

“NORTH CYPRUS EMBARGOES AND THE LAW” PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Part 1 - Property and Trade



European Court of Human Rights - curtesy of Adrian Grycuk Wikipedia



Report prepared by Embargoed!
www.embargoed.org
April 2019

CONTENTS

“NORTH CYPRUS EMBARGOES AND THE LAW” PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Part 1 - Property and Trade

	Page
Preface	3
Background	4
UN Resolution 186.	5
Ban on Academia	5
Ban on Culture	5
Ban on Direct Communication	6
Ban on economic development and international aid	6
Ban on Sporting Events	6
Ban on Direct Travel	7
 Turkish Cypriot land and property	 8
 Issuing legal or procedural challenges to the EU over its failure to adhere to its own regulations and implement its own policies	 10
Failing to overcome obstacles created by the Greek Cypriot Government to the operation of the Green Line Regulations.	10
Suspension of Direct Trade Regulations for 14 years	12
Challenging the EU over its failure to report its proceedings in Turkish, one of the two official languages of the Cyprus Republic.	13
Progressing the Hellim / Halloumi PDO application from the Greek Cypriot Government despite the fact that North Cyprus producers had not been consulted, as required by EU regulations	14
 Bibliography	 17

“NORTH CYPRUS EMBARGOES AND THE LAW” PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Part 1 - Property and Trade

PREFACE

Embargoed! is a human rights group campaigning to bring an immediate and unconditional end to the international isolation of North Cyprus, and the full restoration of political, economic and social rights of the Turkish Cypriot people.

We operate as an independent non-profit, non-governmental organisation and the campaign is driven forward by volunteers.

Our founding members are primarily from London – the home of the largest diaspora of Turkish Cypriots. Together, we form a group of committed human rights activists that use positive, peaceful actions to raise awareness about the plight of Turkish Cypriots and to lobby for change.

As a group, we do not endorse any particular political end solution in Cyprus – we believe this should be left to the democratic free will of the two sides. However, we are committed to helping Greek and Turkish Cypriots reconcile their past and present differences.

This report covers one part of the discussions and conclusions relating to the legality of embargoes - Property and Trade (thought this does not include issues pertaining to Evkaf property, which is more widely covered in our full Embargoed! Property report on embargoed.org/resources). The remaining issues will be reported on in Autumn 2019. These are the exclusion of Turkish Cypriots from international sporting and cultural events, denial of European citizenship to spouses and children of Turkish Cypriots, denial of the right of movement of non-EU citizen travellers from South Cyprus to North Cyprus, physical attacks on Turkish Cypriots in South Cyprus, denial of human rights of Turkish Cypriots defined under Article 2 of the UN's Declaration of Human Rights, and challenging of the length of time Protocol 10 is being in operation.

Fahri Zihni, Bsc, MBA
Chair, Embargoed!
www.embargoed.org

April 2019



BACKGROUND

What are the embargoes placed on Turkish Cypriots?

Today in Cyprus the quality of your life and the ability to exercise your basic human rights depends on which side of the border you live. If you live in South Cyprus, you have the opportunities to enjoy normal trade, political, and social relations with people around the world. In contrast, people living in North Cyprus have had to endure internationally-imposed embargoes that have denied them the right to engage freely and unhampered in any political, economic, social or cultural activities, leaving them seriously isolated from the rest of the world. This situation has existed since 1964.

It is important to note that the embargoes imposed on North Cyprus do not have the authority of any UN Security Council Resolution under Article 41 of the UN Charter. However, the Greek Cypriots have sought to leverage the badly worded UN Resolution 186, passed on 4 March 1964, to legitimise their status as the 'sole recognised authority' on the island of Cyprus and sadly deny Turkish Cypriots their legal, political and basic human rights. This position was aggravated by the European Union's (EU) admission of the divided island into the EU in 2004 (with many unfulfilled promises made to the Turkish side – as discussed further below). It is hard not to consider the admission of the Greek Cypriots as a cynical and politically expedient move by the EU.

Because of extensive lobbying by Greek Cypriot Government, a comprehensive set of embargoes have been applied to North Cyprus that are adhered to worldwide (bar Turkey). The impact is therefore as comprehensive as any UN sanctioned embargo. Moreover, what can only be termed as "institutional capture" in Brussels since 2004 by the Greek Cypriots has allowed them to control the narrative with little or no opposition, and together with an ever increasing general anti-Turkish sentiment has ensured that no material movement has taken place to alleviate the situation of the Turkish Cypriots. Ironically, EU Member States and other countries keen to ensure the continued isolation of the Turkish Cypriot population have been amongst the biggest violators of UN embargoes for other countries when it suits their geopolitical priorities.

24 April 2004 was a watershed in the lives of Greek and Turkish Cypriots, it was the day they took part in the historic referenda for a comprehensive Cyprus Settlement based on the UN's Annan Plan.

75% of Greek Cypriots voted against the Plan
65% of Turkish Cypriots voted in favour of the Plan.



As a consequence, the international community pledged to end the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot people, on the basis that Turkish Cypriots should not be penalised for voting for the UN and EU backed peace plan. EU regulations dictate that a country in conflict may not be admitted to the Union. However, the EU broke its own rules and admitted Southern Cyprus into the European Union, even though the Greek Cypriot side had voted against the UN peace plan. Since then, the Greek Cypriot side, alongside Greece, have blocked all attempts by the EU to support the cultural, economic sporting and other aspects of the development of North Cyprus.

UN Resolution 186

- Many hundreds of Turkish Cypriots were killed, and 25,000 were made refugees in their own country, following violent attacks by the Greek Cypriot EOKA terror organisation and National Guard in December 1963 - January 1964. UN Resolution 186 was passed on 4 March 1964 as part of the UN's commitment to end the violence in Cyprus.
- Unfortunately, this badly worded Resolution referred to working with the "Government of Cyprus", which at that time was 100% staffed by Greek Cypriots.
- Greek Cypriots have used this to assert themselves as the sole "legitimate" authority on the island, even though this contradicts with the 1960 Constitution of Cyprus where both Turkish and Greek Cypriots are politically equal.
- The passing of this Resolution marked the start of more than half a century of embargoes on Turkish Cypriots who refused to accept their constitutional rights being usurped.

Ban on Academia

- Although both peoples in Cyprus have always had rights to separate educational systems under the 1960 Constitution, to ensure their distinct ethnic, religious and cultural identities are maintained, the Greek Cypriots consistently fail to honour this and even academic institutions are prone to Greek Cypriot pressure. Institutions managing European and international schemes are pressurised by the Greek Cypriot Government to exclude Universities from North Cyprus.

Ban on Culture

- Led by the Greek Cypriot Government and allied organisations, foreign artistic performers are constantly pressurised not to perform in North Cyprus, and many succumb to this pressure. However, in the recent years, following the efforts of determined organisers and the Turkish Cypriot public, many high

profile artists are breaking through the ban and making a cultural contribution to North Cyprus.

Ban on Direct Communication

- To date, North Cyprus' postal administration has been denied any status within the Universal Postal Union and Turkish Cypriots do not have internationally recognised addresses or telephone numbers. All mail and calls to and from North Cyprus must go via Turkey

Ban on economic development and international aid

- Foreign investors have been discouraged from entering Turkish Cypriot territory for years through a combination of unwarranted legal threats and a continuous barrage of Greek Cypriot propaganda, resulting in minimal international capital flowing into North Cyprus. As a result, there is a massive difference between the two economies on the island.
- Embargoes have meant North Cyprus cannot be recognised as a candidate for loans by the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank.
- The Greek Cypriot Government has received some £5bn of international aid since 1964, but none of this funding has been apportioned to support the development of the Turkish Cypriot community.

Ban on Sporting Events

- Turkish Cypriots are not allowed to participate or host international teams, or sporting events. The extent of these embargoes are vast; no teams or individuals from North Cyprus have participated in any of the following since December 1963, Olympic and Commonwealth Games, World and European sporting tournaments such as athletics championships or football competitions.
- The Greek Cypriot government and sporting organisations have gone great lengths to prevent Turkish Cypriot teams from competing in the international arena. A good example is the case of Çetinkaya SK, which was due to play Luton Town FC in North Nicosia in the summer of 2007. It would have been the first time a professional British football team would have played in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. While the English Football Association authorised the match, the [Greek] Cypriot Football Association refused permission. It was backed by the usual threats to punish Luton with severe FIFA sanctions if they disobeyed the 'local FA' and played the match. The English FA tried to resolve the match right until kick off with both sets of players waiting in the tunnel to come on to the pitch. But sadly the Greek Cypriot FA refused to drop its objection, resulting in the bizarre outcome of



only Luton Town players appearing to play a practice session amongst themselves.

Ban on Direct Travel

- Greek Cypriots insist the world must obtain permission from them to use any ports in North Cyprus and refuse permission for use of any port not under their direct control. As a result, ports and airports in North Cyprus have been closed to direct international trade and travel since 1974. Travel to North Cyprus can only take place via Turkey.
- The requirement of a stopover in Turkey increases the time, financial cost and environmental impact of travel, discouraging both visitors and potential businesspeople from entering North Cyprus.
- Many countries do not recognise a passport issued by the TRNC, forcing Turkish Cypriots to obtain this document from either Turkey or from the Republic of Cyprus so they can travel around the world. This adds cost and time, as well as a loss of identity.
- Greek Cypriots use the number of Turkish Cypriots holding Republic of Cyprus passports as a tool to claim they are the only legitimate authority on the island – they fail to add that it is through the Greek Cypriot imposed embargoes that Turkish Cypriots are forced to apply for these documents.

A Symposium was held in December 2018 in London to examine the legality of these embargoes under European and International law. This report outlines the preliminary findings of the Symposium.



Embargoed! Symposium on "North Cyprus Embargoes and the Law"

TURKISH CYPRIOT LAND AND PROPERTY

Challenging the Greek Cypriot government at the European courts for the failure of its Custodian procedure to provide a fair, just and effective legal remedy to Turkish Cypriots who own land and property in South Cyprus.

Following violent attacks by the Greek Cypriot EOKA terror organisation, 25,000 Turkish Cypriots fled their homes from 103 villages for the relative safety of the more municipal areas between 1958 and 1964.

Further, in 1974, more people lost their homes in what is now South Cyprus. In total, there were 55,000 refugees (nearly one half of the population), with some of the those becoming displaced twice, even three times in their lives.

There are similar issues for 160,000 Greek Cypriots (nearly one third of the population) who lost their land and properties who are still awaiting recompense. However, whereas rights and processes exist for them to gain forms of compensation through the European Courts of Human Rights ruling of the Demopoulos case, no such internationally agreed rights exist for Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Cypriot government did not compensate Turkish Cypriot refugees between 1964-1974 for their losses. Since 1974, its "Custodian" programme, whereby Turkish Cypriot properties are in principle held in custodianship, has also failed benefit the owners in any way.

Many attempts by Turkish Cypriot owners to gain access or obtain compensation for their properties have failed.

The Greek Cypriot Government has not paid any compensation for land and property which it, in effect, compulsory requisitioned to build public facilities such as roads, car parks, airport, etc from Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Cypriot Custodian Law proposes that this will be dealt with when there is a solution to the Cyprus problem, which means no compensation has been received for 55 years to date.

Most Turkish Cypriot land and property is privately occupied by Greek Cypriots, some of whom were refugees themselves 45 years ago (and vice-versa for Greek Cypriot properties). Although Custodian Laws in theory allow Turkish Cypriot owners access to and compensation for these properties, there has been no successful access or compensation to such property by Turkish Cypriot owners because of deliberate obfuscation by the Greek Cypriot Government.

Some land and property owned by Turkish Cypriots in the South has not been deployed by the Greek Cypriot Government or individuals and is unoccupied. However, even for these properties, Turkish Cypriot owners have not managed to gain any recompense due to cynical "stonewalling" by the Greek Cypriot Administration. Examples of this include the demand by authorities that the owner provides original title deeds, and when these are provided, claiming that they have not been received, and until they are, no further action would take place.

It is true that the Immovable Property Commission (IPC), established to provide compensation to Greek Cypriots owning land and property in the North is far from perfect as the funds it has at its disposal are limited. However, compensation received by Turkish Cypriots amounts to next to nothing compared with over £300 million paid out to Greek Cypriot owners by the IPC to date.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the TRNC government assists those seeking recompense for their properties in the South so that they can successfully challenge Greek Cypriot failures to provide such recompense through the European Courts.

It is also recommended that the funding for the IPC is increased through TRNC, Turkish, European and International finance so that Greek Cypriots can be compensated for their losses allowing Turkish Cypriot individuals and companies internationally recognised ownership and use of such assets.

These measures, in our view, would help diffuse much of the bitterness and tension between the two communities, and make an important contribution to the solution of the Cyprus problem.

A full report on Cyprus Property issues is available on Embargoed! website www.embargoed.org/resources

ISSUING LEGAL OR PROCEDURAL CHALLENGES TO THE EU OVER ITS FAILURE TO ADHERE TO ITS OWN REGULATIONS AND IMPLEMENT ITS OWN POLICIES

Failing to overcome obstacles created by the Greek Cypriot Government to the operation of the Green Line Regulations.

Since 2005, following the UN referendum (see above), the European Commission has been producing annual reports on the operation of the Green Line Regulations, which were established to facilitate trade between the North and the South, providing a "channel" for Turkish Cypriots to sell their goods into South Cyprus and the EU. Unfortunately, it reports the same difficulties created by the Greek Cypriot Administration each year without resolution. Also unfortunate is the fact that the Group looking into this report only meets once a year.

The net result is that relatively insignificant levels of trade go through to the South Cyprus and the EU from Northern Cyprus. Currently, the Green Line trade volume remains at around 4.7 million Euros per annum. The miniscule level of this trade volume becomes clear when it is compared with South Cyprus's total imports worth of 6.5 billion Euros. This is clearly unacceptable.

The key failures of the operation of the Green Line Regulations are described below (direct quote extracts from the Commission's own report).

Obstacles to trade across the Line continue to persist, which, in the views of the Commission and Turkish Cypriot operators, form a reason for the limited level of trade.

As reported in previous years, the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus still do not allow the crossing of processed food products due to concerns raised by health services regarding the production process in the northern part of Cyprus. The Commission continues, as reported previously, to believe that there are no grounds under the Green Line Regulation to carry out checks of premises in the northern part of Cyprus in order to assess if production takes place in line with Union rules. Whilst the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus may take samples of the products for further analysis, in line with the application of the Green Line Regulation, they should not prevent all processed food from crossing. No developments took place during the reporting period on this issue.

During the reporting period, the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus continued to apply the same requirements that they apply to processed foods to trade of materials for contact with food. The Commission continues to look into this matter.

As in previous years, Turkish Cypriot traders have continued to report difficulties in having their products stocked in shops and advertising their products and services in the government controlled areas, which hinders trade. Traders continue to report on a reluctance among Greek Cypriots to purchase Turkish Cypriot products. In addition, it was mentioned that traders from both communities are faced with many administrative problems when wishing to enter into business with the other community. The economic operators from both sides need to be free to engage in trade relations, based on their business requirements.

The Cyprus Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce continued their close co-operation with a view to bringing economic benefits to both communities.

During the reporting period, certain obstacles to trade remained. The Republic of Cyprus continued not to authorise the crossing of Turkish Cypriot commercial vehicles above 7.5 tonnes or of processed foods. No developments took place in 2017.

Overall, and while the Green Line Regulation continues to provide a workable basis for allowing the passage of persons and goods to and from the government controlled areas of the Republic of Cyprus, the Commission continues to be concerned that trade in general is at a low level. The Commission considers that removing the obstacles to trade mentioned in this report would help significantly to increase trade across the Green Line. The Commission hopes that the work of the two Chambers to enhance contacts between the two business communities will lead to increased economic ties.

Recommendations

The Commission needs to be more active in resolving issues it has itself identified each year. If it is unable or unwilling to do so, procedural and legal options for challenging their procedures or competence should be seriously considered.

The Turkish Cypriot NGOs and Government need to work in concert with each other to develop a strategy for addressing this important issue



Suspension of Direct Trade Regulations for 14 years

Following the Turkish Cypriot Community's affirmative vote towards a comprehensive settlement and their expressed desire for a future within the European Union, the EU was determined to put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot Community. With its decision on 26th of April 2004, the EU General Affairs External Relations Council asked the EU Commission to bring forward comprehensive proposals to put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot Community, and to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot Community.

The direct trade regulation was proposed in 2004 as part of the initial comprehensive proposals brought forward by the European Commission. Currently, it is blocked at the European Parliament due to Greek Cypriot government's objection to its legal basis, for purely political considerations. And after 14 years, it is yet to be adopted.

Recommendations

In relation to the Direct Trade Regulations, there would be merit in putting questions to the Commission through MEPs, or complaints to the Commission, which should at least elicit a substantive response which of itself may be helpful. There is also a European Ombudsman who investigates complaints of maladministration by EU institutions and this is also worth exploring.

It is recommended that relevant NGOs engage in discussions with the European Commission in order to evaluate the possible alternative options to Direct Trade Regulations, which would enable North Cypriots to trade directly, under a preferential regime with the EU.

If the above efforts should fail, it is recommended that specialist legal expertise is sought to clarify position on the scope for challenging the EU on legal or procedural basis. Member States could bring such challenges. The hurdle is deliberately set higher for companies and individuals, but this could provide another route. For a company or individual to bring such an action they must be able to point to a decision that affects them by altering their legal position, and there are many North Cyprus companies which should be in a position to do this. There must be an act (essentially a decision) addressed to them or which is of direct and individual concern to them. The most relevant grounds of challenge are lack of competence (ie they haven't got the legal powers), infringement of an essential procedural requirement or of the Treaties or misuse of powers.

Challenging the EU over its failure to report its proceedings in Turkish, one of the two official languages of the Cyprus Republic.

Non-discrimination is a fundamental principle of the EC legal order. The European Court of Justice (ECJ) has articulated the underlying logic: "similar situations shall not be treated differently unless differentiation is objectively justified". In this particular instance, this differentiation can clearly not be justified.

There are many examples of how Turkish Cypriot EU citizens are being actively discriminated against. For example, this occurs when they are taking European Institutions' personnel selection exams. While the Greek Cypriot EU citizens are given the option to take the exams in their native tongue, Turkish Cypriots are denied the same right. This means that the Turkish candidates, as competent as their Greek peers, will not have the same levels of success in their exams and admission to jobs because they are not being given the opportunity to sit the exams in their mother tongue.

The European Union already uses some personnel who deal with translations and interpretations in the Turkish language in its transaction with Turkey, which is within the Customs Union. Facilitating an extension of this is what is required. More importantly, rules governing exams, etc, should be given priority to include Turkish alongside Greek so that justice can be seen to be done, and the principle of equality is not compromised.

An initiative was taken by the Greek Cypriot president in 2016 to implement the Turkish language in the EU, but we are not aware of any progress on this.

Recommendations

The European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) is a European Union mechanism aimed at increasing direct democracy by enabling "EU citizens to participate directly in the development of EU policies. This scheme can be exploited to good effect. Individual Members of European Parliament may well wish to take this up as an issue and progress it through the European Parliament.

Complaints can also be progressed through the EU Ombudsman.

If the above attempts fail, the case could also be brought before the European Court of Justice after seeking specialist legal advice.

Progressing the Hellim / Halloumi PDO application from the Greek Cypriot Government despite the fact that North Cyprus producers had not been consulted, as required by EU regulations

Hellim accounts for more than a quarter of all Turkish Cypriot exports. This product is sold into many countries outside Europe. There are no sales into the EU as the Greek Cypriot Government is unwilling to provide the necessary certification for it through inspections.

In early 2005, the Commission was unhappy to progress the Protected Designation of Origin application from the Greek Cypriot Government because Turkish Cypriot producers had not been consulted - a regulatory requirement. As a way round this impasse, a common understanding on a temporary solution was reached by the two Cypriot leaders and the Commission President Jean Claude Juncker on 16 July 2015. This understanding was a "gentlemen's agreement", and as such, non-binding. In accordance with the common understanding, these measures were agreed on 28 July 2015:

The PDO application would be published in the EU Official Journal to register the names Hellim/Halloumi for the whole territory of Cyprus.

The Commission confirmed in a letter that an independent specialist company would be the internationally accredited control body in charge to perform specific work.

The Commission adopted a proposal to modify the Green Line Regulations (GLR) in order to facilitate trade of Hellim/Halloumi from North Cyprus directly to the EU.

A new procedure was agreed whereby inspection reports of the cheese from North Cyprus would go directly to the Commission.

The Commission agreed to progress the application on the basis of this "common understanding" (despite the Turkish Cypriot producers' exclusion from the consultation process). Nevertheless, this "understanding" was hailed as a breakthrough, overcoming disagreements which had prevailed over many years.

However, having obtained the necessary go-ahead for the application, the Greek Cypriot Government took the decision to reverse its agreed position within two weeks of the agreement. It dismissed the terms of the "Common understanding" relating to the agreed inspections process and the agreed amendment of the Green Line Regulations.

As this represented a breakdown in trust between the Commission, the Turkish and Greek Cypriot Governments, the Commission suspended the progression of this application. This is being contested by the Greek Cypriot side.

The matter has been further complicated more recently, in that many Greek Cypriot Hellim/Halloumi producers are also unhappy with any form of PDO and trademarking because they consider it too restrictive. For example the PDO proposes that within 10 years, the product must have at least 50% of the milk content as sheep or goat milk. The producers are concerned that changing from cow's milk to sheep and goats milk will push up their costs and reduce the milk supply. There are other concerns. For example, producers wish to be able to diversify the product to include basil or chili (instead of mint), and still call it Hellim/Halloumi. A recent case brought by British-based Greek-Cypriot company successfully revoked the UK's Cypriot trademark. It is quite clear that Greek Cypriot producers have not been consulted sufficiently, and Turkish Cypriots have not been consulted at all before taking decisions.

Very recently, it has become clear that many Greek Cypriot producers are not complying with the restrictive standards set, and thus the European Trademark is also under threat.

Most Cypriots have been consuming Hellim/Halloumi for many decades made from milk which is predominantly cow's milk. This product has been called Hellim/halloumi all along. It is therefore fair to ask the question, if this cheese was not Hellim/Halloumi, what was it?

Recommendations

The validity current Greek Cypriot government strategy for Halloumi/Hellim is in grave doubt with many producers and distributors of this product on both sides of Cyprus. It should carry out a complete review of the Halloumi/Hellim production, and involve all producers from North and South as required by regulations. It is quite possible that a less restrictive branding based on the product being of Cypriot origin may be a better way forward.

The EU should not have broken its own rules and progressed the PDO application knowing that the producers in the North were not consulted. The EU should stand by the agreement reached on 16 July 2015 with both leaders. The EU's credibility and integrity is at question with this issue. It should not be progressing the PDO application as it exists at the moment, in effect, rewarding the insincerity of the Greek Cypriot Government in relation to the Statement of Common Understanding. Any registration should ensure that all Cypriot producers have effective access to an

independent control mechanism that verifies compliance with PDO specifications, and a direct channel of sales into Europe via an amendment to the Green Line regulations.

This issue should be progressed vigorously by all interested stakeholders including Turkish Cypriot farmers, the Chambers of Commerce and Industry and the TRNC Government, and a programme of lobbying at EU should be pursued.



Agreement reached on the Halloumi/Hellim statement of Common Understanding, 16 July 2015.

Bibliography

This is not an exhaustive list, but indicates important sources of information that helped inform this report.

The Politics of Property in Cyprus: Conflicting Appeals to 'Bizonality' and 'Human Rights' by the Two Cypriot Communities. By Ayla Gürel & Kudret Özersay, 2006, PRIO

Is the Turkish Cypriot Population Shrinking? By Mete Hatay, 2007, PRIO

Hopes and Fears Regarding a Property Settlement: Insights from Cyprus 2015
Research presented by Ahmet Sözen

Public Opinion and the Property Issue: Quantitative Findings, by Erol Kaymak and Alexandros Lordos for Cyprus 2015 Research

Demopoulos and Others v Turkey, ruling by the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights, March 2010

Attitudes Regarding Property in Cyprus, presented by Erol Kaymak, March 2010, UK House of Lords

Common understanding on a temporary solution for Halloumi/Hellim, to be implemented pending the reunification of Cyprus, reached under the guidance of President Juncker on 16 July 2015, Nicosia, the European Commission

Various articles on Halloumi/Hellim, The Cyprus Mail