

**Third intersessional meeting of the  
Open-Ended Working Group on transnational corporations**

**29 May 2026**

...

**Statement 1**

Mister Chair,

This statement is delivered on behalf of the Treaty Alliance, the ESCR-Net, the Feminists for a Binding Treaty and the Global Campaign.

First and foremost, we wish to express our gratitude to the Chair Rapporteur and his team for their dedicated efforts in creating a strong legally binding instrument throughout this process, as well as to the experts for their contributions to this end. Similarly, we welcome the participation of States during the 2026 intersessional period. Such engagement demonstrates their interest and commitment to the process, especially given the informal nature of these discussions. We anticipate their continued active involvement during the 12th session.

More than a decade after the adoption of UN Res 26/9, we have reached a decisive moment in the treaty negotiations process. **This process was established for a clear purpose: to confront corporate impunity, regulate business activities of a transnational character, fill in the accountability gaps left by voluntary approaches and ensure access to justice and remedy for affected peoples and communities.** The integrity of that mandate must be defended.

It goes without saying that the final treaty must remain fully aligned with the original objective of Resolution 26/9. It must establish binding international obligations to regulate the activities of corporate actors on a transnational scale, guarantee accountability, and ensure legal liability for human rights violations and environmental destruction. **This process cannot end with a weakened instrument shaped by political compromise or corporate capture.**

We would like to refer to the reiterated narrative according to which a "balanced" LBI, meaning a weakened instrument, is needed to safeguard investment and development. In the same vein, an ambitious and detailed instrument, one that contributes to the evolution of international law and to closing accountability gaps, is viewed as detrimental to the economies of states in the Global south. **The exact opposite is the case: It's human rights violations, perpetrated throughout global value chains of transnational corporations, that lead to destruction, while binding regulations can help foster sustainable development, improve living conditions and protect the environment.**

For years, affected communities, workers, Indigenous Peoples, peasants, and civil society organisations have invested immense effort into these negotiations. They have brought testimony, expertise, and lived experience to this process. Their collective struggle cannot result in a treaty that merely reproduces the failures of voluntary frameworks that have allowed corporate impunity to persist. **These negotiations were created precisely because voluntary approaches have failed to stop widespread violations and abuses of human rights by corporations.**

At this stage, there is growing concern over attempts to dilute key provisions related to corporate legal liability, prevention, access to justice, jurisdiction, international cooperation, the obligations of transnational corporations across global supply and value chains, and the consistency of trade and investment regimes and other international legal instruments with this LBI. **Such provisions should not be lost under the guise of simplifying the text.**

Many States have engaged in good faith and put their time and effort towards the purpose of this treaty reflecting the demands of communities affected by corporate power. These contributions **must not be ignored or shoved aside to appease corporate actors lobbying to weaken the text of the Binding Treaty.**

Faced with wars fueled by corporate interests, the growing dominance of economic elites over governments, skyrocketing inequality and massive human rights violations across the Global South, this IGWG has the obligation and the moral duty to regulate corporate power. At a time when the multilateral system and international law are under attack, this Treaty represents an opportunity to prove that the United Nations still serves 'the Peoples'. **To fail now would be to admit that multilateralism has been defeated by corporate interests.**

## Statement 2

Mister Chair,

This statement is delivered on behalf of the Treaty Alliance, the ESCR-Net, the Feminists for a Binding Treaty and the Global Campaign.

As we think about ways forward, we ask the IGWG to consider the following procedural elements :

- The pursuit of **broad State support cannot come at the expense of the substance of the treaty**. A strong instrument must not be sacrificed to accommodate governments unwilling to support meaningful corporate regulation and that have not engaged with the process in good faith so far.
- This historic opportunity must **deliver structural change in legal standards for corporate accountability** — challenging existing systems of corporate impunity. The final treaty must therefore contain strong and enforceable provisions to establish effective legal liability for corporate actors across supply and value chains; guarantee access to justice and remedy for affected communities; strengthen State regulation of transnational corporate activity; protect human rights defenders and affected communities; and ensure international cooperation and robust enforcement mechanisms capable of addressing corporate impunity across borders.
- Regarding the **timeline** for publication of the next draft, the priority must be the strength and integrity of the text rather than arbitrary deadlines. If additional time is needed to preserve strong accountability provisions and reflect the demands of affected communities, flexibility should be shown. If there is a new draft for the 13th session in October 2027, it should be published no later than June 2027 to allow sufficient time for analysis, consultation, and preparation ahead of the negotiations.
- We propose discussing and agreeing on two main criteria that shall guide the process of revision of the Draft:
  1. **Preservation of the most protective human rights language:** The drafting process shall prioritize language that offers the strongest protection for human rights, the environment, and affected communities, in strict accordance with the mandate established by Human Rights Council Resolution 26/9. All provisions and amendments that are not aligned with protective language and with Resolution 26/9 should be rejected.
  2. **Inclusion of broadly supported proposals and amendments:** Provided that the first criterion is met, revisions should incorporate proposals and amendments that have received the broadest support from States in previous sessions, ensuring that the text reflects the democratic convergence of views achieved to date.
- **Meaningful consultations with affected communities and civil society movements must also take place before the next draft is published.** We ask the Chair-Rapporteur to continue meeting with communities and social movements bilaterally before a next draft is issued, so as to ensure that our demands and concerns are fully reflected. Enough time should be provided to comment on the methodology for the 12th session of the OEIWG and beyond.

At this decisive moment, negotiations must move toward a treaty that genuinely confronts corporate power rather than accommodate it. This process was created to regulate the activities of transnational corporations and to end corporate impunity — not to reproduce the gaps of existing voluntary measures.

Thank you