s policy on the area has been one of intransigence is also confirmed by the Greek Cypriot former inhabitants themselves of the fenced area of Maraş. A former prominent Greek Cypriot inhabitant of the said town, namely Mr. Andreas Lordos, has called on the Greek Cypriot administration “to cease its intransigent mentality and stop abusing Maraş as a political tool to put the onus on the Turks” (Greek Cypriot daily Politis, 25 August 2019).
- It should be stressed that the former Greek Cypriot inhabitants of the fenced area of Maraş are very excited and supportive about TRNC Government’s said decision, publicly stating that this decision will provide for them to go back to their properties, which they are ready to do so (Cyprus Mail Online of 10 March 2019).

- In view of the above-mentioned enthusiasm and readiness of the Greek Cypriot former inhabitants, it is appalling that their very administration, namely the Greek Cypriot administration, is keeping the former inhabitants' possession rights hostage to the unacceptable status quo for the sake of jealously protecting the said status quo, which has created a "comfort zone" for the Greek Cypriot leadership/political elite.
- It is crystal clear that none of these steps violate the relevant UN Security Council resolutions but rather is a realisation of the said resolutions which call for respect for the rights of its former inhabitants without awaiting a negotiated settlement- even more pertinent particularly in view of the fact that a negotiated settlement in Cyprus has eluded us for the past 5 decades.
- In fact, maintaining the unacceptable status quo at the expense of the rights of the said inhabitants would be violation of the relevant UN resolutions.
- It must also be underlined that these steps do not in any way prejudice a possible negotiated settlement on the island.
- On the contrary, these constructive steps will no doubt, consequently, help address the deep crisis of confidence between the two sides and their peoples on the island since it will provide for former inhabitants, including Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to work together and to cooperate, building confidence and creating interdependencies- all conducive steps to a negotiated settlement on the island.
- Last but not least, the owner of this decision as regards the fenced area of Maraş is the Turkish Cypriot Government and not Turkey. It must be borne in mind that neither Turkey nor the Greek Cypriot administration of South Cyprus has any jurisdiction or control in North Cyprus.
- TRNC Government, which exercises full control, jurisdiction and authority in North Cyprus and is the only legitimate and competent authority to decide on matters pertaining to North Cyprus, is democratically elected by the Turkish Cypriot people, will of which will determine any future negotiated settlement on the island, as was the case at the 2004 separate and simultaneous referenda for the comprehensive settlement plan on Cyprus, overwhelmingly approved by the Turkish Cypriot side and rejected by the Greek Cypriot side.

2019 Approved religious service requests

1. 1 January 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
2. 6 January 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
3. 6 January 2019 – Church of Ayia Tria – Sipahi/Ayia Trias (Greek Cypriots)
4. 6 January 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
5. 6 January 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios Exorinos – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
6. 12 January 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
7. 13 January 2019 – Church of Timios Prodromos – Akçay (Greek Cypriots)
8. 13 January 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
9. 13 January 2018 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
10. 20 January 2018 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
11. 27 January 2018 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
12. 2 February 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
13. 2 February 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
14. 3 February 2019 – Church of Panagia Galaktotrofoussa – Balıkesir/Palaikythro (Greek Cypriots)
15. 3 February 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
16. 9 February 2019 – Church of Ayios Theodoros – Lapithos/Lapta (Greek Cypriots) (first time)
17. 10 February 2019 – Church of St. Charalambos – Türkmenköy/Kontea (Greek Cypriots)
18. 10 February 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
19. 16 February 2019 – Church of Ayia Marina – Gürpınar/Ayia Marina (Maronites)
20. 17 February 2019 – St. Barnabas Icon and Archeology Museum – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
21. 17 February 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
22. 24 February 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
23. 2 March 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
24. 3 March 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)

25. 3 March 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
26. 10 March 2019- Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
27. 11 March 2019- Church of Ayia Marina – Gürpınar/Ayia Marina (Maronites)
28. 17 March 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
29. 23 March 2019 – Church of Panayia Elousa – Trypimeni/Tirmen (Greek Cypriots) (first time)
30. 24 March 2019 – Church of Panagia Theotokou – Demirhan/Trachoni-Kythrea (Greek Cypriots)
31. 24 March 2019 – Church of Panagia Evangelistria – Alayköy/Gerolakkos (Greek Cypriot)
32. 24 March 2019 – Panagia Monastery – Ağıllar/Mandres (Greek Cypriots)
33. 24 March 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
34. 31 March 2019 – St. Barnabas Icon and Archeology Museum – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (South Korea)
35. 31 March 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
36. 6 April 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
37. 7 April 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
38. 7 April 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
39. 14 April 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
40. 21 April 2019 – Church of Ayia Marina – Gürpınar/Ayia Marina (Maronites)
41. 21 April 2019 – Church of St. Mamas – Güzelyurt/Morphou (Greek Cypriot)
42. 21 April 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
43. 24 April 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
44. 26 April 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios Exorinos – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
45. 26 April 2019 – Church of Saint Sinesios – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
46. 28 April 2019 – Church of Ayia Tria – Sipahi/Ayia Trias (Greek Cypriots)
47. 28 April 2019 – Church of Ayia Tria – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
48. 28 April 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
49. 29 Nisan 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
50. 30 April 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios of Xalona – Bostancı/Zodia (Greek Cypriots)
51. 4 May 2019 – St. Barnabas Icon and Archeology Museum – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)

52. 5 May 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
53. 5 May 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
54. 5 May 2019 – Church of Saint George – Düzova/Exometochi (Greek Cypriots)
55. 11 May 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
56. 11 May 2019 – Church of St. George – Prastio/ Aydıncöy (Greek Cypriots)
57. 12 May 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios – Vadili/Vatyli (Greek Cypriots)
58. 12 May 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios – Bafra/Vokolida (Greek Cypriots)
59. 12 May 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
60. 18 May 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios – Kyrenia/ Girne (Maronites)
61. 19 May 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
62. 26 May 2019 – Church of Saint Sinesios – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
63. 26 May 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
64. 2 June 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
65. 2 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
66. 9 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
67. 9 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Koma tou Yalou/ Kumyalı (Greek Cypriots) (Rum)
68. 10 June 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
69. 11 June 2019 – St. Barnabas Icon and Archeology Museum – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
70. 16 June 2019 – Church of St. Mamas – Güzelyurt/Morphou (Greek Cypriot)
71. 16 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
72. 17 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
73. 17 June 2019 – Church of Ayia Tria – Sipahi/Ayia Trias (Greek Cypriots)
74. 23 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
75. 30 June 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
76. 6 July 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
77. 7 July 2019 – Church of Agios Prokopis – Sınırüstü/Syngراس (Greek Cypriots)
78. 7 July 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)

79. 7 July 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
80. 13 July 2019 – Ayia Marina – Değirmenlik/Kythrea (Greek Cypriots)
81. 14 July 2019 – Church of Timios Prodromos – Boğaziçi/Lapathos-Ammochostos (Greek Cypriots)
82. 14 July 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
83. 17 July 2019 – Church of Ayia Marina – Gürpınar/Ayia Marina (Maronites)
84. 21 July 2019 – Monastery of Prophet Elias – Mevlevi-İkidere/ Kyra (Maronites)
85. 21 July 2019 – Church of Prophet Elias – Serhatköy/ Fylia (Greek Cypriots)
86. 21 July 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
87. 23 July 2019 – Church of Ayios Therisos – Yenierenköy/ Yialousa (Greek Cypriots)
88. 27 July 2019 – Church of Ayia Paraskevi – Church of Ayia Paraskevi – Angastina/Aslanköy (Greek Cypriots) (first time)
89. 28 July 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
90. 4 August 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
91. 4 August 2019 – Church of Ayia Fotini – Yeşilköy/Ayios Andronikos (Greek Cypriots)
92. 4 August 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
93. 6 August 2019 – Church of St. Mamas – Güzelyurt/Morphou (Greek Cypriot)
94. 11 August 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
95. 15 August 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
96. 15 August 2019 – Apostolos Andreas Manastırı – Dipkarpaz (Rum)
97. 18 Ağustos 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
98. 25 August 2019 – Church of Ayios Ioannis Prodromos – Akova/Gypsou (Greek Cypriot)
99. 25 August 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
100. 27 August 2019 – Chapel of Ayios Fanurios – Kyrenia/ Girne (Greek Cypriot)
101. 27 August 2019 – Church of Ayios Fanurios – Sipahi/Ayia Trias (Greek Cypriots)
102. 1 September 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
103. 1 September 2019 – Church of St. Mamas – Güzelyurt/Morphou (Greek Cypriot)
104. 1 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
105. 2 September 2019 – Church of St. Mamas – Güzelyurt/Morphou (Greek Cypriot)
106. 2 September 2019 – Church of Ayios Antonis – Değirmenlik/Kythrea (Maronite)
107. 5 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
108. 6 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)

109. 7 September 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
110. 8 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
111. 8 September 2019 – Church of Panagia ton Pervolion – Aşağı Dikmen/Kato Dikomo (Greek Cypriots)
112. 8 September 2019 – Church of Panagia – Akdoğan/Lysi (Greek Cypriots) (first time)
113. 14 September 2019 – Church of Saint George – Girne/Kyrenia (Greek Cypriots)
114. 15 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
115. 22 September 2019 – Church of Panagia – Kızılbaş/Trachonas (Greek Cypriots)
116. 22 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
117. 29 September 2019 – Church of Church of Ayios Afxentios – Büyükkonuk/Komi Kepir (Greek Cypriots)
118. 29 September 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
119. 5 October 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
120. 6 October 2019 – Church of Ayios Sergios and Vakhos – Pamuklu/Tavros (Greek Cypriots)
121. 6 October 2019 – Apostolos Andreas Monastery – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
122. 6 October 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
123. 13 October 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Ozanköy/Kazafani (Greek Cypriots)
124. 13 October 2019 – Church of Ayios Loukas – Ötüken/Spathariko (Greek Cypriots)
125. 13 October 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
126. 20 October 2019 – St. Barnabas Icon and Archaeology Museum – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
127. 20 October 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
128. 27 October 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronite) [customary]
129. 2 November 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
130. 3 November 2019 – Church of Apostolos Andreas – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
131. 3 November 2019 – Church of Ayios Georgios Exorinos – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
132. 3 November 2019 – Church of Arhangelos Michael, Özhan/ Asomatos, (Maronites) [customary]
133. 6 November 2019 – Church of Agia Marina, Gürpınar/Agia Marina, (Maronites) [customary]

134. 10 November 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronite) [customary]
135. 17 November 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
136. 17 November 2019 – Church of Prophet Iliad – Mutluyaka (Greek Cypriots)
137. 23 November 2019 – Saint Epiphany Church – Yıldırım (Greek Cypriots)
138. 24 November 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
139. 29 November 2019 – Apostolos Andreas Monastery – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
140. 30 November 2019 – Apostolos Andreas Monastery – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpasso (Greek Cypriots)
141. 1 December 2019 – Apostolos Andreas Monastery – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpaso (Greek Cypriots)
142. 1 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
143. 7 December 2019 – Small Church of St. Barnabas – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
144. 8 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
145. 14 December 2019 – Church of Agios Therios – Yenierenköy (Greek Cypriot)
146. 15 December 2019 – St. Barnabas Icon and Archaeology Museum – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Greek Cypriots)
147. 15 December 2019 – St. Anne Church – Gazimağusa/Famagusta (Maronite)
148. 15 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
149. 21 December 2019 – Church of Agia Marina – Gürpınar/Ayia Marina (Maronites)
150. 22 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]
151. 25 December 2019 – Saint Sinesios Church – Dipkarpaz/Rizo Karpaso (Greek Cypriots)
152. 25 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
153. 26 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites)
154. 26 December 2019 – Church of Panagia Chrysellousa – Zümrütköy/Güzelyurt (Greek Cypriot)
155. 29 December 2019 – Church of Agia Paraskevi – Turunçlu (Greek Cypriot)
156. 29 December 2019 – Church of Archangelos Michael – Özhan/Asomatos (Maronites) [customary]

*Those indicated as “customary” are those religious services held every Sunday by Maronites.

List of Churches

1. Ayios Georgios Church (Maronite) (Sadrazam-Kayalar)
2. Ayios Terisso Church
3. Apostolos Andreas Monastery
4. Ayia Trias Church
5. Ayios Fanurios Church
6. Ayios Sinesios Church
7. Ayios Triada Church
8. St. Andrew's Church
9. Chapel outside the St. Barnabas Monastery
10. Archangelos Michael Church (Maronite)
11. Timios Stavros Church (Maronite)
12. St. George Church (Maronite)
13. Banayias Mariadis (Virgin Mary Church)
14. St. Elizabeth of Hungary Roman Catholic Church (Terra-Santa)
15. Ayios Mamas Church (Alayköy)
16. St. Barnabas Monastery
17. Profiti Elias Monastery (Maronite)
18. Sourp Magar Monastery
19. Little Panagia Church (Maronite)
20. Ayia Marina Church (Değirmenlik)
21. Panagia Ton Pervolion Church
22. Ayia Marina Church (Gürpınar)
23. Ayios Georgios Exorinos (Nestorians) Church
24. Panagia Theotokou Church
25. Saint Charalambos Church
26. St. George Church (Girne)
27. St. George Church (Düzova)
28. Sourp Asdvadzadzin Cathedral (Notre Dame De Tyre)-Armenian Church
29. Timios Prodromos Church
30. Ayios Antonios Church (Maronite)
31. Panayia Evangelistria Church
32. Ayios Georgios Church (Vadili)
33. Archangel Michael Church
34. Ayios Nikolas Church (Yayla)
35. Ayios Nikolas Church (Mormenekşe)
36. Ayia İrini Church
37. Ayios Georgios Xalona Church
38. Saint George Church

39. Ay. Timios Prodromos Church
40. Ayios Afxentios Church
41. St. Marina Church
42. Ayia Fotini Church
43. Panagia Galaktotrofousa Church
44. Archangelos Michael Church
45. St. Prokopios Church
46. Christ Saviour Church (Sotira Church)
47. Analipseos Sotiros Church
48. Ay. Artemios Church
49. Saint Epifanios Church
50. Ay. Georgios Church (İskele)
51. Ay. Georgios Church (Dörtyol)
52. Ay. Demetrios Church
53. Ayios Georgios Church (Bafra)
54. Panagia Chryseleousa Church
55. Panayia Trachonas Church
56. Timios Prodromos Church (St. John the Baptist)
57. Neo Chorio (Ayios Charalambos Church)
58. Ayia Eirini Church
59. St. Anne Church (Maronite)
60. Profidi Elias Church
61. Buluşa Monastery
62. Ayios Fanurios Chapel
63. Old St. George Church
64. Archangelos Michael Church (Greek Cypriot)
65. Ayios Georgios Church (Greek Cypriot) (Aydıncöy)
66. Ayios Mamas Church (Greek Cypriot) (Alayköy)
67. Panayia Church (Greek Cypriot)
68. Ayios Andronikos-Athanasia Church (Greek Cypriot)
69. Ayios Loukas Church
70. Ayios Sergios ve Vakhos Church
71. Archangelos Michael Church
72. Profidi Iliya Church
73. Ayios Nikolaos Church (Yamaçköy)
74. Ayios Theodoros Church
75. Panayia Elousa Church
76. Ayia Paraskevi Church (Aslanköy)
77. Panagia Church
78. Ayia Paraskevi (Turunçlu)

Table: Process of finding the Turkish Cypriot Missing Persons and Length of time for the Attorney-General of “Republic of Cyprus” to provide the result of the investigation to the family

<i>Family No</i>	<i>Missing body found est.</i>	<i>Length of time for the Attorney-General of “Republic of Cyprus” to provide the result of the investigation to the family</i>	<i>The result of the investigation</i>
Family 1	2009	9 years (Report 2018)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 2	2010	Investigation is still continuing	
Family 3	2009	Investigation is still continuing	
Family 4	2008	9 years (Report 2017)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 5	2008	9 years (Report 2017)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 6	2008	9 years (Report 2017)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 7	2010	5 years (Report 2015)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 8	2010	5 years (Report 2015)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 9	2007	7 years (Report 2014)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 10	2008	8 years (Report 2016)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 14	2008	5 years (Report 2013)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 15	2008	5 years (Report 2013)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 16	2007	7 years (Report 2014)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
Family 17	2009	4 years (Report 2013)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution
File with many missing persons who went missing similar circumstances	2006	7 years (Report 2013)	File closed by the Attorney-General- No prosecution