

Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

Ref.: OL THA 7/2021
(Please use this reference in your reply)

20 December 2021

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 41/12, 43/4, 43/16 and 40/16.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning the two draft amendments proposed by your Excellency's Government that if adopted, may impinge on the exercise of the rights to freedom of expression and freedom of association which are guaranteed under international human rights law, in particular under articles 19 and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to which Thailand acceded on 29 October 1996. The first amendment concerns the Anti-Money Laundering Act, B.E. 2542 (1999), (AMLA), aimed at fighting money laundering, the financing of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Thailand; and the second one the 2015 Communicable Diseases Act (CDA), B.E. 2558 (2015), for the prevention and control of communicable diseases.

We are respectfully submitting these comments in light of international human rights standards and best practices on the rights to freedom of association, and we stand ready to engage further with your Excellency's Government on this matter.

After its evaluation of Thai money laundering regulations in December 2017, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) concluded that a number of aspects of the AMLA do not conform with international anti-money laundering standards to combat the financing of terrorism. On 4 November 2021, the Thai Cabinet, in principle, approved the Draft Amendment of the AMLA submitted by the Anti-Money Laundering Office (AMLO). The Draft Amendment reportedly aims at amending specific provisions to make AMLA compliant with the FATF recommendations.

On 21 September 2021, the Cabinet, in principle, approved the Draft Amendment to the Communicable Diseases Act. The Ministry of Public Health had previously held a public consultation on an earlier version of the draft amendments, during which concerns were raised by civil society organizations over several vaguely worded and overly broad provisions, which seemed to provide wide-ranging powers to authorities. Nevertheless, since this consultation, further information on the Cabinet-approved draft legislation - including the detailed summary of the Act and its effects - has, to date, not been made publicly available on the Secretariat of the Cabinet's website. The approved amended CDA is expected to replace

the Emergency Decree on Public Administration in Emergency Situation B.E. 2548 (2020) at its expiration on 31 January 2022. The Emergency Decree was enacted in March 2020, reportedly granting the Government extensive powers to control the spread of Covid-19 through the Centre for Covid-19 Situation Administration.

We are referring Your Excellency's Government to our communication expressed our concerns on 26 March 2021 (OL THA 2/2021) regarding the Draft Act on the Operations of NGOs and the Draft Act on the Promotion and Development of Civil Society Organizations. In that letter, we cautioned that the draft legislation did not appear to conform to international human rights law and standards. We noted Your Excellency's Government subsequent decision to consult additional governmental authorities, and to revise the draft law to ensure compliance with international obligations.

On 16 September 2021 we had also expressed our concerns to your Excellency's Government regarding the proposed incorporation of eight principles on anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism into a separate Draft Act on the Operation of Not-for-Profit Organizations. We had recommended careful consideration of our concerns to ensure compliance with international human rights law and standards.

At present, the draft amendment on the AMLA raises similar concerns as those expressed regarding the Draft Act on the Operation of Not-for-Profit Organizations, and thus may impede on fundamental freedoms and civic space.

1. Applicable International and Human Rights Law Standards

We respectfully draw your Excellency's Government's attention to the relevant international human rights law provisions enshrined in the ICCPR: in particular article 19, which guarantees the right of everyone to freedom of opinion and expression, the enjoyment of which is fundamental to the enjoyment of a number of other rights; articles 21 and 22 which guarantee the rights of everyone to peaceful assembly and freedom of association; article 25, which promotes the right of every citizen to take part in the conduct of public affairs; and article 17, which protects against arbitrary or unlawful interference with a person's privacy, reputation and home.

Under article 2 of the ICCPR, your Excellency's Government has a responsibility to take deliberate, concrete and targeted steps towards meeting the obligations recognized in the respective Covenants, including by adopting laws and legislative measures as necessary to give domestic legal effect to the rights stipulated in the Covenants and to ensure that the domestic legal system is compatible with the treaties.

We also refer your Excellency's Government to the fundamental principles set forth in the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, also known as the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. In particular, the Declaration reaffirms each State's responsibility and duty to protect, promote and implement all human rights and fundamental freedoms, including every person's right, individually and in association with others, "at the national and international levels [...] to form, join and participate in non-

governmental organizations, associations or groups” and “to solicit, receive and utilise resources for the express purpose of promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms through peaceful means” (A/RES/53/144, art. 5). We would like to highlight the importance of having clear, comprehensive and human rights- and rule of law-informed guidance regarding the implementation of any proposed monitoring and surveillance powers. We recall the Human Rights Committee’s determination that the right to privacy requires robust, independent oversight systems to supervise the implementation of these measures, including through the involvement of the judiciary and the availability of effective remedies in cases of abuse. (CCPR/C/IT/CO/6, para. 36).

We wish to underline that international human rights obligations remain fully applicable in the context of counter-terrorism, including with regard to the enactment of measures to counter the financing of terrorism. The financing of terrorism has been a longstanding concern for States as demonstrated by the agreement on the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, aimed at criminalizing acts of financing terrorism and which was ratified by Thailand on 29 September 2004. Thenceforth, several Security Council resolutions have expressly called for the criminalization of terrorism financing, including the landmark Security Council Resolution 1373 and Security Council Resolution 2462, the first comprehensive resolution addressing the prevention and suppression of terrorism financing. The latter resolution “[d]emands that Member States ensure that all measures taken to counter terrorism, including measures taken to counter the financing of terrorism [...] comply with their obligations under international law, including international humanitarian law, international human rights law and international refugee law.” While we recognize the need to prevent and deter terrorism financing and terrorism-related offenses, as previously highlighted in a letter to your Excellency’s Government on 16 September 2021 (THA 5/2021), we again recall that criminal penalties are often misused by authorities as a tool to silence civil society actors and human rights defenders, and may disproportionately impinge on the rights to freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association (A/HRC/26/29, para. 60). Criminal penalties may deter individuals from taking part in even the legitimate activities of non-profit organisations.

The Financial Action Task Force (FATF), an inter-governmental body that sets international standards for the prevention of money laundering and terrorist financing, has developed non-binding recommendations aimed at countering terrorist financing. In particular, Recommendation 8 provides guidance to States on the laws and regulations that should be enacted to oversee and protect the subset of NPOs that have been identified as being vulnerable to terrorist financing concerns (Recommendation 8). These measures must be “focused and proportionate”; “a ‘one size fits all’ approach to address all NPOs is not appropriate.” FATF has reaffirmed that State compliance with Recommendation 8 should be implemented “in a manner which respects countries’ obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and international human rights law,” including the State obligation to promote universal respect for, and observance of, fundamental human rights and freedoms, such as freedom of expression, religion or belief and freedom of peaceful assembly and of association. The aim of FATF is to establish an effective institutional framework for the implementation of combating money laundering and the financing of terrorism policies for all sectors, rather than singling out the NPO sector for more stringent regulations that incapacitate the sector and quell the freedoms of association and expression.

The Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism has previously called on FATF and FATF-style regional bodies to implement human rights benchmarking and guidance with similar levels of specificity and comprehensiveness as the recommendations addressing financial measures to facilitate human rights-compliant implementation.¹ The application and enforcement of “soft law” counter-terrorism standards, such as the FATF recommendations, should not function in a *de facto* undermining of binding international law norms.²

1. Issues Concerning Human Rights

Draft Amendments of the Anti-Money Laundering Act

a. Purpose of the Draft Amendment

In its evaluation of Thai money laundering regulations issued under the Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) standards in December 2017, the FATF had reached the conclusion that a number of aspects of the AMLA do not conform with the standards as recommended by the FATF.

Further to the FATF 2017 national assessment report, the Thai Anti-Money Laundering Office (AMLO) agreed on 21 May 2021 on the Draft Amendment of the Anti-Money Laundering Act B.E.2542 (AMLA) to bring it in line with the recommendations issued by the FATF on the prevention and suppression of money laundering and financing of terrorist groups. The Draft Amendment proposes a number of changes to the AMLA, including measures on the seizing of assets, additional criminal sanctions, and the widening of its scope of application. Once the Draft Amendment enacted, the AMLA would include NPOs in its scope of application, as well as determine reporting requirements of NPOs of their financial statements to the AMLO.

The AMLO arranged four public forums in 2021 as prescribed by Cabinet Resolution dated 19 November 2019, via their official website (www.amlo.go.th), to gather public opinions before consolidating those recommendations and then circulating the consolidated version on their official public website. An official Cabinet resolution dated 4 November 2021, confirmed that the Thai Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a comment on the Draft Amendment that it should comply with the Draft Act on the Operation of Not-for-Profit Organizations, and in particular its Section 6, which is currently under the consideration by the Council of State according to Cabinet Resolution dated 29 June 2021, to avoid duplication of law whereby they would provide for the same principles or similar provisions. Section 6 of the Draft Act on the Operation of Not-for-Profit Organizations states that:

Not-for-profit organizations must disclose sources and amounts of funds or property used in their operation each year to the registrar in accordance with the criteria or method prescribed by the Minister, and to submit tax returns to the Revenue Department every year in accordance with the criteria or method prescribed by the Director of the Revenue Department.

¹ A/74/335, para. 37.

² *Ibid.* para. 38

Not-for-profit organizations may accept money or property from natural persons, legal entities or groups of individuals who do not hold Thai nationality, or which have not been registered in the Thai Kingdom, as the case may be, to use only to carry out activities in the Kingdom as permitted by the Minister, and are required to report on the acquisition and the disbursement of such money or property, and the implementation of the activities every year to the registrar based on the criteria, methods and duration determined by the registrar.

The registrar shall have the authority to enter the office of not-for-profit organizations to inspect the use of money or property, or the operation of activities, per the second paragraph, and to have the power to examine and obtain a copy of electronic communications traffic made by the not-for-profit organizations for further examination

The Draft Amendment provides for thirty-three (33) issues to be amended under the first and second amendment of the AMLA. Among other issues, the Amendment imposes: (1) rules governing foreign currency transfers that may be supporting the financing of terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD); (2) rules determining specific financial reporting duties for associations, foundations, and NPOs and assigning selected government agencies to oversee such activities; (3) criminal penalties against those who refer to or use the documentation or information of others, or act as a broker, to circulate this documentation or information in order to conceal their identity to process transactions.

As such, we are concerned that the draft amendment raises the same issues as those regarding the Draft Act on the Operation of Not-for-Profit Organizations, namely anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism principles that could result in violations of fundamental human rights and freedoms guaranteed under international law.³

b. Burdensome financial and reporting obligations

Section 16 of the Draft Amendment of the AMLA provides that all associations, foundations or NPOs, including religious, artistic, scientific, literary, educational or other organizations (collectively known as the “Professions”), have the legal duty to: (1) prepare annual financial statements which reflect clearly all of their income, specifying its source, as well as their expenses; (2) record all information related to their income and expenditure as prescribed by the competent agency; (3) and provide information on the persons authorized to manage the entity and the beneficiaries of their activities. The Professions would further be legally required keep all such information, documentation and evidence, as listed under (1), (2) and (3) for a period of five (5) years from the date of recording the information in relation to a transaction, or from the execution of a transaction, unless directed otherwise by authorities. The format, criteria and items pertaining to such records would be further stipulated by sub-regulations. Section 16 further states that its provisions would not apply to any association, foundation, or NPO that are under the Royal Patronage.

We would like to remind your Excellency’s Government that the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association in a

³ OL THA 5/2021.

report called upon States “[t]o ensure that associations – registered and unregistered – can seek, receive and use funding and other resources from natural and legal persons, whether domestic, foreign or international, without prior authorization or other undue impediments, including from individuals; associations, foundations or other civil society organizations; foreign Governments and aid agencies; the private sector; the United Nations and other entities” (A/HRC/23/39, para. 82 (b)).

We would further like to express our concern that such financial reporting requirements may be overly broad, as they apply to the not-for-profit sector in its entirety. Such a large scope of application would include community-based organizations at a smaller scale, that may not have the established financial or administrative capacities and resources for such reporting, which would expose them in the case of non-compliance to extremely severe repercussions, including large fines and even the possibility of imprisonment. As such, the Draft Amendments would not appear to be proportional, nor in line with a risk-based approach, as required by FATF recommendation 8. The latter recommendation states that “countries should identify which subset of organizations fall within the FATF definition of NPO [using] all relevant sources of information in order to identify features and types of NPOs, which, by virtue of their activities or characteristics, are likely to be at risk of terrorist financing abuse.”⁴ FATF recommendation 8 further provides for a narrow range of measures targeting at-risk NPOs, and that States “should review the adequacy of measures (...) that relate to the subset of the NPO sector that may be abused for terrorism financing support in order to be able to take proportionate and effective actions to address the risks identified.”⁵

We are also concerned that Section 16 of the Draft Amendment is not sufficiently clear with regards to the reporting obligations for all associations, foundations and NPOs. The Draft Amendment would grant a considerable amount of discretion to authorities to potentially impose additional reporting requirements, including on the frequency of such reports, their level of detail, as well as the specific information to be provided. We therefore regret the lack of clarity on the specific content requirement for these reports.

Furthermore, although States may have a legitimate interest in establishing reporting requirements to associations, foundations and NPOs to ensure their compliance with the law, these requirements “should not inhibit associations’ functional autonomy and operation” (Human Rights Council Resolution 22/6) by imposing costly and protracted burdens. Such reporting obligations and administrative requirements entail the dedication of additional time and resources, which could be exceedingly detrimental to the activities of a number of organizations. Indeed, such requirements are particularly time-consuming, and could impact negatively their budgets and capacity to fulfil their mandates and activities, including humanitarian activities. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association further noted that the use of “onerous and bureaucratic reporting requirements” can eventually “obstruct the legitimate work carried out by association” (A/HRC/23/39, para 38).

⁴ International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism & Proliferation, The FATF Recommendations, adopted by the FATF plenary in February 2012.

⁵ International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism & Proliferation, The FATF Recommendations, adopted by the FATF plenary in February 2012.

c. Broad ministerial oversight

Pursuant to Section 16, in case of reasonable suspicion that there is sufficient evidence that an association, foundation or NPO is engaging in money laundering-related transactions, financial support for terrorism, or the proliferation of WMD, the competent governmental agency is authorized to: (1) issue an order for further information on the facts and internal operations of the association, foundations, or NPO, or request financial information or documents, *inter alia*, for examination; (2) issue an order to temporarily suspend such suspicious transactions for a period as determined by the competent governmental agency, but for no longer than thirty (30) days; (3) enter the premises of an association, foundation or NPO from sunrise to sunset without warrant to search for such evidence, in cases where there is reason to believe that it would be otherwise too late to obtain a search warrant and the property or evidence will be removed, concealed, or destroyed.

We would like to raise our concerns over the lack of adequate safeguards in place to prevent the provision from being applied selectively and in a discriminatory manner, given the intrusiveness of the measures proposed by Section 16 of the Draft Amendment in relation to the prevention terrorist financing misuse. The extended powers that are provided to authorities could indeed be used arbitrarily against local NPOs in areas prone to terrorist activities, which authorities may target to physically search and seize any suspicious assessments, without a court issued warrant. We believe that, in the absence of such procedural safeguards to prevent the misuse of power by authorities, this provision could stigmatize certain parts of civil society and therefore is not in compliance with States' obligation to "create and maintain a safe and enabling environment in which civil society and human rights defenders can operate free from hindrance and insecurity" (Human Rights Council's resolution 27/31).

We are further concerned that the power given to authorities to instigate the search of an organization's premises without warrant in the presence of reasonable suspicion and sufficient evidence, could constitute an undue impediment in the organization's right to privacy. While the aim prevent financing of terrorism is a legitimate one, such a provision would permit authorities, and not a competent, independent and impartial judicial court, to access the emails of organizations operational in Thailand and funded by foreign donors, hence allowing them to monitor and surveil any communications of the organization's staff, in breach of their right to privacy, protected by Article 17 of the ICCPR.

Such intrusive searches could also result in a breach of the confidentiality of exchanges between the organizations and people and beneficiaries they serve, which thereafter could expose them to risks of reprisals. We are particularly concerned by the absence of adequate safeguards ensuring that such searches receive prior approval by a competent, independent and impartial judicial authority.

d. Non-compliance and penalties

Pursuant to Section 27 of the Draft Amendment of the AMLA, the competent governmental authorities are given the powers to: (1) enter the place of business or the location of the person having the duty to report, or process data with a computer or any other device of the person having the duty to report during office hours, to make further factual inquiries or to examine documents, evidence or any other information as necessary; (2) to seize documents or information relating to the

execution of the AMLA in cases where there is evidence to believe that there is a violation or non-compliance with the AMLA; 3) to order the business owner, director, officer or other person responsible for the management of the entity with a duty to report to give their verbal statement/testimony, to handover the copy (of documents), and to reveal information, or other relevant persons in charge of the collection or processing of relevant data from such responsible persons with a computer or other devices, or involved in any relevant activities or facts for the performance of duties of the competent authorities, to provide statements, submit copies or present information, documents or any other pertinent evidence. The competent authorities shall determine a reasonable period for such persons to comply with the order. Section 27 of the Draft Amendment further states that competent authorities should notify the abovementioned persons with a reasonable advance, before entering the relevant places under (1), in cases that aren't urgent.

Pursuant to Section 51 of the Draft Amendment, any person who fails to comply with the duty to report a transaction within the determined time period, or with a request for further information as specified in Section 16, shall be liable to a fine of up to one million THB, as well as an additional fine of up to ten thousand THB per day of delay during the period of the violation or until the violation is rectified.

Section 52 further provides that any person who reports, informs or provides information as prescribed by Section 16 and who provides a false information or statement or conceals information that should be notified to the authorities, shall be liable to imprisonment for up to two years, and/or a fine from fifty thousand THB up to five hundred thousand THB.

Finally, Section 53 states that whomever fails to provide testimony as summoned or to submit written testimony, or assets, accounts, data, documents, evidence or any other information, or does not provide an explanation in writing under Section 16 without reasonable cause or resists, does not give consent, or obstructs the order as stipulated in Section 16, *inter alia*, shall be liable to imprisonment up to one year and/or a fine of up to twenty thousand THB.

The overarching measures provided for in Section 27 (1) and (2) with regards to entering the premises of persons with a duty to report and the seizure of documents and information fail to provide for adequate legal safeguards or judicial oversight to ensure that measures adopted are necessary and proportionate in a democratic society. Additionally, Section 27 (3) of the Draft Amendment establishes extensive criminal liabilities and sanctions against persons working as managers, directors or other roles. Such a personal responsibility and liability of a wide range of persons, which would appear to be disproportionate. As such, these provisions could also disproportionately affect persons accepting the responsibility to open bank accounts for small or local NPOs, and could also extend to umbrella organizations that work to manage and transfer funds for such small or local NPOs.

We would like to note that prison sentences and high fines for not complying with the duty to report raises issues of proportionality. Under international law, sanctions must be consistent with the principle of proportionality (see UN Human Rights Committee, *Korneenko et al. v. Belarus* (Communication no. 1274/2004, 31 October 2006), paras. 7.6-7.7.). Accordingly, when deciding whether to apply sanctions, authorities must take care to apply the measure that is the least disruptive and destructive to the right to freedom of association. In this regard, penalties for the late or incorrect submission of reports, or other minor offences, should never be

harsher than penalties for similar offences committed by other entities, such as businesses. In addition, sanctions should be avoided and be replaced by a warning with information on how a violation may be rectified, giving ample time to the association to repair the violation.

2. *Draft Amendment of the Communicable Diseases Act (2015)*

According to the information at our disposal, the Cabinet approved a Draft Amendment to the Communicable Diseases Act (CDA) on 21 September 2021. The approved amended CDA is likely to replace the Emergency Decree on Public Administration in Emergency Situations B.E. 2548 (2020) at the expiration of its fourth extension on 31 January 2022. The Emergency Decree on Public Administration in Emergency Situations was enacted in March 2020 and granted the government sweeping powers to control the spread of Covid-19 through the Centre for Covid-19 Situation Administration.

During one of the public consultations held by the Ministry of Public Health between 15 September 2020 and 28 April 2021 on an earlier version of the Draft Amendment, concerns were raised regarding the overly broad and unchecked powers provided to the Government, including the National Communicable Diseases Committee's right to implement measures to "prohibit [the public] (...) from organizing any activity which may (...) give rise to the outbreak of a serious communicable disease or may prohibit any public gathering or the gathering of individuals exceeding a specified limit." We are thusly concerned that the Draft Amendment of the CDA may retain a number of the restrictive measures imposed by the Emergency Decree that seriously infringe on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and expression.

We recall that, while international human rights laws and standards recognize that in the context of serious public health threats and public emergencies such as the Covid-19 pandemic, an effective response may require temporary restrictions on some rights, including the rights to freedom of expression and assembly, nonetheless, it is necessary for such restrictions to have a legal basis, remain necessary and proportionate in order to achieve a legitimate aim specified by international human rights law, as well as be neither arbitrary nor discriminatory in application. These restrictions must further be of limited duration as well as be subject to review. As such, the restrictions on the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly as issued under the Emergency Decree Emergency provisions are vague and overly broad, and thusly are not in line with international human rights standards. In so much as the Draft Amendment to the CDA reflect the provisions of the Emergency Decree, the subsequent restrictions as issued under the CDA would likewise fail to respect international standards.

Furthermore, the 27 April 2020 guidance of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on Emergency Measures and Covid-19 provides that "sufficient information about emergency legislation and measures should be communicated swiftly and in all official languages of the State (...) and in an accessible manner so the public at large is aware of the new legal rules and can conduct themselves accordingly." Additionally, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association highlighted in his report that access to information is crucial, indeed "public authorities must provide accessible information for all regarding the legal framework governing the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association and ensure public awareness about the law and relevant regulations [...]. That information should include any

procedures to be followed by those wishing to exercise the right, who the responsible authorities are, the rules applicable to those officials and the remedies available for alleged violations of rights (CCPR/C/GC/37, para. 28)” (A/HRC/47/24, para. 35). We are therefore concerned by the lack of transparency and accessibility to the public of the Draft Amendment of the Communicable Diseases Act.

In light of the abovementioned concerns, and should they be corroborated, we are seriously concerned that the overall prospective impact of the Draft Amendment on the Anti-Money Laundering Act, as well as the Draft Amendment on the Communicable Diseases Act, would likely be detrimental to civic space in Thailand.

As it is our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned analysis;
2. Kindly provide information on the remaining stages of the legislative process with regard to the two Draft Amendments;
3. Please provide information on how the assessment of the threats and vulnerabilities of the NPO sector was carried out and address if such assessment was carried out in line with FATF guidance, including with the proper involvement of the NPO sector.
4. Please provide information on the steps that your Government intend to take to amend the Draft Amendment on the Anti-Money Laundering Act, in line with the above mentioned analysis and international human rights law and standards.
5. Please provide a timeline on when would your Excellency’s Government render the Draft Amendment of the Communicable Diseases Act publicly accessible.

In conclusion, we call on your Excellency’s Government to reconsider its approach to amend the Anti-Money Laundering Act and revise the Draft Amendment thoroughly with a view to addressing the aforementioned concerns. We would also urge that any revised drafts be made public well prior to the consultation period which would allow for more meaningful public inputs and discussion. We stand ready to provide support and advice to your Excellency’s Government on legislative reform in this field.

We further call on your Excellency’s Government to render the Draft Amendment of the Communicable Diseases Act accessible to the public in respect of the principle of transparency, and to uphold the international standards of access to information.

This communication, as a comment on pending or recently adopted legislation, regulations or policies, and any response received from your Excellency’s Government will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) after 48 hours. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

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

Clément Nyaletsossi Voule
Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

Irene Khan
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of
opinion and expression

Mary Lawlor
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Fionnuala Ní Aoláin
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental
freedoms while countering terrorism