**Statement on Article 9: Adjudicative jurisdiction**

With regards to Article 9, and any interventions going forward, we align ourselves with interventions made by the State representatives of South Africa and Palestine and others insisting on working with the text of the 3rd draft and comments made at the 7th session.

With regards Article 9.1 we endorse the submissions made by South Africa and the State of Palestine during the 7th session to add ‘**or violations’** after the words human rights abuses, as well as **‘upon the victims and their family’s choice’ .** We believe this offers a victim centered approach to issues of adjudicative jurisdiction.

In Article 9.1 (c) we endorse the State of Palestine’s addition of the words ‘**including in their business relationships and global production chain’,** noting that this approach offers broader protection to victims.

In 9.2 we align ourselves with the State of Palestine’s suggestion for the deletion of the words ‘**domestic law’** and inclusion of **including through their business relationship and global production chain’**

And 9.2 bis which adds **a place where substantial assets are held** to be considered as a place of domicile for a company.

Under Article 9.3 we support South Africa’s input in the 7th session for the text to read

**Courts vested with jurisdiction on the basis of Article 9.1 and 9.2 shall avoid imposing any legal obstacles, including the doctrine of forum non conveniens, to initiate proceedings in line with Article 7.5 of this (legally binding instrument).**

And endorse the State of Palestine and Namibia’s intervention, contrary to other suggestions to keep reference to forum non conveniens.