

The construction of reality and the mass media in Cyprus

MAKARIOS DROUSIOTIS

**The obliteration of opposing opinion through defamation:
the case of President Papadopoulos' accusations that
his political opponents were financed
by the United States and the United Nations.**

ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΔΡΟΥΣΙΟΤΗΣ

NICOSIA – CYPRUS
OCTOBER 2005

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
SUMMARY	6
1. INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 Historical background	8
1.2 The Annan plan	9
1.3 The referendum and its consequences	9
1.4 Rumours about paid agents	10
1.5 The Papadopoulos accusations	10
1.6 Guilty of having an opinion	11
2. THE FACTS	12
2.1 USAID and UNOPS	12
2.2 The Bi-communal Development Project	12
2.3 The BDP and Non-Government Organisations	14
2.4 The Nathan Associates Report	14
2.5 Some conclusions of the Report	15
3. THE MISINFORMATION	16
3.1 The \$6.4 million	17
3.2 The “opinion leaders”	18
3.3 The “visits” to the American Embassy	19
3.4 What was reported in Cyprus	20
4. THE GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE	23

5.	THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF DENIAL	26
5.1	The case of Eleni Mavrou	26
5.2	The case of UNOPS	27
5.3	The case of the State Department	27
6.	WHAT UNOPS ACTUALLY FUNDED	29
6.1	Special Initiative Grants	30
6.2	The letter by Alvaro de Soto	31
7.	INVESTIGATION REFUSED	34
8.	CONCLUSIONS	36
	APPENDICES	39
	ABBREVIATIONS	71

FOREWORD

This report examines the issue of allegations made in Cyprus in October 2004 that politicians, journalists, Non-Governmental Organisations and other institutions were funded by the United States through the Bi-communal Development Plan, which is administered by the United Nations in Cyprus, with the purpose of convincing public opinion to vote in favour of the Annan plan for a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus issue.

The aim of this report is to highlight three basic problems that have been identified as a consequence of these allegations and the manner in which these were presented to public opinion:

- The arbitrary manner in which the mass media (and in particular the TV channels) operate and the extent of their dependence on the executive.
- The lack of independent institutions which could effectively protect public opinion from misinformation.
- The government's undemocratic practice of suppressing dissenting opinion by defamation.

It is hoped that this report will initiate a public dialogue on the quality of information available to public opinion in Cyprus and the need to reinforce democratic institutions and processes.

Copies of this report, which has been simultaneously released in both Greek and English, will be sent to all competent officials and bodies in Cyprus, as well as the European Union, in which the Republic of Cyprus, as a full member since May 1, 2004, possesses full rights, but is also fully accountable.

This report is published on the Internet at the address: www.makarios.ws

SUMMARY

Since 1974, the Greek and Turkish inhabitants of Cyprus have been living apart as a consequence of the Turkish military intervention which forcibly divided the island in two. Turkey invaded Cyprus just five days after the government of President Makarios was overthrown by a military coup, which had been instigated by the military junta ruling Greece at the time.

In 1998, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) agreed with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to fund projects which would contribute to furthering cooperation, reconciliation and peaceful coexistence of the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus. The agreement was made with the consent of the Cyprus government.

The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) administered the Bi-communal Development Programme (BDP), which was funded with \$60.5 million over the period 1998-2004. The BDP proceeded in parallel with the United Nations' political initiative for the comprehensive solution of the Cyprus issue, which eventually resulted in what has become known as the Annan plan. The stated political aims of the BDP were in agreement with the policies of the United States and the European Union, and with those of the governments of Greece and the Republic of Cyprus. These aims were focused on a three-pronged objective: the solution of the Cyprus issue on the basis of the Annan plan, the accession of the whole of Cyprus into the EU, and the beginning of accession negotiations between Turkey and the EU.

The election of Tassos Papadopoulos to the presidency of the Republic of Cyprus in February 2003 changed the political landscape. The new President of Cyprus, who had not been involved in this procedure from its beginning, urged the Greek Cypriots to reject the Annan plan. In the referendum held on April 24, 2004, 76% of Greek Cypriots voted against the plan, while 63% of Turkish Cypriots accepted it.

Some months later, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), which sup-

plies aid to various countries, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and the Bi-communal Development Programme (BDP) became the targets of an orchestrated misinformation campaign, contributors to which included the President of the Republic of Cyprus Tassos Papadopoulos, the Speaker of the House of Representatives Demetris Christofias, other members of the governing coalition, and a number of journalists. The result of this campaign was the denigration of persons and organisations that had supported the Annan plan, who were denounced as paid agents furthering foreign interests against the interests of the Greeks of Cyprus.

Within the context of this campaign, the BDP was presented as an expensive campaign by the US government to buy out consciences and secure votes for the Annan plan. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) which had received funds for projects under the BDP were denounced as traitors.

The starting point for this campaign was a report by the independent firm Nathan Associates, evaluating the projects funded by USAID. The content of that report was distorted so that it could be exhibited as evidence that the Americans were recruiting hand-picked, paid agents to impose their policies in Cyprus.

The purpose of this report was to present the true facts about the funding of the BDP by UNOPS. The evidence supplied demonstrates the extent of the misinformation and the manner in which public opinion was manipulated by the governing coalition and the mass media, in order to annihilate dissenting opinion.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Historical background

Cyprus, an island in the eastern Mediterranean, was declared an independent state at midnight on August 15, 1960. According to the 1960 census, the population of Cyprus consisted of 82% Greeks and 18% Turks. The constitution of the new state was based on an agreement initialled in Zurich on February 11, 1959 by Greece and Turkey, and signed on February 19 of the same year by Greece, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the two communities of Cyprus. The constitution of the new state safeguarded its bi-communal character. This arrangement was considered by the Greek Cypriots as a great compromise on their behalf, because the idea of *Enosis* (union with Greece) was abandoned in favour of the independent bi-communal state.

At the end of 1963 the Zurich agreements collapsed. The Greek Cypriots revived the goal of *Enosis* while the Turkish Cypriots sought to achieve partition. After the collapse of the agreements, the Cyprus government, which from that point onwards included only the Greek Cypriots, was recognised by the UN as the legal government of Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriots, with the help of Turkey, attempted to create a second state on the island. The intercommunal negotiations, which took place from 1968 to 1974 with the purpose of improving the Zurich agreements, failed.

On July 15, 1974 the military junta then ruling Greece staged a coup in Cyprus and deposed President Makarios. On July 20, Turkey invaded Cyprus and occupied 33% of the island in the north. The Turkish army displaced 160,000 Greek Cypriots from the areas it occupied, and they sought refuge in the south; Fifty thousand Turkish Cypriots were moved from the southern to the northern part of Cyprus, while Turkey implemented a colonisation plan. In 1983, the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" ("TRNC") was declared, which was recognised only by Turkey.

All initiatives undertaken to solve the Cyprus issue under the auspices of the United Nations

between 1974 and 1999 failed, with the responsibility for failure lying mainly on the Turkish side. The Turkish position was that the Cyprus issue had been solved in 1974.

1.2 The Annan plan

On November 22, 2002, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan submitted to the two sides a comprehensive plan for the solution of the Cyprus issue. The submission of the plan coincided with a change in the Turkish government. The new Turkish leader, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, abandoned the dogma of the Cyprus issue having been solved in 1974 and promised to cooperate to solve the problem. The UN initiative, which resulted in the Annan plan, was launched in December 1999 and was based on a three-pronged approach: solution of the Cyprus issue, accession of the whole of Cyprus into the EU and the start of accession negotiations between the EU and Turkey.

In February 2003, (three months after the submission of the Annan plan), the president of the DIKO party, Tassos Papadopoulos, was elected President of the Republic of Cyprus with the support of the largest party of the left, AKEL, winning against veteran politician and incumbent president Glafcos Clerides. The new president took over the responsibility of completing the negotiations to solve the Cyprus issue on the basis of the Annan plan. Papadopoulos was considered to be the representative of the “hard line” on the Cyprus issue, as opposed to Clerides, who was seen as a “realist”.

1.3 The referendum and its consequences

The final version of the Annan plan was subjected to separate referenda among the two communities on April 24, 2004. President Papadopoulos called upon the Greek Cypriot people to vote against it. The plan was eventually rejected by 76% of Greek Cypriot voters, while 63% of Turkish Cypriot voters approved it.

These developments created a bitter climate of division in Greek Cypriot society between those who accepted and those who rejected the plan. Those who supported the plan angrily accused President Papadopoulos of misinforming the public and exerting psychological pressure on the population to reject it. Papadopoulos, members of his government and of the parties supporting it responded to the criticisms, claiming that the dissenters:

- Were acting in cooperation with, or at the instigation of, foreign embassies.¹

1. Answering a reporter's question on criticisms of his policy resulting in his international isolation, on October 30, 2004, Tassos Papadopoulos stated: “Of course there are some in Cyprus who consider other contacts important, when they meet the second or third or fourth in rank at the US embassy either to obtain approval of what they say, or to express positions and views which undermine both the authority of the government and our whole cause.” (Cyprus News Agency, 30.10.2004).

- Were undermining the Republic of Cyprus and its cause.²
- Were supporting positions that were tantamount to a national sellout.³

1.4 Rumours about paid agents

During the period after the referendum, AKEL found itself facing strict criticism of its political choices, as a consequence of its cooperation with Tassos Papadopoulos. These criticisms were mostly expressed via the columns of *Politis* newspaper.

The newspaper claimed it had confirmed information that AKEL General Secretary Demetris Christofias had been saying at party gatherings that the newspaper “had sold out to the Americans” and that its functionaries were a “bunch of sellouts”. *Politis* Publishing Editor Dionysis Dionysiou, in a sternly-worded signed article, called on Christofias to take a public position on the rumours.⁴

The Political Office of AKEL’s Central Committee reacted with an announcement, in which it claimed that *Politis* “has long declared war on AKEL as if it were a party itself”, referred to Dionysiou’s article as “unworthy of comment” and warned AKEL supporters that “some have made it their set purpose to undermine the Party”.⁵

1.5 The Papadopoulos Accusations

On October 14, 2004, on his return from a trip abroad, President Papadopoulos answered reporters’ questions in the VIP lounge at Larnaca airport. At the end of the press conference, Papadopoulos commented that he had not been asked about the conflict between the AKEL General Secretary and *Politis* newspaper, and made the following unprompted comment:

“Some people are clutching at phrases whispered by some that have supposedly been said by the

2. One of the most effective arguments used by Tassos Papadopoulos in favour of rejecting the Annan plan was that the plan abolished the Republic of Cyprus. After the referendum, the government made every effort to identify itself with the Republic of Cyprus. Every criticism levelled at the government was presented as an attempt to undermine the state. DISY party President Nicos Anastasiades reported the government to the institutions of the EU accusing it of interfering to manipulate public opinion before the referendum. The accusation levelled at the government was presented as an attack on the Republic of Cyprus, and consequently as undermining the entity of the Cypriot state. The pressure exerted on Nicos Anastasiades was such that he was forced to withdraw his report.

3. President Papadopoulos, commenting on criticism by DISY leader Nicos Anastasiades of the way he handled the Cyprus issue with respect to the prospects of Turkey’s accession to the EU, stated: “The surprising thing is that what we hear in Turkish from the statements of Turkish officials, I hear repeated in Greek by some in the Republic of Cyprus”. (Cyprus News Agency, 29.3.2005).

4. *Politis*, 10.10.2004, column, Thu-kys.

5. Announcement by the Political Office of the AKEL Central Committee, 13.10.2004.

*AKEL General Secretary. What is a bit of an oxymoron is that they are taking cover behind this claim about substantiation of accusations. From what I read and from what I hear, those who become party to such activities are certainly not [he obviously meant to say “issued”] stamped receipts so that there can be substantiation. Many things can be deduced from behaviour. Others can be deduced from the ambient atmosphere.”*⁶

Politis reacted strongly to President Papadopoulos' statement and the next day ran its lead story under the banner “DEMOCRACY IN PLASTER”, with the caption “Leader of the Dark Rumour” next to a photo of Tassos Papadopoulos.⁷

1.6 Guilty of having an opinion

As a result of Papadopoulos' statements and the newspaper's reaction, a public debate began through the newspapers about whether it was correct for someone to be considered suspect of selling out their conscience on the basis only of the “prevalent atmosphere”. In the midst of this debate, a report appeared in *Phileleftheros* newspaper according to which the Americans had spent millions of dollars in Cyprus to influence public opinion, but admitted it had been in vain.⁸ The news item was based on an evaluation report on the American aid to Cyprus (\$60.4 million from 1998 to 2004), which was published on the Internet.

The revelation of that report, at a time when the political atmosphere was heavy with the Papadopoulos statements and the reactions they had caused, was the beginning of a storm of information, most of which was distorted or totally fallacious, according to which the US had spent millions of dollars to buy out consciences in Cyprus with the purpose of promoting the Annan plan.

This campaign was targeted at:

- Non-governmental organisations which had developed bi-communal activity.
- Political persons who had been favourably disposed towards the Annan plan.

The campaign was led by all four national TV channels, while the two newspapers supporting the government, *Haravghi* and *Simerini*, also contributed with news items.⁹

6. Cyprus News Agency, 15.10.2004.

7. The newspaper's front page is published in Appendix 1, p. 40.

8. *Phileleftheros*, 26.10.2004: “US Spent Millions and Admit They Eventually Failed”.

9. Sample front pages are given in Appendix 2, p. 41, and Appendix 3, p. 42.

2. THE FACTS

2.1 USAID and UNOPS

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) is a state organisation engaged in granting economic aid to foreign countries.¹⁰ The US government's annual aid to Cyprus, with the approval of Congress, is \$15 million. From 1974 until 2004, Cyprus received a total of \$450 million in US aid. Until 1998, this aid was granted through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). In March 1998, USAID signed an agreement with the UNDP to supply \$30 million in aid to finance bi-communal projects in Cyprus. Later, the aid rose to \$60 million and the implementation of the programme was extended to 2004. UNDP also contributed \$500,000 to the programme, so the total rose to \$60.5 million over a period of six years (1998-2004). In 1998, the United Nations closed the UNDP office in Cyprus.¹¹ Administration of the aid funds was assigned to the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). UNOPS formed a Project Management Unit in Cyprus.

2.2 The Bi-communal Development Project

The \$60.5 million were used to finance the Bi-communal Development Programme (BDP). The aim of the programme, as recorded in the agreement signed by USAID and UNDP, was "to support the peace-making process in Cyprus" through "bi-communal projects and measures aimed at the reunification of the island and designed to reduce tensions and promote peace and cooperation between the two communities on Cyprus."¹²

The BDP had an overtly political orientation, and its implementation coincided with the efforts

10. For the activities of USAID, see <http://www.usaid.gov>

11. They preserved only the section dealing with political asylum cases.

12. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 3.

of United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan for the solution of the Cyprus issue, in conjunction with the accession of Cyprus to the European Union and Turkey's efforts to secure a date for the start of accession talks. The US, the European Union, Cyprus and Greece supported the United Nations' initiative. Turkey continued to maintain that the Cyprus issue had been solved in 1974. Therefore, when implementation of the BDP began in 1998, there was a unity of purpose among the US, Greece, Cyprus and the EU.

Despite the fact that the government of Cyprus always declared that the solution of the Cyprus issue and the creation of a unified state was its main priority, it never implemented any project contributing to the reconciliation of the two communities. The responsibility for this was left, by the Cypriot state itself, in the hands of the US and of other interested foreign countries. Because, also, of the totalitarian nature of the Denktash regime, the Greek Cypriot side maintained that it was ready to accept the Turkish Cypriots, and that the problem was mostly due to the other side.

UNOPS began to implement the BDP with the full cooperation of the Cyprus government, which took part with a representative on the organising committee. A separate organising committee was formed for those projects concerning the Turkish Cypriots. A representative of the "TRNC" took part in this committee. The separate organising committees were considered necessary because of the problems arising from one side not recognising the other.¹³

The political conditions ambient at the time the BDP began its activities were difficult. The Denktash regime had imposed a complete ban on bi-communal contact, and the political atmosphere was further weighed down by the decision of the Cyprus government to deploy Russian-made S-300 long-range missiles on the island.

As was provided in the agreement signed by USAID and UNDP, the political guidance on the projects which would be funded was to be provided by the US Embassy in Nicosia.¹⁴ From the beginning of the implementation of the BDP in 1998, neither the Cyprus government nor any of the political parties posed a question of US interference in internal Cyprus issues through the BDP. The government and all the big parties, directly or indirectly, used the BDP to finance various projects, accepting the rules governing its implementation.

However, criticisms were often published in the press of both sides of the way in which the US, and other states or international organisations, were promoting reconciliation. On the Greek Cypriot side, the US was accused of using reconciliation to prepare the Greek Cypriots to "accept the *faits accomplis* of 1974". On the Turkish Cypriot side they were accused of "undermining the 'TRNC'".

13. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 5.

14. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 4.

2.3 The BDP and Non-Government Organisations

According to the initial planning of the BDP, 20% of the funding would be given to Non-Government Organisations. At that time, NGOs were not well organised in the Greek Cypriot community and almost nonexistent in the Turkish Cypriot community. At the same time it was almost impossible to find NGOs on either side which would be willing to cooperate in common bi-communal projects.¹⁵ Eventually, the NGOs managed to absorb only 10% of the aid, \$6,416,800. The remaining 90%, about \$58 million, was spent on contributions to the Red Cross, on development projects (Nicosia sanitation project, restoration of monuments, churches, mosques etc.) and on projects concerning public health and the environment.¹⁶ These projects were implemented with the cooperation of the government of the Republic of Cyprus as far as the non-occupied areas were concerned, and of the authorities of the “TRNC” for the occupied areas.

The BDP funded a total of 51 Greek Cypriot and 26 Turkish Cypriot NGO projects. On both sides, the greatest part of the aid went to organisations dealing with health issues such as cancer, Alzheimer's and diabetes.¹⁷ Projects relevant to the environment and education were also funded. One project on the environment cost \$200,000 and another on dyslexia \$150,000.¹⁸ Funding also went to professional associations and to research groups. All these activities were considered bi-communal because their results could be of benefit to the whole of Cyprus. Actually, each community implemented its projects separately.

The Project Management Unit for the BDP evaluated all the projects in the category of the citizens' community and of NGOs in respect to the achievement of their bi-communal aims. The evaluation was done on a scale of A, B and C (good, average, poor): 45% of projects was graded C, 35% B and 20% A.¹⁹ In other words, almost half the projects were considered a waste of time and resources, a third were of average effectiveness and only 20% were successful. This can be attributed to the following factors:

- The institution of NGOs was not developed in Cyprus.
- The political climate did not allow the development of bi-communal relations.
- The resources were expended in areas entirely irrelevant to the purposes of the BDP.

2.4 The Nathan Associates Report

In December 2003, the US government gave the independent firm Nathan Associates the task of evaluating the administration and utilisation of American aid to Cyprus. The contract between

15. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 13.

16. A list of the project budgets can be found at <http://mirror.undp.org/cyprus/projects/sectorsubsector.pdf>

17. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 33.

18. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 21.

19. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 36.

USAID and UNDP ended in 2004. There was also a serious possibility that the Cyprus issue would be solved. It was therefore natural that the US government, which had supplied funds to improve relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, should seek to evaluate the effectiveness of the BDP and to consider its future, with or without a solution to the Cyprus issue.

The main body of the Nathan Associates research was done in Cyprus over the period January to February 2004. The evaluation report, as can be deduced from its content, was written in April 2004, just before the referendum. After the Annan plan was rejected by the Greek Cypriots, a one-page introduction was inserted. The final text of the report is dated May 25, 2004.

2.5 Some conclusions of the Report

In the introduction to the report, the following is noted: “It is perhaps too easy to link the Bi-Communal Development Programme’s expenditure of \$60.5 million since 1998 with the outcome [the rejection of the Annan plan by the Greek Cypriots] by concluding that the programmes and projects financed by BDP with the specific purpose of promoting bi-communal collaboration and reconciliation failed to achieve their purpose.”²⁰

In the introduction, an attempt is made to evaluate the BDP in relation to the result of the referendum. It notes in particular that it could be argued that programmes like the BDP should have begun much earlier to develop active supporters of the solution among the Greek Cypriot community, much as it was able to do with the Turkish Cypriot NGOs, many of which received support from the BDP and were “active proponents of the settlement”, while they helped convince others as well that the proposed plan “was their best hope to enter into the modern world”.

Its evaluation spoke of improvements to the BDP which could have been made with the hope that “the UN plan would be accepted”. As a result of the rejection of the plan by the Greek Cypriots, the Nathan Associates researchers expressed their doubts as to whether the BDP or any other foreign grant programme dedicated to convincing Greek Cypriots to “vote for peace” should be continued. As is mentioned in the introduction, “the factors which caused these citizens to reject a settlement may well be too powerful for any such programme to succeed”.²¹

20. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. iv.

21. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. iv.

3. THE MISINFORMATION

The Nathan Associates report, of which the government had known for some time²², was simultaneously leaked to two newspapers, the Greek language *Phileleftheros* and the English language *Cyprus Mail*, on October 26, 2004, just two days after President Papadopoulos' statement on the "prevalent atmosphere".

Phileleftheros presented the report under the headline "US Spent Millions and Admit they Eventually Failed". The *Cyprus Mail* ran the item under the headline "US Report: Half of NGO Funding a Waste of Time". The headline of the *Phileleftheros* report was the beginning of a broad journalistic campaign by all the nationwide TV channels and by the pro-government newspapers *Haravghi* and *Simerini*, the main feature of which was the "admission" by the US that they had spent millions of dollars to buy out consciences, but failed.

The evaluation report of the BDP by Nathan Associates was presented arbitrarily by all the TV channels and the pro-government press as a top secret document, which recorded the areas of activity and budgets spent by the US government, via NGOs, to buy consciences in order to influence public opinion in favour of the Annan plan in the April 24 referendum.

Michalis Ignatiou, Washington correspondent for Mega TV, citing undisclosed sources, reported that the money was supplied to groups of citizens who had undertaken to promote the Annan plan: "The basic conclusion, according to a top Washington diplomatic source, is that the Americans chose the wrong people; unfortunately for them, they chose the wrong people to promote their plans".²³

22. On October 28, President Papadopoulos stated that "the Nathan Associates Report [...] had been on the Internet for several months now, from which we got the additional information we need" (Cyprus News Agency, 28.10.2004).

23. Mega TV, 26.10.2004.

Just some examples of distortion, incorrect interpretation or selective isolation of elements of the report are the following:

3.1 The \$6.4 million

On October 27, in the daily briefing of reporters by the press officer of the US State Department, Greek reporter Lambros Papantoniou submitted to Richard Boucher that USAID “allocated \$6.4 million from the DOS annual budget to bribe Greek and Turkish Cypriot politicians, reporters, analysts, professors, organisations, et cetera, et cetera, – I have the full report, 120 pages – to campaign for a big ‘yes’ to the Annan plan for the referendum of April 24, 2004.”²⁴

Papantoniou cited the Nathan Associates report as the source of his information, in which, however, what he quoted does not appear.²⁵ The sum of \$6.4 million does exist, but his interpretation that it represented money spent to buy out consciences was wrong. In the report, it is actually stated that: “For a \$6.4 million investment, a better effort should have been made to evaluate and track progress on Turkish and Greek Cypriot NGOs bi-communal performance.”²⁶

The \$6.4 million refers to 10% of the total expenditure of \$60.4 million, which went to NGOs from 1998 to 2004. These NGO projects, as we have seen, had nothing to do with either the Annan plan or the referendum, and were not even political in nature.

The State Department representative, though not aware of the report's content, doubted the veracity of Papantoniou's claims that USAID “spent an additional \$6.4 million on a campaign in favour of the Annan plan before the referendum”:

BOUCHER: I'd have to look at this particular amount, whether it was part of that annual amount or whether it was separate. No, I'm not quite sure it was separate.

QUESTION: It was separate. Correct yourself. It was separate.

BOUCHER: Well, I'd have to look at that and see...

The next day, Mega TV's Washington correspondent, Michalis Ignatiou, reported the following clarifying “information”, in reference to the \$6.4 million allegedly spent to support the Annan plan: “An American official tonight clarified the following in reference to this additional sum of \$6.4 million. [...] The official stated that part of it was spent on activities which, as he stated, ‘we believed would help the Cypriots better to understand the provisions of the Annan plan’. The official said

24. The full text of the references to Cyprus in the State Department Press Officer's briefing of 27.10.2004 is given in Appendix 5, p. 44.

25. The full text of the report and all its appendices is given at <http://www.makarios.ws>

26. Cyprus Bi-Communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 44.

that the names of the persons and organisations which were supported by this special State Department budget would not be disclosed to the public... Let us note here that it has not yet been clarified whether this special budget of \$6.4 million has been approved by Congress as happened with all the funds made available for Cyprus up to April 2004. According to Mega's information, this budget has not been approved by the Congress or the Senate".²⁷

This information, attributed to an unnamed American official, has never been substantiated. However, Michalis Ignatiou is a well respected reporter in Cyprus, and he is considered to be well informed on what is happening in the US. For that reason, the false information he reported was accepted as substantial, and created the certainty that, indeed, a fund of \$6.4 million had been used to buy out consciences.

Some examples of this "certainty" are the following statements by Members of the House of Representatives from the governing DIKO party:

Antigone Papadopoulou:

"The money that was given [for political purposes] is 10% which corresponds to \$6.4 million given for the purpose of promoting the Annan plan".²⁸

Zacharias Koulias:

"I am not citing the Red Cross or brucellosis or the donkey society, to say that because someone gave this money, therefore they have the legal right to intervene with a small people like us, to pay us, to advise us what will happen for the future of our country. Do you agree that the Americans giving us this \$6.5 million to convince us to vote for the Annan plan is a correct action?"²⁹

3.2 The "opinion leaders"

To evaluate the effectiveness of the US aid to Cyprus, the Nathan Associates researchers used the method of interviews on the basis of set questionnaires. A total of 86 interviews was held, of people who were variously involved in the American aid programme, such as members of the US diplomatic mission in Nicosia, of the United Nations mission in Cyprus, officials of the Republic of Cyprus and of the "TRNC" who had taken part in the procedure, and officials of services and organisations which had been supported by the BDP.

One category of people interviewed was that of "opinion leaders". The researches selected 24 important members of society, who they visited at their places of work and interviewed on the

27. Mega TV, 28.10.2004.

28. CyBC TV, 27.10.2004.

29. CyBC TV, 27.10.2004.

basis of a set questionnaire.³⁰ Some of the questions were: “How did you learn about the BDP?”, “From what you know or have heard, how would you describe the way the BDP is being implemented by UNOPS?”.

In the questionnaire, there was a question concerning the current political developments in the Cyprus issue, in relation to the purposes of the BDP:

“If the Annan Plan comes into effect, what are the most immediate problems/issues that need to be addressed if the settlement is to succeed?”

The mass media presented these interviews as training for the promotion of the Annan plan:

ANT1 TV, report by Marios Manousopoulos:

“A surprising element also recorded in the report, and particularly in Section 5B, is that the so-called ‘opinion leaders’ were used, the guides, Greek and Turkish Cypriots who had nothing to do with the funding, but would influence public opinion and submit suggestions so that the Annan plan would pass. “It is worth noting that the ‘opinion leaders’, that is, those who had been selected to influence public opinion [...] were literally hand-picked and personally interviewed. According to the report, they answered ten questions on how they could carry out the task, the basic purpose of which was nothing other than the acceptance of the Annan plan.”³¹

According to the ANT1 report, the journalist was drawing his evidence from the Nathan Associates report, which does not in the least substantiate the above claims. Manousopoulos also mentioned the names of the “opinion leaders” who, as he claimed, would “carry out the task”: “Katy Cleridou, Eleni Mavrou, Michalis Papapetrou, Takis Hadjidemetriou, Ali Erel, Mustafa Akinci, Lellos Demetriades, Christos Artemiou and others...”

These are only eight names out of 23 “opinion leaders” who were interviewed by Nathan Associates. All of those whose names were mentioned by ANT1 happened to have supported the Annan plan. The remaining Greek Cypriot “opinion leaders” whose names are included in the list but were not announced, happened to have taken a position against the Annan plan, or to be persons who are difficult to consider as “guides” who would influence public opinion in favour of the plan. They include: Nikoforos, Bishop of Kykkos, *Simerini* newspaper Managing Editor Aristos Michaelides, and *Phileleftheros* newspaper Editor in Chief Androulla Taramounta.

3.3 The “visits” to the American Embassy

Another category of people interviewed by the Nathan Associates researchers were the grant recipients, those who had benefited from the BDP projects, either representing state services

30. See Appendix 7, p. 48.

31. ANT1 TV, 26.10.2004.

or municipalities, or NGOs. Of the 23 Greek Cypriots in this category, two represented government services, two more represented municipalities and the remainder represented NGOs.³² The interviews were carried out at their places of work, and in some cases, at the Hilton Park Hotel in Nicosia. The interviews were based on a questionnaire of 21 questions. Of these, 20 concerned the BDP and only the last one had political overtones, obviously meant to record the political tendencies of the interviewees. This question concerned their judgement of the Annan plan.³³

In the State Department Press Officer's briefing to representatives of the press on October 27, 2004, reporter Lambros Papantoniou, citing the evaluation report which he had in his hand, referred to the interviews of grantees by the Nathan Associates researchers. He claimed that the interviews were held at the US embassy and their purpose was to determine their suitability as promoters of the Annan plan. Papantoniou submitted the following question to the State Department's Press Officer: *Who had the list of those who showed up at the Embassy and answered those questions?*

Boucher's reply was that he was not in a position to give an answer, obviously because he had not been informed: *You have a public document. If the list is not there, I don't think it's in our interest or appropriate for us to provide a list of people that we might have interviewed in relation to any project.*

In the face of Papantoniou's insistence that a list be given to him, unless it was confidential, Boucher replied: *No, it's not secret or confidential, it's just private. These are not public meetings and I don't think the Embassy has to divulge a list of everybody they might have had a discussion with at some time.*³⁴

From Boucher's answers – and this is perfectly normal – it can be seen that he had no detailed knowledge of the report's content. If he had, he would have pointed out that the names Papantoniou was asking for were listed in Section 2 of the Nathan Associates report, which the reporter was holding in his hand. From the manner in which Boucher replied, it can also be seen that he was speaking on principle, and not about this particular instance.

3.4 What was reported in Cyprus

On the evening of October 27, in a special telephone report from Washington, Mega TV reporter Michalis Ignatiou, citing Boucher's briefing, reported the following verbatim:

32. All the names are given in Appendix 8, p. 49.

33. The questionnaire is given in Appendix 9, p. 53.

34. The exchange between Boucher and Papantoniou is given in Appendix 5, p. 44.

The State Department representative admitted that bi-communal projects were funded and also admitted that the recently publicised report is genuine. Reporters asked for the names of those who had been supported. The representative of the State Department said that he would not give a list of names of those who had received financial support from Washington. He also said that he would not give a list of those who had functioned as advisors to the Americans.³⁵

The information reported by Ignatiou was considered true. The next day, all the remaining national TV channels reported statements attributed to Boucher to the effect that the US had allocated funds to influence public opinion before the referendum, but refused to disclose the names of their collaborators, who were called the “great recipients”:

Sigma TV, Giorgos Christodoulides:

After the Boucher statements, it is now clear that in the period before the referendum there had been external funding with political motives. In an exchange with a reporter, the representative of the State Department revealed that there was a list of people who had received money because they supported the Annan plan, but quickly added that their names would not be publicly disclosed.

Christodoulides referred to Appendix 5 of the Report, where the questionnaire given to persons interviewed by Nathan Associates is given, and reported:

It is revealed that the 21st question which was submitted to the interviewees at the US embassy, Greek and Turkish Cypriot great recipients, as they are characteristically referred to, was the determining factor of whether they would be funded or not.³⁶

CyBC, Panayiotis Kaparis: *The United States refuse to reveal the names of those who had been funded to support the Annan plan. State Department representative Richard Boucher reported that this would not be in the interests of the United States. According to the report, the recipients of the money appeared before the United States embassy in Nicosia and were asked to answer the following question before the money was approved: ‘If a referendum were held now, on the basis of what you know, are you strongly in favour of the Annan plan, in favour with reservations, or against?’*

After this, CyBC distortedly reported the excerpt from Boucher's statements, in which he “admitted” that a list of the names of those who had been funded exists: *You have the public document, but no list is included in it and I don't think it is correct, or in our interests, to give you the list of these persons that we have interviewed in relation to any programme.³⁷*

35. Mega TV, 27.10.2004.

36. Sigma TV, 28.10.2004.

37. CyBC TV, 28.10.2004.

From the content of the above reports, it is clear that either the reporters did not refer to the text of Boucher's statements about Cyprus in the briefing of October 27, or they deliberately distorted his statements. It is also clear that the reporters who were informing public opinion on such a sensitive issue had not studied the content of the Nathan Associates report, which was available on the Internet and which they were citing as the source of their information. Had they studied the report, they would have found that no interviews had been held at the US Embassy and that the names of those they called the "great recipients" were not secret, as they reported, but published in the document in question, and that they had nothing to do with the serious accusations the reporters were heaping on them.

4. THE GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE

President of the Republic of Cyprus Tassos Papadopoulos, Speaker of the House of Representatives Demetris Christofias, and other high-ranking officials of the parties forming the governing coalition, contributed to the misinformation of public opinion by the mass media with information that they gave in their public statements, much of which was inaccurate and sometimes completely unfounded:

On October 28, Tassos Papadopoulos told reporters that:

*Indeed funding was given to organisations, persons, some earlier, some recently approved. Indeed, for this funding to be given, there was a questionnaire and one of its questions was: Are you in favour of the Annan plan? Strongly? Moderately? Not at all? All of this I am saying is in the Nathan Associates report.*³⁸

Tassos Papadopoulos was referring to the questionnaire submitted to those who had received or administered aid within the provisions of the BDP, among whom were government officials. As we have previously mentioned, the Nathan Associates report had nothing to do with the Annan plan, nor with any funding to be given, but rather was evaluating the administration of the funding which had already been given.

The President of the Republic is, in the public mind, obviously a trustworthy person. Consequently, his statements gave credence to the allegations in the mass media that the US had bought out consciences in Cyprus and were, indeed, admitting it. This created the absolute certainty among the public that indeed some people had been bribed to promote the Annan plan. On the basis of this “certainty”, President Papadopoulos publicly denounced the United States and the United Nations for intervening in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

38. All of Tassos Papadopoulos' statements, as reported by the Cyprus News Agency, are given in Appendix 6, p. 46.

The state channel CyBC reported Tassos Papadopoulos' statements on the US and UN intervention in the internal affairs of Cyprus thus:

President Papadopoulos has called the funding by foreign organisations to convince the people to say 'yes' to the Annan plan an unacceptable intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cyprus. He has castigated the United Nations, emphasising that with their attitude they have violated the Founding Charter of the UN.

In the same report, Papadopoulos appears on screen, saying:

It is an unacceptable intervention in our internal affairs. Foreign organisations supplying money, not to support humanitarian and other beneficial causes, but to support one or other political position in Cyprus.

Referring to the United Nations, Papadopoulos said:

I consider this to be a violation of Article 2.7 of the Founding Charter of the United Nations which forbids the UN from intervening in the internal, political developments in member states.³⁹

On the same evening, CyBC reported statements by Speaker of the House of Representatives Demetris Christofias:

Elections are an expression of popular sovereignty, whatever elections they may be. And when the Americans and the Secretary-General were saying that they would fully respect the result of the referendum, how can it be possible that they could intervene in this way, by funding.⁴⁰

President of the Socialist Party EDEK, Yiannakis Omirou, stated:

Lamentable and despicable behaviour, and I refer to those in Cyprus who took money or, as the vernacular has it, grabbed it, to promote the political views of foreigners.⁴¹

The Speaker of the House of Representatives returned to the issue a few days later, saying:

Some organisations or persons were funded to implement a policy as they understand it, which coincided with the policy understood by the Americans to be good to solve the Cyprus issue or the British or even people from the United Nations. That was wrong.⁴²

On the same day, at a political gathering in Kaimakli, Nicosia, he stated:

Is it the first time the Americans have done this kind of thing? To them this is bread and butter stuff, and this was not the only evil.⁴³

39. CyBC TV, 28.10.2004.

40. CyBC TV, 28.10.2004.

41. CyBC TV, 28.10.2004.

42. CyBC TV, 30.10.2004.

43. Mega TV, 30.10.2004.

DIKO deputy Zacharias Koulias, as an everyday guest of TV and radio debates, considered that the allegations of President Papadopoulos and the reports by the media were indisputable facts: *It is clear as daylight that some here went to the American Embassy, made an application, gave an interview, were asked things from which it was clear whether they were in favour of the Annan plan, and if and since they were, they received the funds. This by itself is a condemnable act, just like Judas's thirty pieces of silver. It is clear that this is to be condemned as unacceptable. The Americans have confirmed it in the most outspoken way. Boucher said, 'yes gentlemen we have given money in that direction'; they have been nailed by the Americans and in such a way as if it was the most natural thing in the world.*

Zacharias Koulias alleged that \$20 million was supplied to buy up consciences. When he was asked to name those who had been paid, he answered:

The 'opinion leaders', the Americans published it.⁴⁴

The other Member of the House for DIKO to play a leading role in the debates, Nicos Pittokopitis, said that those who had been paid were serving foreign interests and called upon them to commit public suicide:

Let them judge themselves, and let them commit public suicide in the city squares, at least so they give an example and a message to all the others left in this country to avoid these actions.⁴⁵

A statement by the European Democracy party said the following:

The people do not need receipts or evidence of bribery to determine that the way in which some people conduct politics, as well as their political positions, are equivalent to acting as servants of foreign powers and interests. If indeed they don't even receive money for this, then possibly they're just simple fools.⁴⁶

44. ANT1 TV, 2.11.2004.

45. ANT1 TV, 29.10.2004.

46. Statement by European Democracy, 17.10.2004.

5. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF DENIAL

5.1 The case of Eleni Mavrou

Eleni Mavrou is a Member of the House of Representatives for the AKEL party and is in charge of the party's office dealing with rapprochement with the Turkish Cypriots. She is among those who supported a 'yes' vote in the referendum and her name was cited by ANT1 TV among the "opinion leaders", who had allegedly been selected as guides by the Americans to pass the Annan plan.

Eleni Mavrou attempted to intervene by telephone during ANT1's news programme to restore the truth and to condemn the way in which her name had been used. The reaction of news presenter Pavlos Mylonas was the following:

You do well Mrs. Mavrou. But let me tell you something. ANT1 only transmitted excerpts of the report as they appear and I imagine if you wish to file lawsuits against the American organisation [...], which is using your name – it is right here in front of me, you have it as well. [...] As to promoting the Annan plan, it's not us who are saying that, we are not the ones who involved you in this process, the report itself says that and I have it right here.⁴⁷

Of course, the report did not state what the presenter said it did. However, all the channels insisted that it did. The confirmation of the media reports by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and by other members of the governing coalition did not allow much margin for denial of what came to be regarded as truth in the public consciousness. An indication of the climate of intellectual terror which had been imposed was the following report in a prime time ANT1 news programme:

The revelations about the American funding have made many lose their sleep, as some of those we asked for comments, even though their names do not appear anywhere, reacted with intense nervousness and threats.⁴⁸

47. ANT1 TV, 27.10.2004.

48. ANT1 TV, 27.10.2004.

5.2 The case of UNOPS

After the furore which erupted about the manner in which the BDP funds had been administered, UNOPS published on the Internet a full list of its expenditures. According to the UNOPS announcement, the following funds were spent:

- \$44,525,050.00: Development projects and grants to Non Government Organisations (NGOs).
- \$3,600,000.00: Grant to the Red Cross.⁴⁹

Sigma TV reported that the total expenditures announced by UNOPS amounted to \$48 million and that \$12.5 million were unaccounted for. As *Simerini* newspaper alleged the next day, the UN “hidden \$12.5 million” and there was no report “on its distribution”.⁵⁰

The *Simerini* report supported a new cycle of rumours that there had also been “secret funds” and that the missing dollars were obviously those which had been used to bribe people. The truth is that on the UNOPS web page, there is a separate category of expenditures, referring to the organisation's running expenses. The \$12.5 million “missing” from the accounts were distributed thus:

- Project Management Unit: \$6,572,177.00
- Central UNOPS and UNDP office administration: \$5,485,666.00

Politis newspaper pointed out the location of the announcement referring to the “missing” \$12.5 million.⁵¹ There was no attempt at correction whatsoever.

5.3 The case of the State Department

Deputy representative of the State Department Adam Ereli denied on November 1 all that had been reported about admissions by the US that people in Cyprus had been bought out:

*This is a charge that has been knocking around for some time. We have clearly and unequivocally said that such charges are absurd and baseless, and they should not be made by responsible journalists. The United States does not bribe people with public money for political ends. And it's, I think – I think it's shameful to suggest so.*⁵²

The explanations he supplied were not accepted by either the government or the channels, which insisted that Boucher had admitted that American collaborators had been funded:

49. A detailed presentation of the budgets, by category, as they were announced by UNOPS, can be found in Appendix 10, p. 55.

50. *Simerini*, 28.10.2004, “\$12.5 Million Missing from Dollars Puzzle”.

51. *Politis*, 31.10.2004.

52. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2004/37688.htm>

ANT1, Pavlos Mylonas:

The deputy representative of the State Department now considers ridiculous and unfounded the allegations about bribery, in contrast to his superior Richard Boucher, who the day before yesterday mentioned advisors used by the United States.

In the report which followed, Kyriacos Pomilorides said:

Adam Ereli, Richard Boucher's deputy at the State Department, attempted yesterday to put out the fire set by his superior. [...] He refused, however, to reveal the list of Cypriots who had received money, according to the evaluation report on the funds of the American aid programme to Cyprus.

In the ANT1 report, a statement from the Government Spokesman was transmitted:

"I wish it were so. I remind you that there have been previous statements by Mr Boucher, who had admitted to the supply of funds in Cyprus."⁵³

Sigma, Nikitas Kyriacou

The United States reject, after the fact and for obvious reasons, the allegations about bribing people to promote the Annan plan.

A report by Constantinos Constantinou followed:

The Americans did not like the accusation that they supplied money in Cyprus with the purpose of promoting the Annan plan. State Department representative Adam Ereli, visibly irritated, forgetting the recent statements of his colleague Richard Boucher, argued that all the funds supplied by the United States in Cyprus were spent according to the letter and the spirit of American law.⁵⁴

53. ANT1 TV, 2.11.2004.

54. Sigma TV, 2.11.2004.

6. WHAT UNOPS ACTUALLY FUNDED

According to the way public opinion was informed in Cyprus, the US spent millions of dollars through the BDP in order to promote the Annan plan. As can be seen from the evidence given here, and also from the list of projects published as an annex to the evaluation report, the \$60.4 million were spent on anything but promoting the Annan plan.⁵⁵

When UNOPS published an analysis of the way the funds were managed, it emerged that the greatest proportion of BDP funds went to the Red Cross and to development projects. It also became known that the NGOs which benefited took part in projects on issues such as AIDS, dyslexia, echinococcus, etc., while among those who benefited from the BDP were people associated with the government. It was at that time that president Papadopoulos made statements distinguishing between projects for public benefit and projects aimed at political intervention:

*The UNOPS or US projects are another thing, those done with funding approved by the American Congress supplied to Cyprus for purposes of bi-communal or general public benefit, and which were agreed in the past by the common committee which we have, with the knowledge of the government, publicly, for charitable purposes. What does that have to do with the funding given for specific purposes to organisations or persons, with the explicit purpose of promoting the Annan plan? Persons who or organisations that were judged to be able to provide a lever with which to influence public opinion.*⁵⁶

A careful analysis of the projects funded by the BDP proves that they all fall within the categories mentioned above by Tassos Papadopoulos. Which are the persons or organisations that have been funded to promote the Annan plan? On November 4, 2004, we posed 20 questions in writing to President Papadopoulos, through Government Spokesman Kypros Chrysostomides, ask-

55. The whole list is given in Appendix 13, p. 64.

56. Cyprus News Agency, 31.10.2004.

ing for specific answers to issues raised by the President himself on various occasions. Three months and two written reminders later, we received the following answer:

As far as your pending questionnaire is concerned, I consider that the only thing I have to say is that it has been proved that UNOPS had indeed supplied funds as had become apparent at the time.⁵⁷

6.1 Special Initiative Grants

As becomes apparent from President Papadopoulos' public statements, the government does not consider there is wrong with the funding given on the basis of procedures in which the government itself participated with its own representatives. The problem concerned only the funding given outside agreed procedures and with money not approved by Congress, with the purpose of political intervention.

Tassos Papadopoulos gave some explanation of how he sees the problem in some statements of his:

From 2003 onwards, part of these expenses were exclusively supplied by UNOPS, as they themselves reveal, on instructions of the US government. For those among you who are interested, that is the Nathan Associates report.⁵⁸

There is no mention in the Nathan Associates report of any money given on instructions from the US government. We asked the President – through the Government Spokesman – to indicate which part of the report he was referring to. He refused to answer.

What is described in the evaluation report and is obviously what Papadopoulos was referring to is the following:

After the 2002 Annual Review a 'fast track' process was created for target of opportunity projects or for ad hoc projects that might not receive the approval of the authorities. A weekly meeting was established whereby the PMU and the US Embassy approved such projects without reference to the PSC. This was further formalised as a new grant category called the Special Initiative Grant with a limit in principle of \$12,000 per grant.⁵⁹

As this reference is worded, it does indeed create some suspicion, because:

- The agreed procedure involving the Steering Committee in which the government of Cyprus is represented is not followed.
- These expenditures were approved by the US embassy.

57. Letter by Kypros Chrysostomides to Makarios Droushiotis, 11.2.2005.

58. Cyprus News Agency, 31.10.2004.

59. Cyprus Bi-communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 18.

The explanation supplied in the Nathan Associates report is that the procedure was simplified for small projects for the purposes of flexibility and speed:

From the perspective of the donor, the Special Initiatives offer a great deal of flexibility and the ability to move funds quickly without the cumbersome project review and decision making process.⁶⁰

As far as approval of the funds by the US government is concerned, this is provided for also by the agreement signed by USAID and UNDP. However, the public allegations by President Papadopoulos that the UN was violating the Founding Charter by intervening in the internal affairs of a member state could be justified if, indeed, persons and organisations had been funded via the fast-track process for the purpose of political intervention. According to evidence disclosed by UNOPS, 35 projects were funded with a total of \$290,694 within the category of Special Initiative Grants. Of those, none had anything to do with political developments in Cyprus. Some indicative examples of how these funds were utilised:

- A performance of Cypriot folk dances.
- A bi-communal event on May Day in Limassol.
- A conference on childhood.
- An event on International Women's Day.
- An event on World AIDS day.
- A conference about deaf people.⁶¹

Among the activities funded through this procedure was the publication of a book by the Labour Institute of the union PEO, which is AKEL's labour syndicate. Consequently, the results of grants given through this procedure do not justify the President's allegations of intervention in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

6.2 The letter by Alvaro de Soto

Tassos Papadopoulos stated on October 14 that he had in his possession a letter by the Secretary-General's Special Envoy on the Cyprus issue, Alvaro de Soto, in which it was mentioned that money had been supplied in Cyprus before the referendum to promote the Annan plan.⁶² The next day the President issued a written statement in which he clarified the following:

I had written to Mr. de Soto about various issues and, among other things, I mentioned that I observe these events. Mr. de Soto answered some points of my letter and on this issue he wrote that yes of course, because we consider it an effort to reinforce rapprochement.⁶³

60. Cyprus Bi-Communal Development Programme, Evaluation, p. 23.

61. The complete list of the projects in this category is given in Appendix 11, p. 60.

62. Cyprus News Agency, 15.10.2004.

63. Press and Information Office, 15.10.2004, announcement no. 7.

The opposition, and particularly the United Democrats' EDI, insistently asked that the correspondence between President Papadopoulos and the UN be made public. EDI president George Vassiliou said that Papadopoulos was “morally bound” to do so.⁶⁴ Papadopoulos refused. We put Papadopoulos' allegations to Alvaro de Soto, who strongly refuted that the UN could possibly have made grants in violation of the Founding Charter:

I replied that no UN body would do what he was suggesting: even if the UN was merely a channel for funds, such funds could not be used for purposes that the UN would not itself fund. On the other hand, it was a longstanding part of the UN mandate as laid down by the Security Council to encourage bi-communal reconciliation and as such had over the years helped countless bi-communal projects. In that same spirit – but drawing the line at proselytism and advocacy – UN bodies had assisted all who requested help regarding the plan, including making the text proper available. Similarly, my colleagues – in my own team – had always been at the disposal of groups – pro, con and undecided – who asked for help in understanding its complexities. Anyone could approach us for help within those parameters and would find an attentive ear.⁶⁵

Alvaro de Soto's refutation and Papadopoulos' refusal to publicise his correspondence with the UN, weakens Papadopoulos' allegation that the UN had intervened in the internal affairs of Cyprus, in violation of the Founding Charter, and had indeed admitted to it.

According to evidence disclosed by UNOPS, four projects to present the Annan plan were funded:⁶⁶

1. Public debates organised by the Society for Concern on the Modernisation of Society OPEK. OPEK received a total grant of \$70,000 to organise political debates, of which only two had any direct relation to the Annan plan. Representatives of all tendencies took part in the debates, while the fact that UNOPS was sponsoring the events was written on the invitations.
2. Funding (\$200,000) of the project by the International Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) which included:
 - The creation of the web page “People Decide” which presented the Annan plan in simple terms. Visitors to the page had the opportunity to submit questions and receive authoritative answers on various aspects of the plan.
 - Publication in Greek and Turkish of the *Citizen's Guide*, in which the Annan plan was presented in an understandable way. A booklet explaining the provisions on the property issue was also published. The PRIO initiative was perhaps the only attempt to present the plan in a rational way, while its objectivity was not questioned by anyone. In all the PRIO events, it was mentioned that UNOPS was the sponsor.

64. Cyprus News Agency, 15.10.2004.

65. Reply by Alvaro de Soto to a question posed by us about President Papadopoulos' allegations, 6.3.2005.

66. UNOPS funded various projects which facilitated Annan's initiative, for example, the translation of the Annan plan into Greek and Turkish or the committee which chose the flag and the national anthem of the United Cyprus Republic. Some projects for the promotion of the plan are also included in this category. A detailed statement of expenditure of this category is published in Appendix 12, page 61.

3. Funding of a focus group on the bi-communal conception of the Annan plan by the Cyprus Sociologists' Society with \$36,000. This project was not directed to society at large, and neither did it attract anyone's attention.
4. A grant of \$30,000 to a citizens' group to publish and circulate informational material on the Annan plan:
 - A map of the Annan plan was circulated, showing the areas to be returned and the dates they would be returned on.
 - The "Solution Calendar", describing all the stages of the application of the plan, from the referendum to the year 2018.
 - A leaflet with the 20 basic provisions of the Annan plan.

The material was circulated either as paid newspaper inserts, or by hand. On the printed material there was no mention that UNOPS was the sponsor.

Tassos Papadopoulos made statements to clarify that the organisation of debates and presentations of the Annan plan, even if these had been funded by UNOPS, were not exceptionable activities, provided that the sponsor was clearly disclosed.

*The people must know that he who appears holier than the saints and promotes a position objectively because that is what he believes, would do well to mention: 'We inform you that this event is also sponsored by...' as is done in other events.*⁶⁷

The only case of a project which, according to the criteria set by President Papadopoulos himself, was out of order, concerned the grant of \$30,000 given to a citizens' group to publish advertising material. This case was presented by the pro-government satirical newspaper *Pontiki* as proof of the allegations that there had been bribes to persons to support the Annan plan.⁶⁸

67. Cyprus News Agency, 31.10.2004.

68. Appendix 4, p. 43.

7. INVESTIGATION REFUSED

From the evidence presented here, it is apparent that an independent investigating committee could, within a short space of time, have restored the truth. The state, despite the calls of the opposition, was not disposed to order any investigation, because it started from the certainty that there had been bribery, that the Americans had admitted to this and all that was missing were the names of those who had been bribed. Rejecting the request for an investigation, Tassos Papadopoulos said:

*What is to be investigated? I have said nothing more than Mr. Boucher has said, or than Mr. de Soto has written, or than has been written on the Internet by the report by Nathan Associates, which the American government itself asked to evaluate the expenditure of this money. Who grabbed it, how much they grabbed cannot be determined by an investigation by us. Those who know will not tell us.*⁶⁹

According to CyBC TV, Papadopoulos rejected as “unworthy of comment” the criticism by EDI Deputy President Michalis Papapetrou of his refusal to appoint an investigating committee:

*Let this perforated shield, which is so easily used, not be used, that either you provide the evidence or you do not say it at all. Why should I not say it? What I say is true. It is supported by facts.*⁷⁰

These categorical positions of the President, though unsupported by evidence, gave his allegations credence and drew the whole of the governing coalition into a nationwide denunciation of those who had been paid to promote foreign interests. Some examples:

Demetris Christofias:

When the Americans themselves admit that they funded, then why should we make literary talk.

69. Cyprus News Agency, 3.11.2004 and ANT1 TV, 3.11.2004.

70. CyBC TV, 28.10.2004.

*And at last, let there be an investigation and let the names be published. We have no objection to something like that happening, if some are worried, let them be worried.*⁷¹

AKEL parliamentary representative Nicos Katsourides, referring to the call for an investigation, made the following statements:

*Let some not pretend that this is a witch hunt. The tragedy of this place is the tragedy of intervention of the imperialist powers in the internal affairs of Cyprus, which continue to occur in other forms.*⁷²

In the spirit of Katsourides' above statements, *Haravghi* newspaper Editor in Chief and AKEL Political Bureau member Androulla Ghiurov published a series of articles criticising the “audacity” of the “agents” who demanded an investigation:

*And why do the clowns of the failed, though well-paid US campaign insist in demanding proof and evidence? Who will issue the stamped invoices of their involvement and their fat reward for their guilty work? No one.*⁷³

*And is it not the worst insult for a citizen of the Republic of Cyprus to accept the title of ‘advisor’ to the Americans? And where exactly does the role of ‘advisor’ end, and the role of agent begin?*⁷⁴

71. ANT1 TV, 2.11.2004.

72. Mega TV, 31.10.2004.

73. *Haravghi*, 28.10.2004, “Rapprochement is not assaulted. Undermining was assaulted and revealed!”

74. *Haravghi*, 29.10.2004: “How can the interests of Cyprus be aligned with those of the Americans?”

8. CONCLUSIONS

From the initial allegations in the mass media that rivers of dollars had been spent by the US through the United Nations to buy out consciences (the initial allegations made mention of \$6.4 million given on the final days before the referendum) for the purpose of promoting the Annan plan, the only proven issue was a question of conduct about the way a budget of \$30,000 was spent. The content of the Nathan Associates evaluation report, which formed the basic source of the information with which public opinion was bombarded, was distorted beyond recognition.

The independent Radio and Television Authority which is charged with the control of private TV channels ignored the public calls made to it⁷⁵ to investigate the questions of conduct which had arisen. Despite the fact that for a whole month a public debate was in progress and evidence was supplied to prove the systematic misinformation of public opinion, the Radio and Television Authority did not concern itself at all with the matter. Answering a question we had put to it, it replied: “The Radio and Television Authority has not, either of its own initiative or after any complaint and/or report, made any investigation of the issue in question.”⁷⁶

The Executive Council of the Cyprus Journalists' Union expressed in an announcement its “vital concern and condemnation of the allegations and conjecture being expressed about 'buyouts' and 'bribery' of mass media by foreign centres”. It also called its members to adhere strictly to the

75. *Politis* newspaper wrote on 4.11.2004, “Between a Regime and the Alibi of Democracy”: “A simple reading of the Boucher statement and of the report in question, and a comparison with what the channels have broadcast, would have been more than sufficient procedure to prove that all the broadcast monstrosities are COMPLETELY false. Yesterday in *Politis* we provided evidence supporting what we have been claiming for days, that the affair of the funding is a soap bubble. Our item was based on real evidence, while we made our primary sources of information available to our readers so that they can judge for themselves, without the intervention of the filters and the distorting casts of the channels. No one has refuted us. And neither have we seen any reaction by the Radio and Television Authority, and of course none by the Journalists' Union. IF, THEREFORE, we had a democracy with any depth, as opposed to surface, we would have had a really independent Radio and Television Authority. And if we had an independent Radio and Television Authority, public opinion would have been protected from the steamroller of organised defamation and misinformation.”

76. Reply by the Radio and Television Authority to Makarios Droushiotis, dated 23.2.2005.

code of journalistic conduct.⁷⁷ The Cyprus Journalists' Union does not possess effective mechanisms of control of its members, and neither is it seriously concerned about the quality of journalistic speech. In the matter in question, when the affair acquired some dimension, the president of the Journalists' Union Andreas Kannaouros, who also happens to be a member of the Committee on Journalistic Conduct, asked the committee in writing to examine a matter of violation of the code of journalistic conduct.⁷⁸ The Committee on Journalistic Conduct issued a pale decision in which it simply recalled the provisions of the code, according to which "resort to aphorisms, insults and unacceptable descriptions constitutes a breach of conduct".⁷⁹

Within this politically anarchic and institutionally unprotected environment, President Papadopoulos accused his political opponents of having been bought out by the US and the UN. When he was asked to substantiate his claims, he referred to the "admission" of State Department representative Richard Boucher, to the "confession" by UN Special Envoy on the Cyprus issue Alvaro de Soto contained in an unpublished letter sent to him, and to the content of the Nathan Associates report.⁸⁰

Investigating these allegations, we found that Boucher had not said what had been attributed to him. De Soto refuted what the President alleged, and the Nathan Associates report does not contain what it was claimed to. And when we asked the Government Spokesman to make a clarification about the false information that the President of the Republic gave to public opinion, he refused to answer, insisting on the unsubstantiated claim that it had been proved that UNOPS had bribed citizens.

This behaviour on the part of the government of the Republic of Cyprus, and of the President personally, is highly indicative of the fact that they were the ones who created the climate and fed false information to the mass media. President Papadopoulos placed himself at the centre of this effort and gave substance to the orchestrated misinformation, in the name of service to the interests of the people: "The final judge and shield will be the people. It is not those who reveal, but those who grab it who should explain themselves," he stated in Nicosia on Ochi day.⁸¹ "They themselves [the Americans] admit that no matter how much money they gave, they failed to promote that which the people of Cyprus did not want."⁸²

77. Announcement by the Executive Council of the Cyprus Journalists' Union, 18.10.2004.

78. Letter by the President of the Cyprus Editors' Union Andreas Kannaouros, to the president of the Committee on Journalistic Conduct, Andreas Mavrommatis, 27.10.2004.

79. Decision of the Committee on Journalistic Conduct, no date. It is estimated to have been issued during November 2004.

80. The President of the Republic had the Nathan Associates report, which he drew elements from, in his hands long before it was leaked to the press. Though aware of the content of the report, he did not intervene to stop the misinformation. On the contrary, his public statements were grist to the misinformation mill.

81. The anniversary of Greek Premier Metaxas' rejection of Fascist Italy's ultimatum on October 28, 1940.

82. Cyprus News Agency, 28.10.2004.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	40
Appendix 2	41
Appendix 3	42
Appendix 4	43
Appendix 5	44
Appendix 6	46
Appendix 7	48
Appendix 8	49
Appendix 9	53
Appendix 10	55
Appendix 11	60
Appendix 12	61
Appendix 13	64

Appendix 3

Simerini newspaper front pages: 27.10.2004: "The Invoice in Dollars", and 28.10.2004: "\$12,5 Million Missing from Dollars Puzzle".



Appendix 4

Front page of *Pontiki* newspaper, 5.11.2004: "Contract for 30 (thousand) pieces of silver. Here is the proof and the names!"



Appendix 5

Excerpt on Cyprus, from the State Department Press Officer's briefing on 27.10.2004 (Transcript: State Department Noon Briefing, October 27, 2004).

QUESTION: On Cyprus, Mr. Boucher, any answer to my yesterday's pending question that the United States Agency For International Development, under the auspices of Andrew Natsios, allocated \$6.4 million from the DOS annual budget to bribe Greek and Turkish Cypriot politicians, reporters, analysts, professors, organizations, et cetera, et cetera, -- I have the full report, 120 pages -- to campaign for a big "yes" to the Annan plan for the referendum of April 24th, 2004?

BOUCHER: Somewhere in that 120 pages, does it actually use the phrase, bribe?

QUESTION: I'm using "bribe" --

BOUCHER: That's your summary of the report. I see.

QUESTION: -- as Lambros Papantoniou.

BOUCHER: Let's just make clear that we have that, Mr. Lambros Papantoniou's --

QUESTION: Correct.

BOUCHER: Doing his summary of this 120-page report. But thank you for that information. There is a report by -- that you have, by an independent evaluator. These are the opinion of the evaluators on the bi-communal development program that we've conducted in Iraq/1 with, along with the United Nations. I think the United Nations in Iraq/1 would have more to say on some of these particular projects and efforts, but certainly over the years, we have conducted bi-communal projects with the idea in mind that we can encourage both communities to work with each other. In some of the specific areas they have, you know, whether it's electricity and water and planning and other things, we've already seen some productive results from those projects and we'll have to look at this report and we'll look at the projects and we'll determine how best to go forward with these kinds of programs.

QUESTION: May I -- why, besides with the annual \$13.5 million from the U.S. Congress to be given on bi-communal development programs use (inaudible), it was necessary for the United States Agency For International Development to spend additional \$6.4 million for the campaign on the Annan plan prior to the referendum?

BOUCHER: I'd have to look at this particular amount, whether it was part of that annual amount or whether it was separate. I don't, I'm not quite sure it was separate.

QUESTION: It was separate. Correct. It was separate.

BOUCHER: Well, I'd have to look and that and see, but I think the Agency for International Development will obviously look at this report, look at these programs, and decide how and when to proceed with similar programs in the future. It's always useful to have the views of an independent evaluator, but it is an independent view and not necessarily the final view we might take about these projects.

QUESTION: One more question. According to page 5-2 of the Annex 5A, the recipients, actually those who have been bribed, I have emphasized, appeared before the U.S. Embassy in Nicosia and inter alia have been asked to answer the formal question prior to the non-approval code, "If there were a referendum now, based on what you know, would you be strongly in favor, in favor but with a reservation, or not in favor?" Now, who had the list of those who appear and answer those questions?

BOUCHER: No.

QUESTION: Why not? It's a public document.

BOUCHER: It's -- you have a public document. If the list is not there, I don't think it's in our interest or appropriate for us to provide a list of people that we might have interviewed with relation to any project.

QUESTION: It's not appropriate?

BOUCHER: For us to provide you with a full list of anybody that our Embassy might have talked to.

QUESTION: Why it's secret? Excuse me. It's a secret? It's confidential? What?

BOUCHER: No, it's not secret or confidential, it's just private. These are not public meetings and I don't think the Embassy has to divulge a list of everybody they might have had a discussion with at some time.

QUESTION: But Richard, it's -- is there any -- with background press briefing for this specific report by Andrew Natsios? Cyprus coordinator Laura Kennedy, or the former one, Tom Weston, since there are hundreds of questions, may we have a kind of a deposition of personnel to find out what is going on exactly because --

BOUCHER: Well, I think the places that know the most about this are the UN Operations Project Services, and they have a website that will give you a lot of information on these projects. And second of all, the United Nations Project Offices or our Embassy in Nicosia are probably the best places to find out a little more about these things. But as I stressed at the beginning, this is an independent report from an independent evaluator. The views that are there are from the contract evaluator and their evaluation team. Obviously, they will be taken into account and we will have to consider them, but I wouldn't -- I want to stress again this is not necessarily the final view of these -- this particular set of projects.

QUESTION: Allow me the last question, and I will shut up. Do you know if some of these funds, very important, a resource of Greece with the (inaudible) of your Embassy in Athens and your Ambassador Tom Miller to be given to some reporters, analysts, et cetera, et cetera -- it's not necessary to mention the list -- for a big "yes" to Annan Plan. And the reason this question, Mr. Boucher, since a Greek reporter who was screaming on his TV program for a big "yes" to Annan Plan, a week ago visited Washington, I have his name, and had a meeting here at the State Department to this effect, and so on. My question is --

BOUCHER: Are these just questions about you because we talked to you as well?

QUESTION: Do you know if some (inaudible) Greece, too?

BOUCHER: No, look, I'm not going to -- I don't think it's fair to cast aspersions on Greek reporters who might have meetings with us. We have meetings with a lot of people. That doesn't mean that they're either on our payroll or that they agree with us. I think, you know, that's the situation. So let's not start throwing things around like that.

Second of all, as far as whether any of this money was spent, or whether there were Greek participants in these activities, I don't really know. I'd suggest you check the UN operations Project Service -- UN Operation Project Services website -- and there you'll find out how they spent the money. We've talked about these projects before. I have said they are very upfront. There is a lot of information available on this website and that will describe to you the kind of projects there were and who participated in them.

QUESTION: Thank you.

Appendix 6

Tassos Papadopoulos' statements on 28.10.2004, as reported by the Cyprus News Agency.

Excerpt from Press and Information Office Announcement no. 2, October 28th 2004, on the statements by president Papadopoulos after the schools' parade:

Asked if a point of moral order is raised against those who were funded to promote the Annan plan in Cyprus, President Papadopoulos said: "It is not a point of moral order. I believe that it is an unacceptable intervention in our internal affairs for foreign organisations to supply money, not to support humanitarian causes or other causes of public benefit, but to support one or other political position in Cyprus."

On a remark that the Representative of the American State Department said that he would not reveal names of Greek Cypriot collaborators, President Papadopoulos said: "What I wish to make clear is that the UNOPS money that comes from the annual Congress allocation to Cyprus, is supplied for many years for publicly beneficial, communal reconciliation programmes by a committee in which Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots and the Government and UNOPS participate. From 2003 onwards, part of these expenditures was funded exclusively by UNOPS, as they themselves reveal by instructions of the American government. For those of you who are interested, this is the report of Nathan Associates which was on the Internet for many months, and from which we obtained the additional information we need and which had oddly disappeared."

On a remark that Mr. Papapetrou is accusing him of mudslinging and is asking for the correspondence between the President and Mr. de Soto to be made public, President Papadopoulos said: "The former, about accusations I consider unworthy of comment, you be the judges of what is mudslinging. I said in public what I repeated yesterday in the National Council, what the letters contained. My protestation about the use of money from abroad to influence political situations by the United Nations, which is against the charter, and the reply I received, yes, money has been supplied for this purpose, but it is a policy of reconciliation. I quoted the entire relevant excerpt."

On a remark that the information speaks of budgets that came from American funds, Mr. Papadopoulos answered: "That was other money". To a question if what Mr. Boucher is refusing to reveal will be revealed, President Papadopoulos answered: "What right do I have? I say that there should be full transparency. But don't repeat again the perforated argument-shield: we want evidence and substantiation".

To a question if he would proceed with the appointment of an investigating committee, as some political parties are requesting, President Papadopoulos answered: "For what reason? What is there to be investigated which we do not know? The names? But they're not giving us those."

Called upon to state what he says to the Cypriot people who are anxious about this funding, the President of the Republic said: "Why should the Cypriot people be anxious? They themselves admit that however much money they gave, they failed to promote that which the Cypriot people did not want. The final judge and shield is the people. It is not those who reveal, but those who grab it, who should explain."

Excerpt from Press and Information Office Announcement No. 3, October 28th 2004 on President Papadopoulos' statements at Larnaca Airport, before setting off for Rome:

QUESTION: As far as the issue of funding by UNOPS is concerned, the representative of the American State Department Mr. Boucher, stated today that he will not make the list of the associates and advisors public. You consider that there is an issue of intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cyprus. I ask you if you will make any representations to the Americans.

ANSWER: I would like, once more, to clarify that UNOPS which is an instrument of the United Nations is funded by the USA, as it is every year. In the last years this amount has been reduced to US\$13,000,000.00, for the purposes of funding projects of public benefit which are of assistance to both Turkish and Greek Cypriots, as is the Institute of Genetics and various other projects which have been partly funded by UNOPS, therefore indirectly by American funds, with the approval of the Cypriot Government. This happened for a number of years, in the open, in common knowledge, with the Government's approval, with the consent of the Common Committee in which both Turkish and Greek Cypriots take part, for the supply of this money. From 2003 onwards, perhaps from 2002, UNOPS, either on instructions from the USA, or of their own initiative, decided that part of these funds would be supplied by themselves, outside the framework of the Common Committee, without informing the Committee and refusing to give the Committee, despite our repeated representations, a list as to where this money is being supplied in both the Turkish and the Greek Cypriot community. This resulted in my letter to Mr. Alvaro de Soto, and the text of my letter is known, protesting that they cannot supply money from abroad to promote political causes in Cyprus, political positions in Cyprus. Mr. de Soto's reply was "Yes we do give this money because these are actions of reconciliation". I consider that this is a violation of Article 2.7 of the Founding Charter of the United Nations, which forbids interventions by this international organisation in the internal political developments in its member states. I repeat, funding projects of public benefit is one thing, and funding political positions is another. Since then, it has been revealed, not by us, but by many others, that there has indeed been funding of persons and organisations, some from before, some recently judged. And indeed, for this funding to be given, there pre-existed a questionnaire and one of the questions was: Are you in favour of the Annan plan? Strongly? Moderately or Not? All that I am saying is in the report by Nathan Associates which is an independent firm retained by the USA, to evaluate this funding. The results were that unfortunately, all this effort failed in Cyprus. I repeat, the political part, not the funding of projects in the public benefit. This report by Nathan Associates was on the Internet and accessible to several people, without containing names. But this last week it has disappeared from the Internet. I don't know the reason.

QUESTION: That is, what you are saying confirms that there were other sources besides UNOPS that sent money to Cyprus. Despite the fact that there were no names mentioned, does the Government know who these persons are that took the money?

ANSWER: It is not a secret that there were other sources of funding for promotion of political positions in our internal affairs. And of course every citizen has a right to have this or that view, but it would be useful for anyone to evaluate the objectivity and independence of the positions he poses, that he says that this is what I believe and by the way this effort is also funded by someone. Nothing wrong, therefore that is what is said.

QUESTION: Yet there is an issue of moral order.

ANSWER: Let those who have taken money judge for themselves. They know. I would not consider it difficult for them to say "Yes these were my views on the Annan plan, and by the way, I have asked for and received financial aid in promoting these views." It is good for those who read, and hear, and take part in events, that these events, behind the events in addition to the beliefs of those who express these views, there is also funding, so that perhaps the promotion of these positions is more effective. That is the whole issue. It is not for me to provide judgement or confirmation. Let the people judge, let the mass media who are asking for proof and names judge.

QUESTION: On the other hand there are allegations that "No" was also funded.

ANSWER: But there there is nothing to criticise about us Cypriots expressing our views on a political issue or our support of a political party, of candidates and of political positions. With our own money. What is to be criticised is outside intervention in our internal affairs and indeed, without this being publicly known. Let the people judge if this is to be criticised or not. Why? Will I become prosecutor? I merely reported to the people the facts in my knowledge, without names and proof, and let the same perforated shield not be used again, which is so easily used, that either he should provide evidence or he should not say these things. What I say is true, it is supported by facts and by foreigners.

Appendix 7

Nathan Associates Report, Annex 5B, Core Questions to Opinion Leaders.

ANNEX 5B. CYPRUS BI-COMMUNAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

February 2004

Core Questions: Opinion Leaders

Ask these questions of all Opinion Leaders.

Name: _____ Position: _____ Date _____

1. Are you familiar with the Bi-communal Development Program that is being implemented here by UNOPS? (BDP)
2. How did you learn about the BDP?
3. What can you tell about the purpose of this program?
4. Can you give us your assessment of what this program has accomplished, if anything?
 - 4a. What have been the major strengths of BDP??
 - 4b. What about problems, weaknesses?
5. In your view, has the BDP contributed to a settlement of the political division between Greek and Turkish Cypriots? (IF YES) Please give us examples of what you have in mind.
6. In your view, what groups have benefited the most from this program? (UN, Cypriot Greeks, Cypriot Turks, Local authorities, Everyone, Politicians, NGOs, Greek and Turkish Contractors, Farmers on both Sides...etc)
7. Are there any other initiatives outside of BDP that have had similar objectives and may have contributed to a settlement here?
8. From what you know or have heard, how would you describe the way the BDP is being implemented by UNOPS.
9. If the Annan Plan goes into effect, what are the most immediate problems/issues that need to be addressed if the settlement is to succeed?
10. If the European Union provides major assistance to help implement the Annan Plan, what will be the appropriate role for a future BDP? What kinds of activities would be most suitable for BDP support?

Appendix 8

Nathan Associates Report, Annex 2, Persons Interviewed.

ANNEX 2
PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Stakeholders:

USAID/W:	Nicholas Studzinski, E&E/ECA, Chief, Division for Southeast Europe
UNDP/New York:	Parviz Fartash, Senior Program Manager for the Baltics, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Moldova, Poland, Romania and Turkey Josyane Chapelier, Advisor to the Bureau for Europe and the CIS Abdul Hannan, Results-Based Management Unit
UNOPS/New York:	Franco Becchi
U.S. Embassy/ Nicosia:	Ambassador Michael Klosson Ned Nolan, Deputy Chief of Mission David W. Renz, Chief, Office of Economic, Commercial and AID Affairs Elizabeth Kassinis, USAID Senior BDP Senior Program Advisor Kimberley Foukaris, Embassy BDP Program Advisor Mat Palmer, Chief, Office of Political Affairs Helen Lovejoy, Political Officer Colleen H. Lagasse, Bi-communal Coordinator
UNOPS/PMU:	Miran Rechter, Former Program Manager Andrew Russell, Program Manager Jan Meelker, Deputy Program Manager Miriam Ooi, Operations Manager Dr. Gerhard Zechner, Veterinary Expert Dominique Larsimont, Communications Manager Nicholas Jarraud, Environmental Compliance Officer Halil Guresun, Communications Associate Ece Akcaoglu, Project Officer (NGO) Marina Vasilara, Project Officer (NGO) Meliha Kaymak, Project Officer (NMP)
Republic of Cyprus:	Ninos Savvides, Director of Coordination, Planning Bureau
Cyprus Red Cross:	Her Excellency, Mrs. Stella Soulioti, Chairperson
Humanitarian Relief Mission:	Dr. Behzat Aziz Beyli, President
Turkish Cypriot Authority:	Ayfer Said Erkmen, Director, Cultural & Social Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Defence

Development Associates, Inc.

Kemal Koprulu, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Defence

**Other Donors/
Grant Programs:** Miriam Fuchs, Advisor for Legal Affairs and Project Management
Delegation of European Community to Cyprus
Kannan Rayarathinam, Chief Civil Affairs Officer for Cyprus
United Nations Peacekeeping Force
Daniel T. Hadjittofi, Executive Director, Fulbright Commission
Judy Hardinge, Project Coordinator for the Bi-Communal Support Program, Amideast

Opinion Leaders:

Political Leaders: Katie Clerides, Vice-President, Democratic Rally Party (DISY)
Eleni Mavrou, Member of Parliament, Akel Communist Party
Mustafa Akinci, Party Leader, Peace and Democratic Movement

Government Leaders: Kenan Atakol, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence for Turkish Cypriot Authority
Michalis, Papapetrou, Former Government Spokesperson and Lawyer, Papapetrou Law Firm
Lellos Demetriades, Former Nicosia Mayor and Lawyer, Lellos P. Demetriades Law Office
Taner Erginel, Turkish Cypriot Supreme Court Justice
Gonul Eronen, Turkish Cypriot Constitutional Court Justice
Takis Hadjidemetriou, EU Harmonisation Coordinator, Cyprus EU Office

Association Leaders: Shener Elchil, Secretary General, Cyprus Turkish Teachers Trade Union (KTOS)
Kagan Bahceli, Secretary for Organizational Affairs, Cyprus Turkish Teachers Trade Union (KTOS)
Ali Erel, President, Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce
Mustafa Dandelen, Board of Directors, Turkish Cypriot Chamber Of Commerce
Ahmet Barcin, Director, Cyprus Turkish Middle School Teachers Union (KTOES)
Erdil Nami, Director, Erna
Christos Artemiou, President, Pancyprian Committee of Refugees

Business Leaders: Costas Severis, Board of Directors, Bank of Cyprus
Athos Pitta, Owner, Pitta Dairy Factory

Academics: Peter Loizos, Professor of Social Anthropology, Intercollege
David Officer, Instructor, Intercollege

Religious Leaders: Bishop of Kykko Nikoforos, Metochi Kykko Monastery
Yiannis Miliatos, Secretary to Bishop of Kykko Nikoforos

Press: Andreas Paraschos, Editor-in-Chief, Politis Newspaper
Aristos Michaelides, Editing Director, Politis Newspaper

Opinion Leaders, Continued:

Press: Mrs. Taramountan, Editor-in-Chief, Phileleftheros Newspaper

Development Associates, Inc.

Suyelman Erguclu, Editor-in-Chief, Kibris Newspaper
Shener Levent, Editor-in-Chief, Afrika Newspaper

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY**Grantees:**

Buffer Zone Survey Agni Petridou, Planning Officer, Nicosia Municipality
Layik Topcan Mesutoglu, Head of Planning Section, TC
Nicosia Municipality
Hulyla Davulcu, Planning Division, Nicosia Municipality
Gul Oztek, Planning Section TC Nicosia Municipality

Arab Ahmet Ali Guralp, Project Manager, TC Nicosia Municipality

New Vision for Nicosia Glafkos Constantinides, Planning Consultant, Nicosia Municipality
Gulshen Ozen, Consultant, TC Nicosia Municipality

Pedieos River Michael Ierides, Secretary-General, CYMERA

Nicosia Sewer - Trunk E Evgenios Nicolaou, Technical Manager, Sewerage Board of Nicosia
Nevzat Oznel, Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager, TC Nicosia
Municipality

Veterinary Health Phedias Loucaides, Director of Veterinary Health, ROC
Kamil Aktolgali, Chief Veterinary Officer, TC Veterinary Dept.

Human Health Fatma Duygulu, Director of Nursing, TC Ministry of Health
Dr. Saray Ozbalikci, Elderly Care Project Manager, TC Ministry of
Health

Civil Society**Grantees:**

Bulent Kanol, President, NGO Management Support Center (TC)
Elena Persiani, PMU Consultant, UNDP/UNOPS NGO Training
and Support Center (GC)
Meral Akinci, President, KAYAD (TC)
Aysel Bodi, President, AKOVA (TC)
Sua Saracoglu, President, Kemal Saracoglu Foundation for
Children with Leukemia and Fight Against Cancer (TC)
Ozgur Aldemir, Manager, Kemal Saracoglu Foundation
Kani Kanol, President, Folk Art Foundation (TC) and HasDer (TC)
Neda Louka, Project Coordinator, Girl Guides Association of
Cyprus (GC)
Christiana Kyrialli, Neuronet Project Coordinator, Cyprus
Institute of Neurology and Genetics (GC)
Yiannis Laouris, Director, Cyprus Neuroscience and Technology
Institute
Maria Theocharis, Head Mistress, Highgate School (GC)
Xenia Constantinou, Research Assistant and Youth Promoting
Peace Coordinator, Cyprus Neuroscience and Technology
Institute (GC)
Tina Adamidou, Project Coordinator for Weeping Island, United
Cypriot Friendship Association (GC)

Civil Society

Margarita Mouza, Director, Cyprus Rehabilitation and Counseling

Grantees, Continued: Association (GC)

Development Associates, Inc.

Mr. Theophanous, Chairman, Cyprus Rehabilitation and
Counseling Association
Dr. Maria Hadjipavlou, President, Peace Centre of Cyprus (GC)
Dinos Logides, President, Soma Akriton (GC)
Mr. Spyros Spyrou, Director and Chairperson, Center for the
Study of Childhood and Adolescence (GC)

Appendix 9

Nathan Associates Report, Annex 5A, Core Questions to Grant Recipients.

ANNEX 5A.
CYPRUS BI-COMMUNAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

February 2004

Core Questions: Grant Recipients

Fill in questions 1-4 prior to interview. Ask all other questions of all Grant Recipients.

Name:

Position:

Name of Organization:

Date of interview:

1. Please describe the size and structure, nature and history of your organization
2. What is the title of the grant(s) you have received from the Bi-communal Development Program (BDP)?
3. How long has the BDP grant(s) been in operation? When is it scheduled to end?
4. What is the total value of the BDP grant(s)? How much has been spent to date?
5. What in your view is the general purpose of the UNOPS/BDP program in Cyprus?
6. Please describe the grant's/grants':
 - a. Purpose?
 - b. Beneficiaries?
 - c. Activities?
7. During the grant period, did your organization have activities that involved people from both communities?
8. Has your organization engaged in any activities that promoted bi-communal cooperation and understanding?
9. Could you describe the successes you have had? Or the problems? Have the authorities been supportive of these activities?
10. Have your organization's purpose, beneficiaries or activities changed since you have begun working with the BDP? How so?
11. Are there other key partners for your organization in these activities – e.g., other NGO's? Which partners? Where are they located? What are their roles?

Development Associates, Inc.

12. Describe any problems encountered in implementing the BDP grant? How have these been solved?
13. Could you comment on the grant proposal and approval process you experienced with BDP. How would you improve the process?
14. Has your organization's ability to take on more difficult tasks changed as a result of the grant? How?
15. Has the Project Management Unit (PMU) provided any direct services to you in implementing the grant (e.g., procurement)?
16. When this BDP grant ends, do you plan to continue the activity? And how?
17. What other funding sources does your organization have, including material support from the community?
18. Have you or any other people in your organization received any training in management or proposal writing?
19. Assuming there is a political settlement along the lines of the Annan Plan, how should this new state of affairs change the BDP program, if at all?
20. In your view, in your dealings with the PMU, what have been that organization's:
 - a. Strengths?
 - b. Weaknesses?
 - c. Has the PMU website been efficient and helpful?
21. If there were a referendum now, based on what you know, would you be strongly in favor, in favor but with reservations, or not in favor?

Appendix 10

List of BDP funds, by category and subcategory.

Bi-communal Development Programme 1998-2004 Funding by Sector and Sub-sector to 31 December 2004

The following information provides tentative details of grants anticipated by Sector and Sub-sector to 31 December 2004 under the Bi-communal Development Programme, which is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and administered by UNDP. The Programme is executed in Cyprus by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

The purpose of the Bi-communal Development Programme is to contribute to peace-building and cooperation throughout the island with projects benefiting both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in areas of common concern.

All grants are provided on a non-discriminatory basis through a review process subject to the regulations and rules applicable to UNDP.

This resource is provided for general information purposes only. As many activities are still ongoing, final figures may vary from the details given here.

I. HUMANITARIAN RELIEF - Total \$3,413,941

II. INFRASTRUCTURE – Total \$23,139,077

1. Nicosia Master Plan - \$5,866,801
2. Upgrading and Rehabilitation of Nicosia Area Sewerage System - \$6,404,077
3. Preservation and Restoration of Nicosia's Venetian Walls - \$3,157,859
4. Apostolos Andreas and Hala Sultan Tekke - \$3,555,231
5. Water Supply - \$606,115
6. Waste Management - \$184,772
7. List of Pre-1974 Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Religious Temples - \$53,079
8. Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment, Nicosia Area - \$1,674,025
9. De-Silting and Fixing of Valves of the Marathassa Dam - \$126,705
10. Restoration of Pentakomo Spiritual Centres - \$630,929
11. Clean-up around Engomi Ruins - \$54,619
12. Revitalisation of Historic Cities - Conference of Visiting Mayors and Publication of Proceedings - \$43,202
13. Upgrading of Traffic Calming Measures in Pyla - \$133,380
14. Cypress Tree Project – An Initiative for the Rehabilitation of Cemeteries - \$196,612
15. Restoration of Old Nicosia Airport Buildings for use of Bi-communal Development Programme and UN Good Offices - \$410,656
16. Improving Waiting Conditions (shade, seating, water, etc.) during April 2003 Crossings - \$41,015

III. ANIMAL HEALTH – Total \$4,902,409

IV. PUBLIC HEALTH – Total \$1,699,138

1. Patient Care and Support - \$590,404
2. Educational Programmes and Campaigns - \$276,771
3. Health Studies and Screening - \$647,689
4. Drug Abuse - \$157,274

V. ENVIRONMENT – Total \$3,751,589

1. Forestry - \$700,802
2. Recycling - \$93,331
3. Environmental Pollution - \$1,284,623

- 4. Clean-ups - \$553,468
- 5. Animal Protection and Conservation Projects - \$473,385
- 6. Surveys and Studies - \$527,656
- 7. Environmental Education and Awareness - \$118,324

VI. EDUCATION AND CULTURE – Total \$5,024,781

- 1. Strategy Formulation - \$189,226
- 2. Art - \$221,331
- 3. Music and Dance - \$342,794
- 4. Literature - \$150,976
- 5. Television - \$2,413,135
- 6. Cultural Heritage - \$399,263
- 7. Education – History - \$97,477
- 8. Education – Environment - \$119,671
- 9. Teacher Training and Curriculum Development - \$156,834
- 10. Public Education - \$394,509
- 11. School Programmes - \$442,552
- 12. E@ting towards Unity: Website and Events to Celebrate Cypriot Cuisine - \$40,000
- 13. Sponsorships of UN Day Celebrations (1998-2004) - \$57,013

VII. GOVERNANCE AND CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT – Total \$2,727,769

- 1. Strategy Formulation - \$210,344
- 2. Community Centres and NGO Support - \$1,263,912
- 3. Rights Awareness - \$65,097
- 4. Women and Gender Equality - \$190,900
- 5. Youth - \$132,414
- 6. Public Opinion and Public Information - \$725,313
- 7. Empowerment of the Deaf Cypriot Community - \$39,040
- 8. Publication of and Training on Building Bridges - A Guide to Intercultural Communication in Cyprus - \$100,749

VIII. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – Total \$1,301,163

- 1. Strategy Formulation - \$175,567
- 2. Agriculture - \$1,056,419
- 3. Eurocodes: Reconciling Codes for the Building Industry to meet EU Standards - \$2,042
- 4. Handicrafts - Empowering Women Craft Workers - \$67,135

IX. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS – Total \$1,085,716

- 1. Strategy Formulation - \$99,067
- 2. Direct Telephone Lines between North and South Administered by UNFICYP - \$236,922
- 3. Websites and Internet Access - \$536,054
- 4. Promotions and outreach - \$213,673

X. SPECIAL INITIATIVE GRANTS – Total \$272,691

XI. DIRECT ASSISTANCE AT THE REQUEST OF THE UN GOOD OFFICES AND DISSEMINATION OF THE ANNAN PLAN - Total \$508,094

Bi-communal Development Programme 1998-2004
Direct Assistance at the Request of the UN Good Offices and
Dissemination of the Annan Plan

At the request of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Cyprus, the Bi-communal Development Programme provided office and conference facilities and an additional US\$270,700 in direct support to the UN Good Offices, mainly for technical expertise on the various aspects of the Plan (US\$160,000), but also for the creation of the Annan Plan website and the public announcement of the website address (<<http://www.annanplan.org>>), translation of various versions of the Plan into Greek and Turkish, and one panel discussion on its key provisions.

The Programme also facilitated and supported the work of the Flag and Anthem Committee (US\$48,000), which led to the selection, by a bi-communal group of individuals appointed by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders, of a flag and an anthem for the United Cyprus Republic.

Additional activities, totalling US\$189,500 and related to the dissemination of information on the provisions of the Annan Plan, consisted specifically of the design and printing of citizen's guides to the Annan Plan and property regime booklets, the design of leaflets on aspects of the Plan and the production and a printing of the final version of the main sections of the Plan in newspapers. The sole purpose of these activities was to support the efforts of concerned Cypriots from both communities who sought to facilitate access by the public to information on the Annan Plan.

Direct Assistance for the Dissemination of the Annan Plan

1. Creation and maintenance of the official Annan Plan website <http://www.annanplan.org>
Cost: In-kind contribution by UNOPS staff
Implementing Agency: UNOPS
2. Printing of citizen's guides to the Annan Plan and booklets on the property regime of the Annan Plan
Cost: US\$ 79,000
Implementing Agency: Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) for original design and UNOPS for printing
Results: 12,000 Greek-language and 5,150 Turkish-language copies of the citizen's guide and 5,100 Greek-language and 2,100 Turkish-language copies of the property regime booklets.
These were disseminated in the following ways:

Greek Cypriot Community:
 - Direct distribution (by hand) of the booklets within communities;
 - Direct distribution to political parties, ministries, public employees, academic institutions, refugee organizations, NGOs, villages, individuals, seminars and conferences;
 - Distribution via mass mailing targeting:
 - Advocates
 - Banks
 - Bishoprics
 - Bookshops
 - Chambers of Commerce and Industry
 - Charitable Organizations
 - Courts and Offices
 - Supreme Court, Law Office, Revision and Consolidation of Cyprus Legislation
 - Office of the Negotiator of the Accession of Cyprus to the European Union

- Ombudsman
- Audit Office
- Public Service Commission
- Educational Service Commission
- Planning Bureau.
- Public Information Office
- Cultural Centres and Organizations
- Estate Agents
- Members Of Parliament
- Greek Government
- Hotel Managers
- Libraries
- Media
- Medical Practitioners
- Municipal Authorities
- Museums
- Organizations and Institutions of Social Service
- Political Parties
- Tourist and Travel Agents
- Universities and Colleges
- Embassies in Cyprus
- Embassies of Cyprus

Turkish Cypriot Community

The distribution targeted NGOs, political parties, "governmental" offices, academic institutions, and the public at large and was implemented directly by the members of the PRIO project team assisted by volunteers and also through:

- Organized local communities;
- NGO networks, especially teachers' unions; and
- Political party networks.

3. Publication of summary versions of the Annan Plan in all major newspapers

Cost: US\$ 50,000

Implementing Agency: PRIO for overall design and UNOPS for printing

Results: Two inserts containing the content of the citizen guide and the property regime booklet published in the following newspapers:

- Cyprus Mail, Cyprus Weekly (Citizen's Guide)
- Politis (Citizen's Guide)
- Kibris, Yeniduzen, Ortam, Kibrisli, Afrika, and Cumhuriyet (Citizen's Guide)
- Machi, Politis, Phileleftheros, Simerini, Haravgi (Property Regime)
- Kibris, Yeniduzen, Ortam, Kibrisli, Afrika and Halkin Sesi (Property Regime)

4. Design and Dissemination of informational material in Greek on key aspects of the Annan Plan

Cost: US\$ 30,000

Implementing Agency: Ad Hoc Committee "All Cyprus Together"

Results: The design of the following informational material:

- The map of the settlement plan with time schedules for returns
- A summary of the basic provisions of the settlement plan; and
- An implementation calendar of the Annan Plan, including key milestones in the event it was approved.

5. Informational radio programmes in Turkish on the Annan Plan
Cost: US\$ 29,000
Implementing Agency: Radio May
Results: Radio programme entitled "Step-by-Step Annan Plan", begun on 2nd April and finished on 23rd April 2004. Broadcasted twice everyday in the morning and in the evening. The following aspects of the Plan were presented and discussed:
- Constitution
 - Property
 - Citizenship
 - Defence
 - Security
 - Demilitarisation
 - Guarantees
 - Economic aspects

Appendix 11

List of projects in the category of Special Initiative Grants.

X. SPECIAL INITIATIVE GRANTS - Total \$290,694

The Bi-communal Development Programme also manages a Special Initiatives Grants window. This grant scheme is aimed at small, high-impact, time sensitive, ad hoc and short duration initiatives. To be eligible, the applicant must be one of the following: a non-profit organization, a non-governmental organization, a voluntary organization, a charity or union, or a group of individuals. More information on how to apply is available at the BDP website www.unopspmu.org

To date 35 Special Initiatives Grants have been approved for the following activities:

1. Cypriot Folk Dance Performance
2. Preparation of First Bilingual (Turkish/Greek) Edition of an Arts Magazine
3. Bi-communal Theatre Productions
4. Bi-communal Development and Production of Dance/Theatre Performance
5. Bi-communal Conference on Prospects for a United Cyprus
6. Bi-communal Communication and Cooperation Seminar
7. Bi-communal May Day Celebration in Limassol
8. Bi-communal Peace Celebration in Limassol
9. Peace Concert
10. Cyprus Olympic Truce Declaration
11. Bi-communal Voyage of Understanding - Tall Ships Sailing Trip for Cypriot Youth
12. Translation of Book on Political and Social Issues for the PEO Cyprus Labour Institute
13. Bi-communal Children's Camp in Ayios Nicholas
14. Children's Congress
15. Conference on Early Childhood
16. Rockathon: Merging Cultures: Bi-communal Music Event
17. Bi-communal Conference on Gender in the Mediterranean: Emerging Discourses and Practices
18. International Women's Day Celebration
19. Empowering Young Women for Success - Workshop For Young Women
20. Internet Forum for Civic Expression
21. Preparations for Beijing NGO Conference
22. Pan European NGO Seminar
23. Civil Society Common Initiative Panel Discussion
24. 14th International Conference of the Alliance of Universities for Democracy
25. International Conference on Violence
26. 4th Global Conference on Cultures of Violence
27. HIV/AIDS Conference
28. World AIDS Day Celebration
29. Public Education on HIV/AIDS and STD Prevention
30. International Thalassaemia Conference
31. International Cardiology Forum
32. Conference on Laparoscopic Surgery
33. Conference for the Deaf
34. World Environment Day
35. Training of Facilitators for Rural Land Use Decision-Making Processes

Appendix 12

List of funds related to the Annan plan.

Bi-communal Development Programme 1998-2004 Direct Assistance at the Request of the UN Good Offices and Dissemination of the Annan Plan

At the request of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Cyprus, the Bi-communal Development Programme provided office and conference facilities and an additional US\$270,700 in direct support to the UN Good Offices, mainly for technical expertise on the various aspects of the Plan (US\$160,000), but also for the creation of the Annan Plan website and the public announcement of the website address (<<http://www.annanplan.org>>), translation of various versions of the Plan into Greek and Turkish, and one panel discussion on its key provisions.

The Programme also facilitated and supported the work of the Flag and Anthem Committee (US\$48,000), which led to the selection, by a bi-communal group of individuals appointed by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders, of a flag and an anthem for the United Cyprus Republic.

Additional activities, totalling US\$189,500 and related to the dissemination of information on the provisions of the Annan Plan, consisted specifically of the design and printing of citizen's guides to the Annan Plan and property regime booklets, the design of leaflets on aspects of the Plan and the production and a printing of the final version of the main sections of the Plan in newspapers. The sole purpose of these activities was to support the efforts of concerned Cypriots from both communities who sought to facilitate access by the public to information on the Annan Plan.

Direct Assistance for the Dissemination of the Annan Plan

1. Creation and maintenance of the official Annan Plan website <http://www.annanplan.org>
Cost: In-kind contribution by UNOPS staff
Implementing Agency: UNOPS
2. Printing of citizen's guides to the Annan Plan and booklets on the property regime of the Annan Plan
Cost: US\$ 79,000
Implementing Agency: Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) for original design and UNOPS for printing
Results: 12,000 Greek-language and 5,150 Turkish-language copies of the citizen's guide and 5,100 Greek-language and 2,100 Turkish-language copies of the property regime booklets.
These were disseminated in the following ways:
 - Greek Cypriot Community:
 - Direct distribution (by hand) of the booklets within communities;
 - Direct distribution to political parties, ministries, public employees, academic institutions, refugee organizations, NGOs, villages, individuals, seminars and conferences;
 - Distribution via mass mailing targeting:
 - Advocates
 - Banks
 - Bishoprics
 - Bookshops
 - Chambers of Commerce and Industry
 - Charitable Organizations
 - Courts and Offices
 - Supreme Court, Law Office, Revision and Consolidation of Cyprus Legislation
 - Office of the Negotiator of the Accession of Cyprus to the European Union

I

- Ombudsman
- Audit Office
- Public Service Commission
- Educational Service Commission
- Planning Bureau.
- Public Information Office
- Cultural Centres and Organizations
- Estate Agents
- Members Of Parliament
- Greek Government
- Hotel Managers
- Libraries
- Media
- Medical Practitioners
- Municipal Authorities
- Museums
- Organizations and Institutions of Social Service
- Political Parties
- Tourist and Travel Agents
- Universities and Colleges
- Embassies in Cyprus
- Embassies of Cyprus

Turkish Cypriot Community

The distribution targeted NGOs, political parties, "governmental" offices, academic institutions, and the public at large and was implemented directly by the members of the PRIO project team assisted by volunteers and also through:

- Organized local communities;
- NGO networks, especially teachers' unions; and
- Political party networks.

3. Publication of summary versions of the Annan Plan in all major newspapers

Cost: US\$ 50,000

Implementing Agency: PRIO for overall design and UNOPS for printing

Results: Two inserts containing the content of the citizen guide and the property regime booklet published in the following newspapers:

- Cyprus Mail, Cyprus Weekly (Citizen's Guide)
- Politis (Citizen's Guide)
- Kibris, Yeniduzen, Ortam, Kibrisli, Afrika, and Cumhuriyet (Citizen's Guide)
- Machi, Politis, Phileleftheros, Simerini, Haravgi (Property Regime)
- Kibris, Yeniduzen, Ortam, Kibrisli, Afrika and Halkin Sesi (Property Regime)

4. Design and Dissemination of informational material in Greek on key aspects of the Annan Plan

Cost: US\$ 30,000

Implementing Agency: Ad Hoc Committee "All Cyprus Together"

Results: The design of the following informational material:

- The map of the settlement plan with time schedules for returns
- A summary of the basic provisions of the settlement plan; and
- An implementation calendar of the Annan Plan, including key milestones in the event it was approved.

5. Informational radio programmes in Turkish on the Annan Plan

Cost: US\$ 29,000

Implementing Agency: Radio May

Results: Radio programme entitled "Step-by-Step Annan Plan", begun on 2nd April and finished on 23rd April 2004. Broadcasted twice everyday in the morning and in the evening.

The following aspects of the Plan were presented and discussed:

- Constitution
- Property
- Citizenship
- Defence
- Security
- Demilitarisation
- Guarantees
- Economic aspects

Appendix 13

Nathan Associates Report, Annex 9, PMU Project and Organisational Ratings.

ANNEX 9
PMU PROJECT AND ORGANIZATIONAL RATINGS

Reference	Description	Type	FACILITY		ORGANIZATION		Overall Rating	Comments
			Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score		
PMU 2001	PMU 2001 - PMU 2001	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2002	PMU 2002 - PMU 2002	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2003	PMU 2003 - PMU 2003	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2004	PMU 2004 - PMU 2004	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2005	PMU 2005 - PMU 2005	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2006	PMU 2006 - PMU 2006	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2007	PMU 2007 - PMU 2007	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2008	PMU 2008 - PMU 2008	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2009	PMU 2009 - PMU 2009	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2010	PMU 2010 - PMU 2010	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2011	PMU 2011 - PMU 2011	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2012	PMU 2012 - PMU 2012	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2013	PMU 2013 - PMU 2013	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2014	PMU 2014 - PMU 2014	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2015	PMU 2015 - PMU 2015	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2016	PMU 2016 - PMU 2016	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2017	PMU 2017 - PMU 2017	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2018	PMU 2018 - PMU 2018	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2019	PMU 2019 - PMU 2019	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2020	PMU 2020 - PMU 2020	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2021	PMU 2021 - PMU 2021	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2022	PMU 2022 - PMU 2022	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2023	PMU 2023 - PMU 2023	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2024	PMU 2024 - PMU 2024	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2025	PMU 2025 - PMU 2025	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2026	PMU 2026 - PMU 2026	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2027	PMU 2027 - PMU 2027	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2028	PMU 2028 - PMU 2028	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2029	PMU 2029 - PMU 2029	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2030	PMU 2030 - PMU 2030	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2031	PMU 2031 - PMU 2031	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2032	PMU 2032 - PMU 2032	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2033	PMU 2033 - PMU 2033	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2034	PMU 2034 - PMU 2034	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2035	PMU 2035 - PMU 2035	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2036	PMU 2036 - PMU 2036	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2037	PMU 2037 - PMU 2037	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2038	PMU 2038 - PMU 2038	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2039	PMU 2039 - PMU 2039	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2040	PMU 2040 - PMU 2040	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2041	PMU 2041 - PMU 2041	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2042	PMU 2042 - PMU 2042	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2043	PMU 2043 - PMU 2043	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2044	PMU 2044 - PMU 2044	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2045	PMU 2045 - PMU 2045	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2046	PMU 2046 - PMU 2046	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2047	PMU 2047 - PMU 2047	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2048	PMU 2048 - PMU 2048	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2049	PMU 2049 - PMU 2049	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2050	PMU 2050 - PMU 2050	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2051	PMU 2051 - PMU 2051	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2052	PMU 2052 - PMU 2052	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2053	PMU 2053 - PMU 2053	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2054	PMU 2054 - PMU 2054	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2055	PMU 2055 - PMU 2055	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2056	PMU 2056 - PMU 2056	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2057	PMU 2057 - PMU 2057	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2058	PMU 2058 - PMU 2058	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2059	PMU 2059 - PMU 2059	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2060	PMU 2060 - PMU 2060	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2061	PMU 2061 - PMU 2061	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2062	PMU 2062 - PMU 2062	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2063	PMU 2063 - PMU 2063	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2064	PMU 2064 - PMU 2064	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2065	PMU 2065 - PMU 2065	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2066	PMU 2066 - PMU 2066	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2067	PMU 2067 - PMU 2067	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2068	PMU 2068 - PMU 2068	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2069	PMU 2069 - PMU 2069	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2070	PMU 2070 - PMU 2070	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2071	PMU 2071 - PMU 2071	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2072	PMU 2072 - PMU 2072	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2073	PMU 2073 - PMU 2073	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2074	PMU 2074 - PMU 2074	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2075	PMU 2075 - PMU 2075	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2076	PMU 2076 - PMU 2076	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2077	PMU 2077 - PMU 2077	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2078	PMU 2078 - PMU 2078	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2079	PMU 2079 - PMU 2079	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2080	PMU 2080 - PMU 2080	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2081	PMU 2081 - PMU 2081	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2082	PMU 2082 - PMU 2082	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2083	PMU 2083 - PMU 2083	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2084	PMU 2084 - PMU 2084	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2085	PMU 2085 - PMU 2085	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2086	PMU 2086 - PMU 2086	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2087	PMU 2087 - PMU 2087	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2088	PMU 2088 - PMU 2088	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2089	PMU 2089 - PMU 2089	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2090	PMU 2090 - PMU 2090	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2091	PMU 2091 - PMU 2091	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2092	PMU 2092 - PMU 2092	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2093	PMU 2093 - PMU 2093	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2094	PMU 2094 - PMU 2094	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2095	PMU 2095 - PMU 2095	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2096	PMU 2096 - PMU 2096	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2097	PMU 2097 - PMU 2097	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2098	PMU 2098 - PMU 2098	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2099	PMU 2099 - PMU 2099	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good
PMU 2100	PMU 2100 - PMU 2100	FC	5	5	A	A	5.00	Good

ABBREVIATIONS

UNDP: United Nations Development Program

UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services

USAID: Agency for International Development

BDP: By-Communal Development Program

AKEL: Progressive Party of the Working People

DIKO: Democratic Party

NGO: Non-Governmental Organisation

OPEK: Association for Social Reform

PEO: Pancyprian Association of Labour

TRNC: “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus”

FRIEDRICH
EBERT
STIFTUNG



Published in Greek under the title:
«Η περιρρέουσα ατμόσφαιρα»

Design: Akis Ioannides (Schinovatis Graphic Arts)
Translation: George Karaolides
Editing: Kosta Pavlowitch

IKME Publication

The publication of the study *The construction of reality and the mass media in Cyprus* is included in the activities of the IKME with the support and co-operation of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

This study is distributed free of charge in printed and electronic form and its purpose is to assist the prevalence of truth, democracy and European spirit in social institutions and practices in Cyprus.

IKME – The Foundation for Sociopolitical Studies – is a non-profit organisation and its purpose is to contribute to the arrival, development and protection of freedom, democracy, the socialist ideal and European spirit.

www.ikme.org

Makarios Drousiotis

makarios@cytanet.com.cy
www.makarios.ws