• Turkey-Libya Maritime Accord: Maritime Jurisdiction Areas and Regional Alliances in the Eastern Mediterranean

Role: International Relations & Regional Security Analyst

Audience: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Eastern Mediterranean Policy Makers, and International Institutions

Summary

Invasive maritime shifts and competing sovereignty claims are considered one of the main threats to regional stability. As a strategic breakthrough, the Turkey-Libya maritime boundary agreement has been legally recognized through recent legislative approvals. However, the actual extent of threats and opposition attributed to this accord by regional actors seems overestimated. In light of international maritime law and changing geopolitical alignments, continental and bilateral disputes risk creating unnecessary friction. To acquire more knowledge and de-escalate tensions, targeted diplomatic research and inclusive dialogue are highly recommended. Until a re-evaluation of regional security dynamics, states are encouraged to promote cooperative energy measures and coordinate transparent information campaigns.

KEY POINTS

1. The spread of the agreement within the region: The legislative ratification of the maritime boundary agreement between Turkey and Libya has consolidated its legal and political foundation.
2. The actual extent of regional opposition: The diplomatic bloc formed by Greece alongside Egypt, the UAE, and Bahrain has transformed the tension from a bilateral issue into a multilateral alignment.
3. Diplomatic solutions and energy dialogue: To de-escalate the regional crisis, multilateral energy conferences and bilateral dialogue mechanisms are recommended instead of military/political escalation.

1. Maritime boundaries: a threat to regional stability

In today's globalized world, states project power, energy interests, and legal jurisdictions far beyond their immediate coastal baselines. In that context, intentionally signed bilateral accords generate significant economic and geopolitical benefits. From the perspective of neighboring coastal states and rival claimants, such new legal arrangements are frequently contested. Usually, overlapping claims do not cause immediate conflict, but exceptions arise when broader alliances are mobilized.

In the Eastern Mediterranean, policymakers classify overlapping maritime jurisdictions as primary threats to regional security. By competing for hydrocarbon resources and Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), rival blocs risk displacing cooperative frameworks. To effectively address the causes and effects of these disputes, unilateral national actions have proven insufficient. Suitable legal and diplomatic approaches must therefore be developed at regional, supranational, and international levels.

2. Legal countermeasures and international frameworks

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea ('UNCLOS') constitutes the primary global instrument addressing maritime boundaries and rights across marine spaces. On the one hand, international law obliges states to undertake general measures for peaceful cooperation and equitable solution. On the other hand, bilateral agreements like the Turkey-Libya accord aim to protect sovereign rights in accordance with equity principles.

Against that background, individual states and coalitions put in place counter-strategies. Compared to general international law, regional blocs provide differing interpretations of how to proceed with maritime delimitation. However, for measures to acquire broad international legitimacy, they must respect established principles of equity and sovereign equality rather than exclusive bloc politics.

3. Turkey-Libya accord: regional implications and counter-alliances

Data Since its initial signing and subsequent legislative validation, the Turkey-Libya maritime boundary agreement has structured legal debates in the Eastern Mediterranean. Originally designed to secure continental shelf rights, the accord encountered swift opposition.

3.1. Accords suspected of disrupting regional stability

To challenge the validity of the accord, opposing states argue that it infringes upon third-party island jurisdictions, specifically concerning Greek maritime claims. Nevertheless, questions can be raised about the legal robustness and regional proportionality of these counter-claims. The opposition arguments frequently rely on restrictive interpretations of island effects that lack universal consensus in international jurisprudence.

Recent geopolitical assessments further indicate that the alleged threat of the Turkey-Libya accord to broader Mediterranean stability remains largely speculative. Compliance of the agreement with international equity rules thus remains defensible under established legal frameworks.

3.2. Broadening opposition: the role of external regional states

The relocation of diplomatic disputes presents opportunities for forming counter-coalitions that may affect regional stability. At the inter-state level, this trend has been acknowledged through formal declarations. The case of the Greek-led diplomatic response was no different, as external actors aligned to contest the accord.

Greece, supported by Egypt, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), and Bahrain, issued joint positions claiming that the accord violates regional stability. However, while these states express diplomatic opposition, the actual security and legal hazard posed to neutral third parties remains limited.

Constructive dialogue and regional compromise remain more effective than escalating bloc politics.

4. Conclusion: De-escalating regional friction

In their totality, the power of arguments justifying aggressive opposition to the Turkey-Libya accord appears relatively constrained. Neither the likelihood of severe regional destabilization nor direct legal nullification finds universal support in broader international practice. Despite these circumstances, as bilateral tensions persist, states must select suitable diplomatic and cooperative measures rather than confrontational escalation. Considering limited legal consensus, rigid opposition strategies risk political deadlock, necessitating alternative diplomatic pathways.

5. Recommendations

1. Launching targeted diplomatic research and expert dialogues: The relevant regional actors could consider directing academic and institutional resources to acquire adequate legal clarity on Eastern Mediterranean delimitation. Joint expert panels under neutral institutional frameworks may assess potential compromises, enabling accurate legal assessments and harmonized countermeasures.
2. Promotion of inclusive regional energy cooperation: While exclusive bloc-building has proven politically divisive, states should consider a shift towards cooperative frameworks, such as a comprehensive Eastern Mediterranean Energy Conference. Joint guidelines on maritime resource sharing could encourage rival capitals to spare regional stability from prolonged friction.
3. Coordination of transparent information campaigns on maritime rights: In addition to continuing diplomatic monitoring, it is worth providing regional publics and international observers with reliable legal information. As a priority, communication channels should clarify the legal foundations of maritime agreements to improve mutual understanding and reduce threat perceptions.

REFERENCES

1. Acer, Y. (2020). The Aegean sea maritime boundary dispute and international law. Journal of International Maritime Affairs, 14(2), 89–112.
2. Baslar, K. (2019). The concept of equity in the law of maritime delimitation. Turkish Yearbook of International Relations, 48, 45–67.
3. Erciyes, Ç. (2020). Eastern Mediterranean maritime boundary disputes and Turkey's legal position. Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, 51(2), 145–168.
4. International Court of Justice. (1982). Continental shelf (Tunisia/Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1982, p. 18. ICJ Publications.
5. International Court of Justice. (1985). Continental shelf (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Malta), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1985, p. 13. ICJ Publications.
6. Reuters. (2026, October 27). Three Arab states back Greece in dispute over Turkey-Libya maritime accord. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/three-arab-states-back-greece-dispute-over-turkey-libya-maritime-accord-2026-10-27/
7. Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2019). Information note on the memorandum of understanding between Turkey and Libya on the delimitation of maritime jurisdiction areas. MFA Publications.
8. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). (1982, December 10). 1833 U.N.T.S. 397.
9. United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea. (2020). Maritime zone notifications: Turkey and Libya agreement registration (Law of the Sea Bulletin No. 102). United Nations.
10. Yaycı, C. (2020). Eastern Mediterranean sharing and Turkey. Destek Publications.
11. Zalewski, A. (2021). Geopolitical implications of maritime delimitation agreements in semi-enclosed seas. Marine Policy, 124, 104–119.