Thank you Mr.Chair,

I speak on behalf of CETIM, member of the Global Campaign. We welcome the broad definition of jurisdiction provided by article 5. Even so, we have some proposals in order to strengthen the article and ensure its effectiveness.

First of all, as underlined by the panelists and some states, we also believe that it is essential to provide provisions to inhibit the use of the argument of *forum non conveniens,* one of the main component of corporate impunity.

Second, paragraph d) does not adequately cover the concept of supply chain. This means that there will be no provisions on responsibility for violations committed by subsidiaries, suppliers, subcontractors and licensees, nor on how to link parent companies to these entities. This type of provision is fundamental in order to pierce the corporate veil and hold corporations responsible and accountable. In addition, it is necessary to add clarifications on the liability links between parent companies and their supply chains, in order to be able to jointly attack the parent company and the entity in question before the same jurisdiction, as co-authors of the damage or violation.

Finally, it is necessary that the article considers that in cases where national complaint mechanisms fail, affected communities must be able to bring their complaint before an international mechanism, and link this provision to article 14. The Global Campaign proposes the creation of an international court that would guarantee the implementation of the obligations established in the Convention. Lastly, it would also be important to consider the opportunity to include a *forum necessitatis* that could be used as an option in circumstances of denial of justice, allowing a court to declare itself capable of hearing a case when there is no forum available. This would help to avoid *forum non conveniens*, which is a major contribution to impunity for TNCs.

Thank you.