

# MYANMAR FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION SCORECARD

2 MAY 2019





# MYANMAR FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION SCORECARD

ASSESSING THE PROGRESS OF THE STATE  
IN THE KEY AREAS NEEDED TO STRENGTHEN FREE EXPRESSION

---

2 MAY 2019

To commemorate World Press Freedom Day 2019, PEN Myanmar, based on consultation with 17 expert partners, finds there is a continued lack of progress to respect, protect, and fulfil the right to freedom of expression. In some cases, there has been alarming regression. In only a small number of areas limited progress has been observed. PEN Myanmar and its partners thus award a score of 6 out of a possible 60 points for the 2019 freedom of expression scorecard. The annual scorecard assesses the progress of the state in the key areas needed to respect, protect, and fulfil free expression. The 2019 findings are similar to 2018; the methodology, however, has been reviewed and strengthened over the past year. Therefore, to understand the 2019 score (4 points higher than 2018), it must be considered within the context of the revised methodology.

## KEY FINDINGS AND METHODOLOGY:

**“The government doesn’t care about media freedom and free expression. It isn’t a priority.”**  
*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

A free expression environment that fosters informed dialogue, protects open debate, and promotes government transparency and accountability is a crucial foundation for democratic reform. On April 21, 2019, PEN Myanmar gathered expert partners to reflect on free expression in Myanmar and in particular on the performance of the state.

The expert partners assessed the progress—or lack thereof—of the state in six key areas needed to strengthen free expression: legal protections; media independence and freedom; digital freedom; information access; freedom of assembly, speech and opinion; and safety and security, and proposed priority recommen-

dations for each area.

The 2019 score—6.0 out of 60— indicates a significant lack of progress in instituting key reforms to secure free expression in Myanmar, as well as backsliding in some areas. Acknowledging that the challenges associated with reversing decades of repression during the military junta are significant, and that the NLD government committed to reforms in its election manifesto and has made some nascent efforts, partners pointed to multiple areas where there had been little to no change as well as some areas where the state had not only failed to reform but also engaged in practices that threaten free expression.

### MAY 2019 FREE EXPRESSION SCORECARD

**Total score: 6.0 out of 60**

2019 score for each indicator:

<b>-Laws and regulations:</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>(out of 10)</b>
<b>-Media independence and freedom:</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>(out of 10)</b>
<b>-Digital freedom:</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>(out of 10)</b>
<b>-Freedom of assembly, speech, and opinion:</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>(out of 10)</b>
<b>-Right to information:</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>(out of 10)</b>
<b>-Safety and security:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(out of 10)</b>

#### Methodology for scoring each indicator and each sub-question:

Each of the 6 indicators is scored 0-10, with 0 being the lowest score and 10 the highest. The potential total score is 0 to 60. Each indicator is divided into 5 specific questions covering different aspects of the indicator. Each of the questions is scored on a range of 0 to 2, with 0 indicating regression, 1 indicating no change or nascent progress and/or a stated commitment to change, and 2 indicating notable progress. The 2019 score - 6.0 out of 60 - constitutes a mean average of 0.2 out of 2 (for each question scored), thus indicating varying levels of regression across all of the indicators.

This is the fourth freedom of expression scorecard published by PEN Myanmar. The six expert partners that participated in the first pilot mid-year scorecard in November 2016 awarded a collective score of 8 out of 60 points, as did the 14 groups that participated in the May 2017 one-year assessment. The 19 expert groups that participated in the 2018 scorecard awarded a collective score of 2 out of 60. PEN Myanmar convened its expert partners in early April 2019 to review past scorecards, discuss lessons learned, and revise the 2019 scorecard methodology in an effort to strengthen it and to ensure its rigour and transparency.

The 18 expert partners that participated in the 2019 scorecard assessment include: Assistance Association for Political Prisoners, Athan, Burma News International, Center for Myanmar Media Development, Equality Myanmar, Free Expression Myanmar, Human Rights Defenders Forum, Independent Lawyers' Association of Myanmar, Myanmar ICT for Development Organization, Myanmar Journalism Institute, Myanmar Journalists Association, Myanmar Journalist Network, Myanmar Media Lawyers' Network, Myanmar Women Journalists Society, PEN Myanmar, Protection Committee for Myanmar Journalists, Pyi Gyi Khin, and Yangon Journalism School.

As a point of comparison for the 2019 scorecard, partners considered the state of free expression in Myanmar since 2016 when the NLD first assumed power, as well as the 2010-2015 period when the Union

Solidarity and Development Party was in power. As there are no scorecards to serve as a baseline for 2010-2015, partners drew on their combined extensive experience and knowledge, as well as on media and free expression reports. Participation was limited to 17 expert groups invited by PEN Myanmar, including representatives of or specialists covering ethnic media, women journalists, child rights, and LGBT rights. Although wide-ranging, the partners do not represent the views of all of the groups working in the country. The objective of the scorecard is to assess and score the current situation, not to explain the intent or circumstances of the choices made or actions taken by the state.

To enable an open discussion and safe environment, individual participants in the consultations are not identified or quoted by name. The scoring, content, and quotations represent diverse views expressed during the assessment, and are not necessarily held by each partner. Several of the partners cited above were not able to attend the scorecard assessment event in person, but have reviewed and signed off on the results.

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

**“The government says it’s implementing change but,if so, it isn’t transparent or inclusive and doesn’t deserve our praise.”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

To encourage the state to expand and expedite its attention to respect, protect, and fulfil the right to freedom of expression and foster a more open, democratic society, the expert partners in the 2019 scorecard assessment have proposed six key recommendations based on the six scorecard indicators. For all six recommendations, there is strong agreement that it is the government’s duty and obligation to proactively organize meaningful public consultations with relevant stakeholders throughout every stage of the reform process.

- **Laws and regulations:** Implement a detailed plan for the timely reform of Myanmar’s legal framework to respect, protect, and fulfil the right to freedom of expression in line with international democratic standards. The plan should include constitutional amendments, judicial reform, and amendment of all content regulation laws, notably those covering criminal defamation and various forms of dissent against the state.
- **Media independence and freedom:** Implement a detailed plan for promptly ending all state interference in the media. The plan should include transferring all state-controlled media into private or public service ownership or shutting it down, with a clear deadline. It should also create an enabling environment for the sustainability of independent media; cease obligatory special licensing for private print media; remove the state’s role in determining members of the Press and Broadcasting Councils; and require all state officials, including military officials, to use the media regulatory bodies to file complaints.
- **Digital freedom:** Implement a cyber legislative framework that fully protects the right to freedom of expression online in accordance with international democratic standards. The cyber framework should protect the right to privacy by including robust data protection provisions and safeguards for lawful interception. It should not apply any content restrictions except those acceptable under international standards.
- **Freedom of assembly, speech, and opinion:** Amend the Peaceful Assembly and Peaceful Procession Law to bring it into line with international democratic standards. The amendment should place an obligation on the state to facilitate protests, including spontaneous protests, and remove all the provisions that are currently misused to stop protests based on their content. The power to prevent protests going ahead should

be removed and the law should clearly state in what situations a protest can be dispersed and how.

- **Right to information (RTI):** Enact an RTI law that is in line with international democratic standards. The law should override all other laws, including the Official Secrets Act; include whistleblower protections; and create an authoritative independent commission with strong powers to oversee the implementation of the law.
- **Safety and security:** Publicly and unequivocally condemn all attacks against journalists and human rights defenders, including threats of such attacks, and ensure impartial, prompt, thorough, independent and effective investigations with the aim of prosecuting perpetrators, including those who command, conspire to commit, aid and abet, or cover up such crimes.

## FREE EXPRESSION INDICATORS: SCORING AND SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

### LAWS AND REGULATIONS—SCORING: 0.2 points out of 10

**“We are very far away from international standards.”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- **International standards:** Over the past year has the state made any legal reform efforts to ensure Myanmar’s laws meet international standards? **(0.2 points)**
- **New and/or amended laws/bylaws:** Over the past year have any new laws or bylaws been passed and, if so, do they foster or repress free expression? Have any existing laws or bylaws been reviewed, amended or repealed and, if so, do the actions support or suppress free expression? **(0 points)**
- **Public consultation:** Over the past year has there been public consultation on laws relating to free expression? If so, has there been adequate time for feedback from stakeholders and the public, and have consultations been publicly advertised? **(0 points)**
- **Implementation of laws:** Over the past year has the implementation of laws and regulations (including informal regulations that are not written down) hampered free expression on the national and/or state/region levels? **(0 points)**
- **Public awareness/education:** Over the past year has the state ensured that stakeholders and the public are aware of new laws and understand them? **(0 points)**

### LAWS AND REGULATIONS—SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

- A new parliamentary committee tasked with reviewing Myanmar’s constitution is an opportunity for the government to guarantee the democratic rights to free expression, media freedom, and access to information.
- In general, amendments and new laws appear to have slowed down although there remains no clear government plan or timeline. Promised laws such as RTI have disappeared from the legislative agenda. Promised positive amendments, such as to the News Media Law, have not appeared. Meanwhile, problematic amendments, such as to the Peaceful Assembly and Peaceful Procession Law, have appeared without warning. The state has ignored other desperately needed amendments to laws such as the Penal Code and Official Secrets Act. Consultation remains rare.
- A range of laws continue to be misused by state officials, often with malicious intent to both punish criticism and encourage self-censorship. Private individuals also misuse the vague and overly broad criminal

laws in private disputes because there is little to no cost as the state bears all costs of criminal prosecution. At the same time, desperately needed laws such as the Broadcasting Law remain unimplemented years after adoption.

- Judicial decisions always interpret laws in the most punitive manner and in favour of the state or complainant, sentencing journalists and others legitimately expressing themselves to highly disproportionate prison terms on questionable grounds.
- Civil society has started a campaign to decriminalize defamation through the adoption of a civil defamation law that will replace Myanmar's 6 criminal laws. The coalition is built upon earlier efforts by the 66(d) coalition.

## **MEDIA INDEPENDENCE AND FREEDOM—SCORING: 1.4 points out of 10**

**“Financing state media with public funds in order to publish propaganda is an insult to the public.”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- **Legal actions:** Over the past year have there been new legal actions brought against media, or ongoing actions, are they unjust, and do they suppress media freedom? **(0 points)**
- **Press Council:** Over the past year has the press council effectively represented/supported the sector, and was the 2018 election of members fair and transparent? **(0.5 points)**
- **State media:** Over the past year has the state made efforts to curtail the power and privileges of state (government & military) media, including efforts to close state media? **(0 points)**
- **Private media:** Over the past year has the state made concrete efforts to create an improved enabling environment for private, independent media? Did private media have reasonable and/or improved access to financing, public advertising, distribution networks, printing houses, subsidies, tax benefits, etc? **(0 points)**
- **Special media licensing:** Over the past year have media still been subject to special licensing/registration? Have diverse media been able to operate despite the licensing regime? **(0.9 points)**

## **MEDIA INDEPENDENCE AND FREEDOM—SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

- Urgent action is needed to respect free press and ensure journalists can report freely without fear of threat or retaliation. The state should conduct an open and inclusive consultation with journalists in order to implement an action plan to improve media freedom.
- The unjust conviction and jailing of Reuters reporters Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo has had a chilling effect on media freedom particularly relating to reporting on the state's mistreatment of marginalised groups. Their conviction should be overturned and they should be provided with adequate financial compensation. In the immediate term they should be pardoned and released. The state should also establish an independent inquiry into allegations that they were intentionally entrapped, denied their legal rights, and were subject to cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and torture.
- Repressive laws that are unduly restricting media independence and freedom, including colonial era legislation such as the Penal Code, Unlawful Associations Act, and the Official Secrets Act, should be reformed to protect the right to freedom of expression. In the meantime, they should not be used to threaten, arrest, or imprison journalists and editors.
- Criminal defamation provisions such as Article 66(d) of the Telecommunications Law threaten media

freedom because they are vague and overly broad and can be easily misused. In addition, cases are always weighted against the accused and punishments are disproportionate.

- Journalists must be allowed adequate and timely access to state officials across all departments nationwide, as well as adequate access to the information held by the state on behalf of the public. In turn, the state should encourage officials to speak with journalists as well as protect them from any repercussions of doing so.
- An RTI law must be enacted that enables and protects journalists' right to access information held by the state, and in turn protects those persons who release information to journalists, particularly where that information concerns wrongdoing.
- The state must strengthen the broadcast sector, including implementing the broadcast law and ensuring a fair allocation of licenses to a diversity of applicants. Independent broadcasters should be operating well in advance of the 2020 general elections so that the electorate can access a range of different opinions and cast an informed vote. Licences should be awarded to maximise the range of views and information available to the public, including local channels operating in a range of local languages.
- The News Media Law should be amended so that the Press Council is legally independent from the state. This includes ensuring all members are chosen by the media and civil society and no members are chosen by the state. The state also has a duty to ensure that state officials use the Press Council to resolve any disputes that they may have with the media. The state could also include in official handbooks a requirement that state officials refer any complaints to the Press Council.
- A plan and timeline must be put in place to cease all state (government and military) control over the media, including both direct control via the Ministry of Information and military, and indirect control via partnerships between private companies and the state, as well as state control over the allocation of both temporary and permanent broadcast licences. In the meantime, any request to increase the budget or other resources for the state media should be rejected, and all official interference in the state media's editorial decisions should be stopped and individuals attempting to interfere, including those at the highest levels, should be subject to appropriate disciplinary procedures.

## **DIGITAL FREEDOM—SCORING: 1.4 points out of 10**

**“People are afraid to write about topics online that they fear others will find controversial. They are self-censoring.”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- **Policies:** Over the past year have state policies supported and improved digital freedom, including data privacy, data protection, and access (internet penetration, price, SIM card registration, etc)? **(0.7 points)**
- **Online expression:** Over the past year have writers, bloggers, and individuals been able to actively engage and post online? **(0 points)**
- **Legal actions:** Over the past year have there been legal actions brought against individuals for their online expression, for example under Section 66(d) or other statutes? **(0 points)**
- **Privacy/surveillance:** Over the past year has the state worked to protect online privacy and/or conducted online surveillance/monitoring? Has there been any action taken with regards to the cyber-crime draft law, specifically with regards to ensuring it does not hamper free expression online? **(0 points)**
- **Hate/dangerous speech:** Over the past year has the state worked to effectively counter and fight hate/dangerous speech, misinformation, and disinformation? **(0.7 points)**



## DIGITAL FREEDOM—SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

**“None of Myanmar’s digital policies are perfect. Some are getting better and some aren’t. But at least there has been some movement forward, although we don’t yet know what will actually happen.”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- The state has enforced mandatory registration of SIM cards with the result that communications can be attributed to specific persons, undermining their right to privacy and potentially leading to self-censorship.
- It remains unclear what the newly established Social Media Monitoring Team is doing or how it has used the budget allocated to it by parliament. Civil society is concerned that the SMMT is carrying out mass surveillance without any form of safeguards to protect the right to freedom of expression and privacy.
- Telecoms companies are obliged to provide data about their users without any proper safeguards to ensure that data requests are lawful. Users’ rights are not protected by judicial oversight of data requests.
- Decriminalise defamation, including in Article 66(d) of the Telecommunications Law, and replace with a single proportionate civil defamation law in line with international standards.
- Reform the Citizens’ Privacy and Security Protection Law to bring it into line with international standards, including by adding protection for users’ privacy online.
- Develop and implement a robust cyber policy framework that protects users’ right to freedom of expression online in line with international standards, including with adequate provisions on data protection and lawful interception.
- Promote digital literacy including via the media and via Myanmar’s education system.
- Cultivate MPs who champion the right to freedom of expression online and lead a public debate on digital rights.
- There is a fear among users about expressing themselves online about topics that others may find controversial. This is particularly the case in relation to expression relating to religion, gender, sex, ethnicity, or political opinion. Users who do express themselves on controversial issues or who come from a marginalised group face harassment and self-censorship is a result of what they express.
- Malicious misuse of vague and overly broad laws, such as Article 66(d) of the Telecommunications Act, have had a punitive and chilling effect. There are many cases; for example, the award-winning journalist Swe Win has been fighting a court case for more than 2 years for comments he made online; in another high-profile case, filmmaker Min Htin Ko Ko Gyi was arrested under Article 505 (a) of the Penal Code and Section 66(d) and imprisoned on 12 April for insulting and defaming the military; he is suffering from a life-threatening illness.

## FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY, SPEECH, AND OPINION—SCORING: 0.1 points out of 10

**“If your campaign supports the government, your protest application is accepted. If your campaign doesn’t support the government, the authorities reject your application and say that you cannot protest”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- **International standards:** Over the past year has the government worked to ensure Myanmar laws

and regulations regulating freedom of assembly, speech, and opinion meet international standards? **(0.1 points)**

- **Freedom of assembly, speech, and opinion:** Over the past year have civil society actors, writers, journalists and individuals been able to express their opinions freely, rally, protest, and engage in creative expression? **(0 points)**
- **Legal actions:** Over the past year have there been new and/or ongoing legal actions that foster or suppress freedom of assembly, speech, and opinion? **(0 points)**
- **Permission:** Over the past year has it been possible to obtain permission to assemble and/or protest in a reasonable manner and time, without discrimination? **(0 points)**
- **Law enforcement:** Over the past year have law enforcement officers, local authorities, and others in charge been aware of, and respected, individuals' rights to freedom of assembly, speech, and opinion, and have they conducted themselves professionally and fairly when doing their jobs (including with regards to riot regulations)? **(0 points)**

### **FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY, OPINION, AND SPEECH—SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

- According to Athan, there were 36 cases with 129 people being prosecuted under various provisions of the Peaceful Assembly and Peaceful Procession Law in 2018. According to Athan, there were also 14 cases involving 33 people online and offline prosecuted under Article 505(b) of the Penal Code.
- A draft amendment to the Peaceful Assembly and Peaceful Procession Law was proposed in parliament in April 2018. The draft, which has not yet proceeded, contains five amendments that would undermine freedom of expression.
- The bylaws the Yangon Regional government put into effect in November 7, 2017, which banned demonstrations in 11 townships, have not been withdrawn. As a result, people cannot exercise their right to freedom of expression in protests in those places.
- CSOs are facing difficulties arranging events and trainings. Across most of the country CSOs must obtain permission from local authorities in order to run activities such as workshops. This permission is granted based partly on what the CSOs will be doing or discussing. Due to pressure from local authorities, some events are organised but then prevented from taking place. Private hotels and halls sometimes refuse to allow CSO events and trainings because of the local authorities. Some CSOs are concerned that the conditions have gotten worse between 2017 and 2019.

### **RIGHT TO INFORMATION (RTI)—SCORING: 2.9 points out of 10**

**“There has been some proactive disclosure at a regional level, such as in Magway Region, but overall it is still not possible to access information from the state”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- **RTI Law:** Over the past year has there been progress with regards to ensuring Myanmar's draft RTI law is in line with international standards, including a provision that the law overrides all other laws, including the Official Secrets Act? Has the law been implemented? **(1 point)**
- **Other laws:** Over the past year have other laws and regulations hampered right to information and access? **(0 points)**
- **Access:** Over the past year have civil society actors, journalists, writers, and the public been able to access the information they need for their own lives, and to hold authorities accountable? Has there been

improvement or regression to this regard? (1 points)

- **Information handling:** Over the past year has the government worked to ensure a reasonable standard on information handling? Over the past year has there been proactive disclosure? (0.9 point)
- **Whistle-blowers:** Over the past year has the government worked to develop protections for whistle-blowers? (0 points)

#### **RIGHT TO INFORMATION—SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

- A draft RTI bill was written by the special committee of the Pyithu Hluttaw, national level ministries and CSOs at the end of 2017. To date it has not been submitted to the parliament and there is no public timetable for when or if it will be submitted.
- At the 5 December 2018 Myanmar Media Development Conference in Nay Pyi Daw, a reporter asked a military panellist why the military does not respond to journalists' requests for comment or for information. The spokesperson answered that until an RTI law has been enacted, no military personnel will answer reporters' questions.
- Overall, it is still not possible to access information held by the state, and proactive disclosure remains rare. However there has been some proactive disclosure efforts on the regional level; for example, the Magway region government has already started e-government procedures (without waiting for national policy and principles on data/information handling and protection). This has already been very useful for multi-departmental information sharing and for local media and CSOs.
- Other laws hampering RTI: If an RTI law in line with international standards had been enacted, it may have provided the Reuters journalists Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo with some protection against the state's use of the Official Secret Act.
- The whistleblower Moe Yan Naing, after testifying in the trial of the Reuters journalists that they were entrapped by an order from a police chief officer, was sentenced to one year in prison in May 2018 for violating the Police Disciplinary Act, and fired. Whistleblowers have no protection even when the information they disclose is of significant public interest due to criminal wrongdoing and misuse of power.

#### **SAFETY AND SECURITY—SCORING: 0 points out of 10**

**“Journalists don't feel safe doing their jobs and when they get into trouble they don't know where to go for help”**

*(Scorecard Discussion Participant)*

- **Safety:** Over the past year have civil society actors, journalists, writers, documentary-makers, and other individuals been able to engage in free and creative expression, including journalism and investigations on sensitive topics, safely and securely? (0 points)
- **Attacks/harassment:** Over the past year have there been physical attacks and/or verbal/written/physical harassment, including with regards to fixers and individuals who help ensure the safety and security of free expression advocates and journalists at their own risk? (0 points)
- **Judiciary:** Over the past year have free expression advocates, journalists, CSOs, and individuals had access to fair and independent trials and/or an independent judiciary? (0 points)
- **Impunity:** Over the past year has there been continued impunity for past cases linked to free expression and journalism, or has there been a robust investigation and prosecution of crimes? (0 points)

- **Conflict zones:** Over the past year have journalists, CSOs, and others had reasonable and timely access to conflict zones, and have authorities endeavoured to ensure their safety while in conflict zones? (0 points)

### **SAFETY AND SECURITY — SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

- Threats to safety and security continue to occur. For example, Mon Mon Pan and Ah Kyaw, Myitkyina Journal reporters, were allegedly held captive against their will and assaulted by representatives of the ThaKhin Sit Mining Company at the company's Waingmaw township compound in Kachin State on 26 February 2019.
- Partisan judiciary: Reuters journalists Wa Lone and Kyaw SoeOo were convicted on the basis of charges that clearly violate their right to freedom of expression. They lost their regional court appeal in January 2019 and Supreme Court appeal in April 2019, and remain in prison as victims of a partisan judicial system.
- Journalists threatened: Various media outlets (ex: The Irrawaddy, Eleven, 7Day, RFA) received threatening emails linked to their coverage of the Rakhine crisis, specifically their coverage of conflict between the Tatmadaw and the Arakan Army in April 2019.
- Attempted arrests: Security forces in the Ayerwaddy Delta attempted to arrest journalists who were interviewing the families of disabled soldiers who were forcibly recruited as soldiers (July 2018).
- Attacks: Plain clothed thugs attacked peace process protesters in Tamwe Junction, Yangon and threatened journalists (May 2018).

The 2019 freedom of expression scorecard discussion was organized by PEN Myanmar, with support from PEN America. For more information, please contact PEN Myanmar secretary, Han Zaw, 09 44 308 1350, hanzaw.media@gmail.com.

### **PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS:**

1. Assistance Association for Political Prisoners - <http://aappb.org/>
2. Athan- <https://www.facebook.com/athan.foe.myanmar/>
3. Burma News International -<http://burmese.bnionline.net/>
4. Center for Myanmar Media Development - <http://mmdcmyanmar.com/>
5. Equality Myanmar - <http://equalitymyanmar.org/>
6. Free Expression Myanmar - <http://freeexpressionmyanmar.org>
7. Human Rights Defenders Forum (HRDF)- <https://www.facebook.com/HRDefendersForum/>
8. Independent Lawyers' Association Myanmar - <http://www.ilam.org.mm>
9. Myanmar ICT for Development Organization - <https://www.facebook.com/Myanmarido/>
10. Myanmar Journalism Institute - <http://www.mjmyanmar.org>
11. Myanmar Journalist Network - <https://www.facebook.com/Myanmar-Journalist-Network-206380619436115/>
12. Myanmar Journalists Association -<http://www.mjjournalistsa.org/>
13. Myanmar Media Lawyers' Network - <https://www.facebook.com/myanmar.mmln/>
14. Myanmar Women Journalists Society- <https://www.facebook.com/MWJS1/>
15. PEN Myanmar - <https://www.facebook.com/penmyanmar/>, [www.penmyanmar.org](http://www.penmyanmar.org), <http://www.pen-international.org/>
16. Protection Committee for Myanmar Journalists - <https://www.facebook.com/PCMJMyanmar/>
17. Pyi Gyi Khin- <https://www.facebook.com/PyiGyiKhinMyanmar/posts/620480441308996>
18. Yangon Journalism School (YJS)- <http://www.yangonjschool.org>