



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-ninth session
1–12 November 2021

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Thailand*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 60 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations² and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies³

2. Amnesty International (AI) stated that there had been no significant progress on ratification of treaties, including the OP-CAT.⁴ JPF, JS1 and JS2 recommended that Thailand ratify the ICPPED.⁵ CGNK recommended the ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the crime of Genocide.⁶

3. AI noted that authorities had not followed through on standing invitations to Special Procedures.⁷ JPF, JS1 and JS2 recommended that Thailand invite the Working Group on Enforced Disappearances.⁸ JS2 recommended a country visit of the Special Rapporteurs on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders and on the Rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.⁹ SAR also recommended that Thailand extend an invitation to the SR on the protection and promotion of the rights to freedom of opinion and expression.¹⁰

B. National human rights framework¹¹

4. JS3 noted that the 2017 Constitution was drafted in a climate where the exercise of fundamental civil and political rights was severely curtailed.¹² JS2 added that it was drafted without meaningful consultation and participation, and inconsistent with articles 19 and 21 of the ICCPR.¹³ AI noted that it introduced an electoral system aimed at weakening political

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



opposition.¹⁴ JS3 also noted that it disproportionately limited the power of elected parliament members, institutionalising the military's unchecked power.¹⁵ JS4 further stated that Thailand's constitutional framework had not been brought into compliance with its international obligations.¹⁶ In addition, JS5 and JS6 noted the constitution did not explicitly recognise indigenous peoples.¹⁷

5. AI, JS1 and JS4 expressed concern that the 1914 Martial Law Act, the 2008 Internal Security Act and the 2005 Executive Decree for Public Administration in Emergency Situations granted security forces overbroad and unchecked power of arrest, detention without warrant, censorship, and surveillance without judicial oversight.¹⁸ The National Council for Peace and Order established in 2019 expanded the role of the military-led Internal Security Operations Command in the management of internal security, widening their responsibilities to include reconciliation and external security.¹⁹ JS4 highlighted the incompatibility of those laws with human rights law and standards and their rampant abuse in the context of COVID-19.²⁰

6. AI noted that revisions to the legislation on the National Human Rights Commission (NHRCT) and the National Broadcasting Telecommunications Commission had compromised their operations and independence.²¹ ORF and JS7 noted the NHRCT was downgraded by GANHRI in 2015 for its partial compliance with the Paris Principles.²² JS8 noted the lack of independence and transparency of the selection process for the commissioners and the NHRCT's inability to monitor and investigate human rights violations.²³ ORF and JS8 recommended that Thailand ensure the NHRCT fully complies with the Paris Principles.²⁴ AI and JS9 made similar recommendations.²⁵

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

*Equality and non-discrimination*²⁶

7. Despite some progress following the enactment of the Gender Equality Act in 2016, JS10 and JS11 expressed concern about employment discrimination, invisibility and silencing, unreported violence and abuse, family and societal pressure to conform to gender norms and roles of LGBTIQ+ people as they were insufficiently protected by Thailand's legal frameworks and the severe challenges in accessing their rights.²⁷

8. JS11, JS12 and JS13 noted same-sex marriage and transgender identity were not legally recognised. LGBTIQ+ women, lesbian and transgender women were particularly vulnerable and suffered discrimination to access health and social services, employment, harassment and bullying.²⁸ JS10, JS14 and JS26 also expressed concern about persistent discrimination of LGBTIQ+ youth in schools and the education and health systems, gender-based crimes, misrepresentation in media and degrading and humiliating treatment, due to lack of family acceptance, often resulting in mental health conditions.²⁹ JS15 indicated LGBTIQ+ youth from indigenous communities were affected by homophobia and the lack of acceptance by their families. It further mentioned the increased risks that LGBTIQ women had of being forcibly married and "corrective rape".³⁰

9. JS11 reported barriers in accessing health care and social services, including denials of medical services and treatments and incidents of LGBTIQ+ persons suffering stigmatisation, intimidation, transphobic attacks and judicial harassment for their human rights work and activism.³¹ Furthermore, JS11 and JS12 highlighted that COVID-19 exacerbated the challenges faced by the LGBTIQ+ community, leaving them more vulnerable regarding economic impact, violence and discrimination and access to health.³²

*Development, the environment, and business and human rights*³³

10. JS19 recommended that Thailand adopt a human rights-based approach to development projects and ensure participation of communities in decision-making that affects them, with a view to seeking their free, prior and informed consent.³⁴

11. JS17 noted Thailand had been largely unwilling and inactive in addressing climate change, pollution and environmental degradation.³⁵ JS19 mentioned air and water pollution and widespread impact of hazardous and industrial waste that had implications on the rights to life, health and adequate standard of living, and alerted about recent environmental legislation weakening the prevention of environmental degradation.³⁶ Furthermore, JS7 noted the COVID pandemic and government response had further exposed the systemic injustices impacting human rights and the environment.³⁷

12. AI and JS18 noted the Government adopted a national action plan on business and human rights.³⁸ ETOs Watch Coalition noted the lack of genuine public participation to develop the Action Plan, overly broad recommendations that hindered operationalisation, reliance of the regulatory mechanism on state and public authorities without an inclusive accountability mechanism, inconsistency of the implementation with the Guiding Principles as well as lack of information.³⁹ JS18 described the National Action Plan as weak voluntary measures unlikely to regulate businesses, and that resulted in marginalized communities' remaining vulnerable to corporate abuses without access to effective remedies.⁴⁰

13. JS16 and JS17 noted that Thailand largely focused on industrial expansion, large infrastructure projects and the establishment of special economic zones and economic corridors to achieve development, without proper environmental and health impact assessments, overlooking the rights of local communities and causing harm to their livelihoods and the environment.⁴¹ JS32 expressed concern about the disregard for the rights of local communities by Thai authorities under climate change mitigation grounds, resulting in misappropriation of land of small subsistence farmers and indigenous peoples and the criminalization of those who defied such actions.⁴²

14. ETOs Watch Coalition, JS8, Article19 and JS18 noted that businesses used the judicial system against those who criticized their activities and harassed human rights defenders, activists and journalist that exposed human rights abuses committed by business activities and development projects.⁴³ FLD and JS7 reported that human rights defenders working on land and environmental rights had been increasingly targeted by business interest and authorities in the form of judicial harassment, violent attacks and killings.⁴⁴

15. JS19 reported large-scale evictions without appropriate procedural protections as required by international law, including to implement the "Forest Reclamation Policy".⁴⁵

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*⁴⁶

16. AI and JS21 noted that courts continued to hand down death sentences for murder and drug-related crimes.⁴⁷ JS34 also noted the most recent execution by lethal injection in June 2018, which reversed a de facto moratorium in place since 2009.⁴⁸ JS21 recommended establishing a moratorium on executions, commuting all death sentences to prison terms and abolishing the death penalty for all crimes.⁴⁹ Similarly, UPR Project at BCU recommended that Thailand adopt an official moratorium on the death penalty and amend national legislation to abolish the punishment in all circumstances.⁵⁰

17. AI and JS4 stated that torture continued to be documented in military and police custody.⁵¹ Incommunicado detention and suspected enforced disappearances continued to be reported.⁵² The NHRCT reported receiving complaints on detainees' rights.⁵³ JPF and JS2 expressed concern at the lack of transparent and independent investigations of enforced disappearances, the denial of truth to the families and lack of reparations for the victims.⁵⁴

18. JS20 expressed concern about prison conditions, including severe overcrowding, access to healthcare, food and punishment and discipline in the context of limited use of non-custodial measures.⁵⁵

19. ORF and AI recommended enacting legislation criminalizing torture and ill-treatment.⁵⁶ AI and JS9 also recommended that Thailand enact legislation on enforced disappearances in accordance with Thailand's treaty obligations.⁵⁷ The ProjectX also recommended that Thailand immediately drop charges and end arbitrary arrest and

detention against political prisoners and effectively and adequately provide rehabilitation programmes and support to political prisoners.⁵⁸

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*⁵⁹

20. JS8 and JS9 noted the transfer of prosecutions of civilians from military to civilian courts. However, authorities continued to deny rights to fair trial, especially in cases on “national security”, with hearings and trial held privately, as well as excessive punishment and harsh sentencing.⁶⁰ ATD noted the frequent denial of bail to those investigated for *lèse majesté*, despite the non-violent nature of the offence.⁶¹ JS9 also expressed concern on the judiciary’s susceptibility to political influence.⁶²

21. AI noted that authorities routinely failed to initiate prompt, thorough, independent and effective investigations into torture, extrajudicial killings and cases of excessive and unnecessary lethal force and hold the suspects accountable.⁶³

22. L4L highlighted concerns related to shortcomings on the right to independent counsel and inconsistent upholding of guarantees for the proper functioning of the legal profession, including access to clients, lack of respect for lawyer-client confidentiality, as well as harassment and intimidation of lawyers.⁶⁴

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*⁶⁵

23. JPF stated that the measures contained in the Emergency Decree on Public Administration to combat COVID-19 might constitute a blanket restriction on fundamental freedoms, including free expression, opinion, information, privacy and freedom of assembly and association, without judicial review.⁶⁶ JS21 stated that the decree granted officials immunity from prosecution for any human rights violations committed during the emergency.⁶⁷ In this context, Article 19 and JS7 highlighted the Government’s enactment of repressive emergency measures used to stifle dissent, in particular a broad and vague ban on assemblies applied strictly and discriminatorily against pro-democracy protesters.⁶⁸ JS4 reported that authorities blocked the messaging application “Telegram”, commonly used for the organisation of protests.⁶⁹ FLD reported notable increases in widespread intimidation and reprisals against human right defenders and pro-democracy protesters.⁷⁰ HRF also stated that Thailand abused emergency powers during the pandemic to restrict freedom of speech and expression.⁷¹

24. JS8, JS9 and JS21 expressed concern about the severe restrictions to civic space in Thailand.⁷² JS21 stated that security forces conducted announced and unannounced visits to civil society groups.⁷³

25. Various stakeholders highlighted the undue restriction of the right to freedom of opinion and expression through vaguely worded legislation that was inconsistent with international human rights standards, including Articles 112 (*lèse majesté*), 116 (sedition), 326 (defamation) and 328 (libel) of the Criminal Code.⁷⁴ JS3 and JS21 described these provisions as tools to intimidate and suppress critical views against the authorities.⁷⁵ SAR referred to the use of arrests and prosecution to prevent or punish non-violent political and student expression.⁷⁶ Art. 112 was described as a legal weapon to disproportionately prosecute and to crack down on political opponents and limit freedom of expression with its severe punishments, ambiguous interpretation and unjust enforcement.⁷⁷ AI, JS2 and JS9 noted similar concerns.⁷⁸ ICJ recommended that Thailand repeal or substantially amend criminal law provisions that criminalize or unduly restrict the rights to freedom of expression, information, peaceful assembly and other related rights.⁷⁹

26. SAR, ATD and Article 19 reported a spike in *lèse majesté* prosecutions since November 2020, with at least 76 persons being investigated by the police since then up until March 2021, according to Article 19.⁸⁰ In the extreme, JS9 reported enforced disappearances of at least 9 Thai dissidents.⁸¹

27. JS2 also highlighted the use of the vague definitions of offences of Article 14 of the Computer Crimes Act to criminalize the peaceful and legitimate expression of opinions.⁸² NHRCT expressed concern about law enforcement against online media users.⁸³ Five contributions referred to these prosecutions as strategic lawsuits against public participation

(SLAPP suits) against human rights defenders.⁸⁴ Article19 noted that authorities had used lawsuits and other forms of pressure to try to secure the cooperation of social media platforms in censoring online content connected to the protest movement.⁸⁵ JS8 and JS23 reported state-sponsored disinformation, harassment and smear campaigns against activists.⁸⁶

28. JS21 stated that outspoken media outlets and reporters often faced intimidation and punishment for criticism of authorities.⁸⁷ JS8 reported censorship and monitoring of media content from all media sources under laws curtailing their independence, access restrictions and content take downs extensively practiced by authorities. It reported pressure exercised over online platforms such as Facebook and Google to comply with government demands and remove critical online content deemed as “fake news” or “illegal”.⁸⁸ JS4 reported that authorities sought judicial orders to block online content across various platforms deemed to violate existing laws, including YouTube, Change.org and Facebook.⁸⁹ JS9 reported online free speech being targeted for shutdowns and prosecutions for ostensible threats to national security and independent news increasingly threatened.⁹⁰ It further noted that the COVID-19 pandemic led to emergency decrees to limit access to independent information.⁹¹ JS4 highlighted the Emergency decree was used by authorities to restrict the ability of journalists and news platforms covering the pro-democracy protests.⁹² JS3 also noted that Announcement 41/2016 gave authority to the junta-appointed National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission to close down any media that failed to cooperate with the junta or presented information deemed as a threat to national security.⁹³

29. ORF, Article19 and JS2 noted the Public Assembly Act imposition of overly burdensome requirements for protest organisers and unnecessary restrictions incompatible with relevant standards and recommended its amendment.⁹⁴ AI also noted that police had prohibited and forcibly dispersed peaceful protests and used unnecessary or excessive force and less lethal weapons.⁹⁵ JS2 stated that authorities had subjected student leaders, including children, to grave pressures, frequent harassment, including judicial, intimidation and surveillance with recent growing detentions.⁹⁶ AI, HRF and JS3 recommended that any restriction on peaceful expression, assembly and privacy in law strictly meet requirements of legality, necessity and proportionality, and make domestic legislation compliant with its international human rights obligations by amending or repealing the Computer Crimes Act, Public Assembly Act and Cybersecurity Act, laws on contempt of court, and Articles 112, 116, 238 and 326 of the Criminal Code.⁹⁷

30. JS9 expressed concern about the Severe Emergency Decree invoked in October 2020, which appeared aimed at restricting the rights of peaceful assembly, to information, not to be arbitrarily arrested or detained, tortured or subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and to access lawyers and families.⁹⁸ A number of submissions noted the escalating police brutality and unlawful use of violence, the use of water cannon containing dye and chemical irritants, chemical irritant grenades and kinetic impact grenades and increasing use of rubber bullets against peaceful pro-democracy protestors, resulting in injuries to protesters and journalists, of particular concern during the COVID19.⁹⁹

31. Various stakeholders stated that human rights defenders, including land rights, indigenous and community defenders, as well as trade union, pro-democracy and student activists were subjected to violent attacks, abduction, arbitrary detention, harassment and intimidation by state officials, companies and unidentified perpetrators.¹⁰⁰ JPF highlighted the prevalence of cyber-bullying and sexual harassment against women human rights defenders in southern border provinces and recommended investigating, prosecuting and punishing the perpetrators.¹⁰¹ JS2 also noted gender-specific attacks against women human rights defenders in the form of verbal abuse and online attacks and harassment. It recommended that Thailand ensure a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders and protect women human rights defenders from gender-specific attacks.¹⁰² JS1 and FLD expressed concern about the targeting of youth and children activists through violent crackdown from armed forces, unlawful arrests and breaches to fair trials guarantees.¹⁰³

32. AI, HRF, JS2 and JS8 noted that authorities had deregistered political parties and disqualified individuals from running as candidates.¹⁰⁴ JS21 expressed concern about the

dissolution of the opposition Future Forward Part (FWP) in February 2020 by the Constitutional Court, and JS3 noted with concern the targeting and judicial harassment of its members noting the misogynistic attacks and intimidation to discredit female opposition MPs.¹⁰⁵ JS3 recommended that Thailand immediately end all forms of politically-motivated harassment of opposition lawmakers, human rights defenders, media and peaceful protesters, including the use of criminal charges, threats, surveillance, disinformation or other forms of harassment.¹⁰⁶

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*¹⁰⁷

33. ECLJ stated that whilst the majority of trafficking victims were Thai nationals, there were victims from neighbouring countries, who were forced, coerced or deceived into labour or sexual exploitation.¹⁰⁸ HKCIJ noted the impact on women victims, including starvation, unsanitary conditions and trauma from sexual exploitation.¹⁰⁹ ECLJ highlighted that children were also targeted for use in prostitution and online pornography.¹¹⁰ HKCIJ noted that girls from tribal groups and ethnic minorities, stateless and refugees were most likely to be trafficked.¹¹¹ Jubilee Campaign noted the likelihood of many Rohingya refugees being victims of human trafficking.¹¹²

34. JS18 highlighted that sex workers continued to be criminalized and subjected to stigma, violence, exploitation, discrimination and marginalisation, as well as were often forced to pay bribes to access basic rights and suffered unfair employment practices.¹¹³

*Right to privacy*¹¹⁴

35. JS23 noted a series of laws permitting surveillance and arbitrary data search and seizures based on national security and public order, notably the 2019 Cybersecurity Act and the National Intelligence Act, coupled with vast powers to the monitoring bodies to access data without court orders or independent oversight. It noted this created the basis for unlawful and excessive surveillance, as with the Malay Muslims that had been subjected to discriminatory and disproportionate biometric data collection and increased CCTV surveillance in the southernmost border provinces of Thailand.¹¹⁵

36. JS23 expressed concern about the government's pressure on technology companies to enforce censorship and surveillance measures on their platforms.¹¹⁶ Article19 further noted that activists and protesters reported being under surveillance and that police had visited and searched their schools and residences.¹¹⁷ JS21 reported surveillance of critical local and international civil society organizations.¹¹⁸

37. JS3 highlighted the use of surveillance against political opponents either by authorities or unknown individuals, including after they left office.¹¹⁹

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*¹²⁰

38. WWUAWT and JS24 noted that Thailand's labour laws severely restricted freedom of association and collective bargaining and the lack of enforcement of existing weak protections, as well as retaliation by employers against workers attempting to exercise their rights and longstanding egregious abuse of workers. They also noted widespread labour trafficking and forced labour, and structural discrimination and vulnerability of migrant workers.¹²¹ JS25 highlighted that common challenges encountered by women workers, including migrant women, included discrimination on wages, occupational safety and health hazards, precarious work and gender-based harassment and violence.¹²²

39. JPF stated that low income workers had faced a higher risk of income loss during the COVID-19 lockdown despite the governmental stimulus package.¹²³

*Right to an adequate standard of living*¹²⁴

40. JS22 stated that since COVID-19, the Government's measures to support the poor and vulnerable had proven insufficient, heightening the already existing inequalities.¹²⁵

41. JS15 noted the severe food crisis from shortage of income and unemployment on the indigenous community (*Maesamlaep*) resulting from COVID19.¹²⁶

42. JS17 highlighted the vulnerable situation of elderly people, who were affected by insufficient allowances and weak pension schemes, underdeveloped public senior care system that lacked skilled personnel, including health care in a context of related legislative gaps. Similarly, it noted that elderly people faced physical and mental abuse.¹²⁷

*Right to health*¹²⁸

43. JS22 noted the failure of the Government to provide universal healthcare.¹²⁹

44. JS29 noted that Thailand's policies regulating safe abortion were not aligned with international human rights standards.¹³⁰ JS22 highlighted obstacles to access safe abortion in a context of inadequate legislation and a patriarchal culture.¹³¹

45. JS27 stated that people living with HIV and persons who injected drugs (PWID) continued to face severe human rights violations, including limited access to healthcare and social welfare, continued stigmatisation and discrimination socially and in employment, and barriers to accessing education. Due to disproportionate penalties under the 1979 Narcotics Act, PWID were prone to punishment and over-incarceration.¹³²

46. JS28 expressed concern about the lack of healthcare for Malayu women and girls and the continued practice of genital circumcision.¹³³

*Right to education*¹³⁴

47. JS33 noted barriers faced by refugee, migrant and stateless children to enjoy education, including socioeconomic reasons and hardship, lack of information and low quality education within camps. School closures and socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 on communities and society had disrupted children's and young people's normal support systems and exacerbated vulnerabilities.¹³⁵ RRN stated that parallel education systems that refugees and migrants had to manage had hindered their access to quality education.¹³⁶

48. JPF highlighted the impact of COVID-19 on access to education and food for marginalized children living in remote areas and of poor families without access to the Internet.¹³⁷ JS15 noted the negative effects of COVID-19 on education of *Maesamlaep* children and youth.¹³⁸

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*¹³⁹

49. JS13 expressed concern by discrimination against women in employment and workplace, as well as rampant violence and abuse. It also noted that the 2015 Gender Equality Act was ineffective in protecting and ensuring gender equality and the persistence of stereotypes as a contributor to discrimination.¹⁴⁰

50. JS13 highlighted that gender-based violence was widespread, supported by stereotypical gender roles which remained strong and led to increasing violence.¹⁴¹ JS13 and SHero also described domestic violence as deep-rooted that was considered a private matter in Thai culture. Abuse and psychological, physical and/or sexual violence against women were reportedly rampant. Women faced stigmatization and victim-blaming, dismissal by authorities that promoted settlements between victims and perpetrators, an ineffective justice system and inadequate protection.¹⁴² JS13 reported a 34 per cent increase in domestic violence cases during the COVID19 lockdown.¹⁴³ JS5 also noted the special vulnerability of indigenous women to violence, including sexual and domestic.¹⁴⁴ SHero recommended that Thailand ensure the safety and protection of women subjected to all forms of male-violence and women's access to justice and legal remedies.¹⁴⁵

51. JS33 expressed concern about the prevalence of early and forced child marriage and unions.¹⁴⁶ PPAT indicated that the higher risk of poverty of migrant girls, particularly irregular migrant girls, was a key driver to child marriage.¹⁴⁷ COLCGS highlighted conflicting normative frameworks and practices regarding the legal age of marriage,

particularly in Southern Thailand where decisions were made on Islamic law.¹⁴⁸ It recommended that Thailand revise, reform and effectively enforce statutory legislation accompanied by community-based awareness raising.¹⁴⁹

*Children*¹⁵⁰

52. GIEACPC and JS33 expressed concern about the continued legality of corporal punishment of children at home, alternative care settings and day care, despite the constitutional duty to protect children from violence and unfair treatment.¹⁵¹ GIEACPC recommended that Thailand enact legislation to prohibit all corporal punishment of children.¹⁵²

53. HKCIJ and JS33 highlighted the vulnerability of children to online sexual abuse and violence such as cyberbullying, online grooming, theft of information, and trafficking mostly for sexual exploitation.¹⁵³ HKCIJ also noted that children were used for agricultural forced labour and recruited by armed groups as child soldiers, specifically in Thailand's southernmost provinces.¹⁵⁴ CLCGS also noted that controversial conflict of law cases appeared in matters of child early marriage in regions where the law of traditions or religious rules were taken to be considered being primary over the statutory legislation.¹⁵⁵

54. JS33 noted with concern the growing number of mental health issues, including the heightened risks of violence and discrimination confronted by LGBTIQ+ children. It also raised concern about the heavy reliance on private institutional care for children and the risk of harm to children as many facilities were unregistered, unmonitored and the quality of care was very low.¹⁵⁶

*Persons with disabilities*¹⁵⁷

55. JS16 expressed concern about the severe discrimination that persons with disabilities faced in employment, lack of opportunities and under-representation in politics, public administration and government entities.¹⁵⁸ JS13 noted challenges experienced by persons with disabilities to access education, healthcare and decision-making processes, with women with disabilities facing a double burden.¹⁵⁹

Minorities and indigenous peoples

56. JS28 expressed concern about the treatment of Malayu Muslims, due to the severe challenges in accessing human rights. It also stated that torture of Malayu Muslims to extract confessions had been documented. Additionally, employers were reluctant to hire Malayu Muslims.¹⁶⁰ Malayu women and children faced additional barriers in advancing their rights due to their intersectional identities.¹⁶¹

57. JS6 expressed concern about Isaan people's longstanding discrimination stemming from negative stereotyping, which resulted in severe challenges to access health, education, social welfare and justice, and continued threats to their right to land, persistent poverty and negative impact of infrastructural development projects.¹⁶²

58. JS15 highlighted that discriminatory law and policies undermining land, community and environmental rights of indigenous peoples in Thailand had a significant negative impact on women's lives, including poverty, food insecurity, loss gender inequality of livelihoods and traditional ways of life, and resulted in powerlessness with the landless, stateless indigenous women and young LGBTIQ+ being extremely vulnerable. It further highlighted that more than 50 per cent of *Maesamlaep* indigenous peoples were unable to acquire Thai citizenship.¹⁶³ JS19 also stated that the Government's denial of the traditional rights of indigenous peoples to their ancestral lands and natural resources remained a persistent problem.¹⁶⁴ JS5 had similar concerns.¹⁶⁵

59. JS7 and JS22 stated that ethnic Karen indigenous people living in Bang Kloi were forcibly evicted from their homes in Chai Paen Din, following authorities burning down homes and crops, forcing 140 villagers from their land. Harassment and forced evictions against Karen people were reported to continue.¹⁶⁶

60. JS13 and JS5 noted the severe challenges that indigenous women had in accessing their rights, as well as the multiple forms of discrimination on the grounds of indigeneity

and gender within their communities and mainstream Thai society. It highlighted that they faced racial discrimination, exclusion from participation in public life, lack of access to healthcare and education and were vulnerable to human trafficking and domestic violence.¹⁶⁷

*Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers*¹⁶⁸

61. JS25 noted that migrant workers were excluded and discriminated from a number of social protection benefits, since most social protection schemes introduced during the pandemic were not designed to include them and were subjected to arrests, prosecutions and hefty fines for violating the Emergency decree.¹⁶⁹ JS26 noted unregistered migrant workers detention, deportation and lack of social services, legal protection, aid and support. It stated that they faced exploitation at the workplace, were overworked and dismissed without notice or compensation. Migrants in the sex industry also faced even more challenges. During the COVID-19 pandemic, migrant workers had been severely affected.¹⁷⁰

62. JS16 also noted insufficient protection of migrant workers' rights, discrimination, exploitation, lack of information and of access to healthcare, more acutely during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁷¹ JS25 also noted migrant workers' inability to access social welfare and protection during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁷² PPAT noted that many migrants and their families, especially those who migrated irregularly, were particularly vulnerable to abuse and exploitation, leaving their spouses and children without access to sexual and reproductive healthcare and more vulnerable to unplanned pregnancy, sexually transmitted illnesses (STIs), limited antenatal care, and maternal mortality.¹⁷³ JS13 noted that women migrant workers faced more discriminatory work environment and worsened working conditions.¹⁷⁴

63. AI noted that Thai authorities had adopted measures to grant protected status to persons in need of international protection, however, they did not define "refugees" in accordance with international human rights, did not provide sufficient guarantees against *refoulement* and did not allow for a right of internal or legal appeal to the determination of protected status.¹⁷⁵ RRN stressed that asylum seekers and refugees were still subject to *refoulement*.¹⁷⁶ ADF International, JS16 and JPF noted detention for extended periods of time without opportunity to apply for refugee status or deportation, despite imminent threats to their lives, in particular asylum seekers fleeing from religious persecution.¹⁷⁷ RRN noted limited access to interpreters or legal counsel during criminal proceedings.¹⁷⁸ It recommended that Thailand cease human rights abuses of asylum seekers and take steps to protect the right to asylum in accordance with international norms.¹⁷⁹

64. RRN further noted that refugees' lack of legal status impacted on the right to work and exposed them to exploitation and dependency on humanitarian assistance, and that COVID-19 had further aggravated their exclusion from the labour market.¹⁸⁰

65. JS30 expressed concern about the specially vulnerable and dire situation of Ahmadi refugees and asylum seekers regarding poor living conditions, lack of access to legal protection and exposure to arrest, detention and exploitation.¹⁸¹

66. Jubilee Campaign expressed concern about the situation of Pakistani Christian asylum seekers and the deplorable living conditions in Internal Displacement Centres (IDC) facilities. Similarly, it expressed concern about the situation of Rohingya refugees detained in cramped and unhygienic centres susceptible to COVID-19 outbreak.¹⁸² JS31 also indicated Thailand had historically failed to protect Rohingya as refugees, victims of trafficking or stateless refugees.¹⁸³

Stateless persons

67. JS31 noted that statelessness was predominant in various ethnic communities who lived in the highlands and descendants of migrants fleeing from conflict and persecution and stressed that it was attributed to systemic discrimination and exclusion of ethnic minorities, changes and gaps in nationality framework and lack of safeguards for otherwise stateless children, bureaucratic failures, erratic and incomplete civil registration and complications due to language barriers, illiteracy and remote living and displacement and

migration. It stated that denial of fundamental rights of stateless people increased their vulnerability to socio-economic exploitation, particularly labour and human trafficking.¹⁸⁴ It recommended that Thailand ensure the right to nationality by facilitating access to citizenship including equal access for women belonging to ethnic minorities and indigenous groups.¹⁸⁵

5. Specific regions or territories

68. JS28 stated that the prevalence of violence and fatalities in the ongoing ethnic conflict and separatist movement in the Southern Border Provinces since 2004 had claimed over 7,000 lives. The response of the Thai Government had been increased counterinsurgency and special security laws and curfews, which had resulted in increased state surveillance, arbitrary arrests, detention, torture and extrajudicial killings of insurgency suspects and human rights defenders.¹⁸⁶ Violence had disproportionately affected the Muslim community. Children were caught in the conflict and were stigmatized at school. Malayu women were subjected to rape and sexual harassment by soldiers.¹⁸⁷ JS28 also expressed concern that in the Southern Border Provinces, Malayu Muslims were stereotyped as “suspected insurgents”, put under governmental surveillance, racially profiled and subjected to movement control. Random profiling through forced DNA collection was routinely conducted and the information added to a security database.¹⁸⁸ JS9 stated the military reportedly continued to use torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment against the Muslim population.¹⁸⁹

69. JPF also expressed concern about informal justice systems “*hukum pakat*” based on religious and cultural principles in three Southern Border Provinces, which discriminated against women and girls. Malayu Muslim women’s political participation and decision-making were restricted by religion, culture and tradition and local values. It recommended that Thailand increase women’s representation in decision-making structures.¹⁹⁰

70. According to JS22 and JS28, the dialogue between the Thai government, the BRN (a militant non-state group) and other actors in the conflict was put on hold indefinitely, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Local communities and civil society actors were not effectively engaged in peace dialogues as their views were disregarded. The participation of women was limited even though they were significantly affected by the conflict. The prevailing impunity about torture, arbitrary detention and violent attacks constituted an obstacle for reconciliation between Buddhist and Malayu Muslims.¹⁹¹

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with “A” status).

Civil society

ADF International	ADF International, Geneva (Switzerland);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
Article 19	Article 19 (United Kingdom);
ATD	Association for Thai Democracy (United States of America);
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling (Switzerland);
CLCGS	Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Geneva (Switzerland);
ECLJ	European Center for Law and Justice (France)
ETOs Watch Coalition	ETOs Watch Coalition (Thailand)
FIDH	International Federation for Human Rights (France);
FLD	Front Line Defenders (Ireland);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom);
HKCIJ	Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom);
HRF	Human Rights Foundation, New York (United States of America);

ICJ	International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), Geneva (Switzerland);
JC	Jubilee Campaign (United States of America);
JPF	Justice for Peace Foundation (Thailand);
L4L	Lawyers for Layers (Netherlands);
ORF	Omega Research Foundation (United Kingdom);
PPAT	Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand (Thailand);
RRN	Refugee Rights Network
SAR	Scholars at Risk (United States of America);
SHERO	SHERO (Thailand);
The ProjectX	The ProjectX, Bangkok (Thailand);
UPR BCU	Birmingham City University Centre for Human Rights, Birmingham (United Kingdom);
WWUAWT	Wingspan Workers' Union and Airport Workers of Thailand (Thailand).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: SHero Youth Network, United Front of Thammasat and Demonstration (UFTD), Student Union of Thailand (SUT), Bad Students, The Ratsadon, UNME of Anarchy, Nisit Chula Party, ROOT;
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: FIDH-International Federation for Human Rights, Paris (France), Internet Law Reform Dialogue (iLaw) (Thailand), Thai Lawyers for Human Rights (Thailand);
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: ANFREL, Asian Network for Free Elections (Thailand), ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights (APHR); (NOT SURE if Indonesia?);
JS4	Joint submission 4 submitted by: ICJ International Commission of Jurists (Switzerland), Thai Lawyers for Human Rights (Thailand);
JS5	Joint submission 5 submitted by: Indigenous Women Network of Thailand and Manushya Foundation (Thailand);
JS6	Joint submission 6 submitted by: The Human Rights Violations in Isaan Monitoring Group, The Sai Thong Rak Pah Network, Amnat Charoen Friend of Women Center, Isaan Gender Diversity Network (IGDN), Manushya Foundation, The Thai CSO coalition for the UPR (Thailand);
JS7	Joint submission 7 submitted by: EnLawThai Foundation (Thailand), Community Resource Centre Foundation (United States), Campaign for Public Policy on Mineral Resources (PPM) (Thailand), Protection International (Thailand);
JS8	Joint submission 8 submitted by: Manushya Foundation (Thailand), Access Now (United States), The Thai CSOs coalition for the UPR (Thailand), The Coalition of Innovation for Thai Youth (CITY)(Thailand);
JS9	Joint submission 9 submitted by: Destination Justice (France), Cross Cultural Foundation (Thailand), Human Rights Lawyers Association (HRLA) (Thailand), Duayjai Group (DJG) (Thailand), Justice for Peace Foundation (JPF) (Thailand), Asia Centre (AC) (Thailand);
JS10	Joint submission 10 submitted by: Togetherness for Equality (TEA) (Thailand), Feminist's Liberation Front (FLF) (Thailand); NOT SURE about it;
JS11	Joint submission 11 submitted by: Manushya Foundation (Thailand), Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT), Health and Opportunity Network (HON), Sirisak Chaited, MPlus Foundation, CAREMAT, Andaman Power, Rainbow Dream Group Thailand, Ruangaroon Lampang Group, Tamtang (Thailand);
JS12	Joint submission 12 submitted by: Kaleidoscope (Australia), Sexual Rights Initiative (SRI) (Switzerland);
JS13	Joint submission 13 submitted by: Manushya Foundation

- (Thailand), Health and Opportunity Network, Empower, Thai Positive Women Network (2 more that are UNCLEAR);
- JS14 **Joint submission 14 submitted by:** Manushay Foundation, Young Pride Club, BUKU Classroom, Isaan Gender Diversity Network, Deaf Thai Rainbow Club, The Volunteer House for Children and Youth, The Coalition of Innovation for Thai Youth (Thailand);
- JS15 **Joint submission 15 submitted by:** Sangsan Ankot Yawachon Development Project (Sangsan), V-Day Thailand, (LBTQ) Indigenous Youth For Sustainable Development (IY4SD) from MaeSamLaep Community (Thailand);
- JS16 **Joint submission 16 submitted by:** Manushya Foundation (Thailand), Thai BHR Network (Thailand), Thai CSOs Coalition for the UPR(Thailand);
- JS17 **Joint submission 17 submitted by:** Foundation for Older Persons' Development (FOPDEV) (Thailand), Manushya Foundation (Thailand);
- JS18 **Joint submission 18 submitted by:** The Thai BHR Network (Thailand), Women Workers for Justice Group (WJG), Manushya Foundation (Thailand), EMPOWER Foundation (Thailand), The Thai CSOs Coalition for the UPR (Thailand);
- JS19 **Joint submission 19 submitted by:** International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) (Switzerland), Land Watch Thai (Thailand), ENLAWTHAI Foundation (En LAW) (Thailand);
- JS20 **Joint submission 20 submitted by:** FIDH-International Federation for Human Rights (France), Union for Civil Liberty (UCL) (Thailand);
- JS21 **Joint submission 21 submitted by:** CIVICUS (Switzerland), Asia Democracy Network, Seoul (Republic of Korea);
- JS22 **Joint submission 22 submitted by:** Thailand UPR Network 2021 Submission (Thailand);
- JS23 **Joint submission 23 submitted by:** Access Now (United Kingdom), Manushya Foundation (Thailand), Article 19 (United Kingdom), ASEAN Regional Coalition to #StopDigitalDictatorship (Thailand);
- JS24 **Joint submission 24 submitted by:** International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) (Belgium), International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) (United Kingdom), State Enterprises Workers Relations Confederation (SERC), (Thailand);
- JS25 **Joint submission 25 submitted by:** Migrant Working Group (MWG) endorsed by Environmental Justice Foundation, Proud Association, Foundation for AIDs Rights, Human Rights for Development Foundation, Migrant Workers Rights Network, Raks Thai Foundation;
- JS26 **Joint submission 26 submitted by:** Save the children, Plan International, ECPAT Foundation, World Vision Foundation Thailand, The Life Skills Development Foundation, PYNA Organisation, Association of Children and Youth for the Peace in the Southernmost Provinces of Thailand, The Foundation of Transgender Alliance for Human Rights;
- JS27 **Joint submission 27 submitted by:** Health And Opportunity Network (HON) (Thailand), Manushya Foundation (Thailand), The International Drug Policy Consortium (IDPC), Thai Positive Women Foundation (Thailand), Tamtang (Thailand);
- JS28 **Joint submission 28 submitted by:** The Patani Working Group for Monitoring on International Mechanisms (Thailand), Civil Society Assembly for Peace (CAP), The Federation of Patani Students and Youth (PerMAS), Manushya Foundation (Thailand);
- JS29 **Joint submission 29 submitted by:** Tamtang (Thailand).

JS30	Manushya Foundation (Thailand); Joint submission 30 submitted by: International human Rights Committee (United Kingdom), Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience (CAP) (France);
JS31	Joint submission 31 submitted by: Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) (Thailand), the Global Campaign for Equal Nationality Rights (GCENR);
JS32	Joint submission 32 submitted by: Manushya Foundation, Sai Thong Rak Pah Network, the Indigenous Women's Network of Thailand, the Thai BHR Network, The Thai CSOs Coalition for the UPR;
JS33	Joint submission 33 submitted by: CRC Coalition Thailand (Thailand);
JS34	Joint submission 34 by: Eleos Justice; International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH); World Coalition against the Death Penalty.

National human rights institution:

NHRCT National Human Rights Commission of Thailand, Bangkok, Thailand*.

² The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

³ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.1–10, 158.13–19, 158.21, 158.24–25, 158.59–61, 159.1–8, 159.10–11, 159.16, 159.19–20, 159.22, 159.28, 159.51, and 159.65.

⁴ AI, para. 4

⁵ JPF, p. 3; JS1, p. 5; and JS2, p. 12.

⁶ CGNK, p. 6.

⁷ AI, para. 4.

⁸ JPF, p. 3; JS1, p.5; and JS2, p. 12.

⁹ JS2, pp. 5 and 9. See also SAR, p. 6.

¹⁰ SAR, p. 6.

¹¹ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.26–31, 158.38–48, 158.50–54, 158.63, 158.107, 158.113, 158.117, 159.12–15, 159.20, 159.31, 159.35–36, and 159.57.

¹² JS3, part I, para 1.

¹³ JS2, paras. 2–5.

¹⁴ AI, para. 6.

¹⁵ JS3, part I, para 3.

¹⁶ JS4, para. 4.

¹⁷ JS5, para. 2.–3; JS6, para 2.4.

¹⁸ AI, para 7; JS1, p. 5 (II); and JS, paras 26–27.

¹⁹ AI, para. 8.

²⁰ JS4, para. 5.

²¹ AI, para. 10.

²² ORF, paras. 11–12 and JS 7, para. 7.

²³ JS8, paras. 6.2 to 6.5.

²⁴ ORF, section IV, paras. 11–12 and JS8, para. 7.5.

²⁵ AI, p. 5 and JS9 para. 70.

²⁶ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, para. 158.66.

²⁷ JS10, para. A.2 and E; and JS11, para. 1.3.

²⁸ JS11, paras. 2.4 and 4.3; JS2 paras. 4.1–4.2; and JS13 paras. 4.1–4.6

²⁹ JS10 F, 32 to 38; JS14, paras. 3.2–3.3 and 4-6; and JS26, paras. 15–19.

³⁰ JS15, para. 4.7.

³¹ JS11, para. 10.6.

³² JS11, paras. 5.2, 6.1–6.4, 7.2, 8.1, 8.3, 10.3 and 10.5; and JS12, section 3

³³ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.36–37, 158.49, and 158.181.

³⁴ JS19, p. 10.

³⁵ JS17, para. 10.1.

³⁶ JS19, paras. 35–37.

- 37 JS7, p. 1.
- 38 AI, para. 3 and JS18, para. 2.2.
- 39 ETOs Watch Coalition, para. 7.d.
- 40 JS18, p. 2.2.
- 41 JS16, paras. 1.3, 5.1–5.4 and JS17, para. 10.3.
- 42 JS32, para. 1.3.
- 43 ETOs Watch Coalition, p. 4; JS 8, para. 4.4; Article 19, para. 30; and JS18, para 5.6.
- 44 FLD, paras. 13–14 and JS7, parts 2, 3 and 4.
- 45 JS19, paras. 17–23.
- 46 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.11–12, 158.22, 158.32–35, 158.72–80, 158.119–123, 159.9, 159.17, 159.21, 159.23–27, 159.29–30, 159.32–33, 159.37, 159.58, and 159.66.
- 47 AI, para. 22 and JS21, paras. 7–9.
- 48 JS34, para. 6.1.
- 49 JS21, para 15. See also FIDH, p. 4.
- 50 UPR Project at BCU, p. 8.
- 51 AI, para. 23 and JS4, para. 45.
- 52 AI, para. 24.
- 53 NHRCT, para. 4.
- 54 JPF, pp. 1–2 and JS2, paras. 52–59.
- 55 JS20, paras. 16–27.
- 56 ORF, section II, para. 6, and AI, p. 6.
- 57 AI, p. 6 and JS9, part 5.
- 58 The ProjectX, p. 1.
- 59 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.124, 159.14, 159.34, and 159.38–47.
- 60 JS8, paras. 5.2–5.4 and JS9, para. 32.
- 61 ATD, para. 12.
- 62 JS9, para. 32.
- 63 AI, para. 25.
- 64 L4L, sections B, D and E.
- 65 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.130–137, 158.139–142, 159.50, 159.52–56, and 159.59–63.
- 66 JPF, para 21.
- 67 JS21, para 4.8.
- 68 Article 19, paras 5 and 7; JS 7, p.1.
- 69 JS4, para 36.
- 70 FLD, para 3 and 4.
- 71 HRF, para 12 and 13.
- 72 JS8, para. 1.4; JS9, para. 5; and JS21, para. 1.9.
- 73 JS21, para 2.8.
- 74 JS2, para 21, 22 and 23; JS 8, para 3.3; Article 19, para 12; HRF, paras 13 and 14; JS 1, parts 6, 7; SAR paras 17–21; FLD, para 9 and 10; JS 22, para 8; JS 4, paras 30 to 32.
- 75 JS3, part I and JS21, para. 3.3.
- 76 SAR, para. 17.
- 77 JS1, paras. 8–10.
- 78 AI, paras. 28–32; JS2, para. 17; JS9, para. 5.
- 79 ICJ, p. 9.
- 80 SAR, para. 18; ATD, paras. 88–11; and Article 19, para. 19.
- 81 JS9, para. 5.
- 82 JS2, para. 26.
- 83 NHRCT, para. 13 (2).
- 84 JS9, para. 7; FLD paras. 11–12; JS23, section 6; JS22, para. 6; and JS19, para. 5.
- 85 Article 19, para. 13.
- 86 JS8, para. 4.6 and JS23, section 6.
- 87 JS21, para. 4.4.
- 88 JS8, paras. 3.4–3.9.
- 89 JS4, para. 37.
- 90 JS9, para. 5.
- 91 JS9, para. 23.
- 92 JS4, para. 39.
- 93 JS3, part I, para. 8.
- 94 ORF, section II, para. 8; Article 19, para. 6; and JS2, paras. 39–45.
- 95 AI, para. 30.

- ⁹⁶ JS2, paras. 46–51.
- ⁹⁷ AI, p. ; HRF, para. 24; and JS3, p. 11.
- ⁹⁸ JS9, paras. 40–44.
- ⁹⁹ ORF, para. 10; Article 19, paras. 10–11; JS8, para. 2.6; HRF, paras. 15–16; JS1, paras. 4 and 6; ATD, para. 3.2.
- ¹⁰⁰ AI, para. 32; JS8, paras. 2.7; 4.24.3; Article 19, paras. 12–14; JPF, p. 3; JS9, part I; and FLD, paras. 2–3.
- ¹⁰¹ JPF, pp. 3–4.
- ¹⁰² JS2, paras. 15–20.
- ¹⁰³ JS1, paras. 11–12 and FLD, para. 16.
- ¹⁰⁴ AI, para. 29; HRF, paras. 20–22; JS2, paras. 27–37; and JS8, para. 1.3.
- ¹⁰⁵ JS21, para. 2.–10; JS3, part II, paras. 32 and 42.
- ¹⁰⁶ JS3, p. 12.
- ¹⁰⁷ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.23, 158.100–101, 158.108–109, 158.111–112, 158.114–116, and 158.118.
- ¹⁰⁸ ECLJ, paras. 10–12.
- ¹⁰⁹ HKCIJ, paras. 5–7
- ¹¹⁰ ECLK, paras. 10–12.
- ¹¹¹ HKCIJ, paras. 10–11.
- ¹¹² Jubilee Campaign, para. 31.
- ¹¹³ JS18, paras. 3.1–3.7.
- ¹¹⁴ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, para. 159.48.
- ¹¹⁵ JS23, Section 4.
- ¹¹⁶ JS23, para. 1.4.
- ¹¹⁷ Article 19, para. 14.
- ¹¹⁸ JS21, para. 2.8.
- ¹¹⁹ JS3, part II, paras. 33–34.
- ¹²⁰ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, para. 158.110.
- ¹²¹ JS24, sections II, V, VI, and WWUAWT, pp. 1–5.
- ¹²² JS25, p. 9.
- ¹²³ JPF, para. 24 and p. 8.
- ¹²⁴ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.55, 158.67, 158.144, 158.147–149, and 158.180.
- ¹²⁵ JS22, para. 14.
- ¹²⁶ JS15, para. 4.
- ¹²⁷ JS17, sections 3, 4, 5 and 6.
- ¹²⁸ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.146, 158.150–152, and 158.153–157.
- ¹²⁹ JS22, para. 19.
- ¹³⁰ JS29, para. 1.3, sections 2–3.
- ¹³¹ JS22, para. 31.
- ¹³² JS27, sections 1, 2, 3 and 6.
- ¹³³ JS28, para. 4.4.
- ¹³⁴ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.89, 158.102, 158.158–162, and 158.164–167.
- ¹³⁵ JS33, paras. 8–14.
- ¹³⁶ RRN, paras. 30–35.
- ¹³⁷ JPF, para. 23.
- ¹³⁸ JS15, para. 4.7.
- ¹³⁹ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.62, 158.64–65, 158.68–69, 158.71, 158.81–82, 158.83–84, and 158.143.
- ¹⁴⁰ JS13, paras. 1.3 and 2.2–2.3.
- ¹⁴¹ JS13, paras. 3.3–3.4.
- ¹⁴² JS13, paras. 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6, and SHero, paras. 11–14.
- ¹⁴³ JS13, para. 3.7.
- ¹⁴⁴ JS5, paras. 6.3–6.7.
- ¹⁴⁵ SHero, p. 5.
- ¹⁴⁶ JS33, para. 21.
- ¹⁴⁷ PPAT, para. 17.
- ¹⁴⁸ COLCGS, p. 5.
- ¹⁴⁹ COLCGS, p. 6.
- ¹⁵⁰ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.57–58, 158.85–92, 158.93–99, 158.103–106, 158.125–129, 158.163 and 159.49.

- ¹⁵¹ GIEACPC, pp.1–3 and JS33, paras. 15–16.
¹⁵² GIEACPC, p.2.
¹⁵³ HKCIJ, paras. 12–15 and JS33 paras. 3–6.
¹⁵⁴ HKCIJ, paras. 12–15.
¹⁵⁵ CLCGS, p. 6.
¹⁵⁶ JS33, paras. 22–31.
¹⁵⁷ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.168–174.
¹⁵⁸ JS16, paras. 4.2–4.4.
¹⁵⁹ JS13, para. 7.4.
¹⁶⁰ JS28, sections 2 and 3.
¹⁶¹ JS28, section 4.
¹⁶² JS6, sections 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.
¹⁶³ JS15, pp. 3–4.
¹⁶⁴ JS19, paras. 24–26.
¹⁶⁵ JS5, para. 7.2.
¹⁶⁶ JS7, para. 3.a, and JS22, para. 38.
¹⁶⁷ JS13, section 5 and JS5, paras 1.4, 4.7, and 5–8.
¹⁶⁸ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/16, paras. 158.175–179, 159.64, and 159.67–68.
¹⁶⁹ JS25, p. 4.
¹⁷⁰ JS26, paras. 4.3–4.10.
¹⁷¹ JS16, paras. 2.2–2.12.
¹⁷² JS25, p. 3.
¹⁷³ PPAT, paras. 8–9 and 19–21.
¹⁷⁴ JS13, para. 6.2.
¹⁷⁵ AI, para. 18.
¹⁷⁶ RRN, para. 16.
¹⁷⁷ ADF International, para. 10; JS16, para. 2.8; and JPF, para. 25.
¹⁷⁸ RRN, paras. 19–24.
¹⁷⁹ RRN, paras. 36–41.
¹⁸⁰ RRN, paras. 36–41.
¹⁸¹ JS30, paras. 19–23.
¹⁸² Jubilee Campaign, sections A and B.
¹⁸³ JS31, Issue 4.
¹⁸⁴ JS31, pp. 4–5.
¹⁸⁵ JS31, para. 66.
¹⁸⁶ JS28, paras. 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6.
¹⁸⁷ JS28, paras 4.2 and 4.5.
¹⁸⁸ JS28, sections 2 and 3.
¹⁸⁹ JS9, para. 5.7.
¹⁹⁰ JPF, paras. 17–20.
¹⁹¹ JS22, paras. 26–27 and JS28, section 6.
-