

FINAL STATEMENT

Chile's National Contact Point OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises

Non-official English translation

In Santiago, on 18 June 2015, Chile's National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (hereinafter referred to as the NCP) – having considered the specific instance request and supporting documents submitted by UNI Global Union and UNI Americas, on behalf of its affiliate, the Sole Union of Workers of the Ripley Group S.A. Peru (SUTRAGRISA) – initiated a specific instance regarding alleged breaches of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (hereinafter referred to as the Guidelines) by the Peruvian subsidiary of the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. Having also reviewed the information provided by the latter, the NCP hereby states the following;

I. OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises

The Guidelines are recommendations addressed by governments to multinational enterprises operating in or headquartered in adhering countries. They contain non-binding principles and standards for responsible business conduct in a global context, consistent with applicable laws and internationally recognised standards.

Their objective is to promote the positive contribution of enterprises to economic, environmental, and social progress worldwide, reflecting the shared values of the governments of countries that are the source of a significant portion of global foreign direct investment and are home to many of the world's largest multinational enterprises.

In this context, and with the aim of promoting and implementing the Guidelines, the governments of adhering countries have committed to establishing National Contact Points.

Among their responsibilities, National Contact Points are tasked with assisting enterprises and stakeholders in taking appropriate measures to promote the implementation of the Guidelines, serving as a platform for mediation and conciliation to resolve practical issues that may arise.

II. Procedure of the NCP

Any person (natural or legal) currently affected by a multinational enterprise's non-compliance with the Guidelines may submit a formal complaint to the NCP.

Analysis of the submission

Every submission, along with its supporting documents, will be reviewed by the NCP and its Executive Secretariat. Based on this assessment, the NCP may conclude:

1. That it must request additional information from the submitter.
2. That it must request clarification on one or more points of the submission.
3. That it must request the submitter's authorisation to share the submission with the multinational enterprise.
4. That it is appropriate to inform one of its counterparts of the submission.

Information exchange

Once authorised, the NCP will share the information contained in the submitter's submission (complemented and clarified, where applicable), forwarding all relevant materials to the multinational enterprise. The enterprise will be given a non-extendable deadline to respond, which must also include a statement on whether it accepts or declines the NCP's good offices. This deadline will be determined on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the merits of the available information provided by the submitter(s).

Once the response from the multinational enterprise has been received, both the response and the supporting information will be reviewed by the NCP and its Executive Secretariat. Based on this assessment, the NCP may conclude:

1. That additional information regarding its response must be requested.
2. That clarification on one or more points of its response must be requested.

Assessment of the specific instance

Once the non-extendable deadline set by the NCP has passed, the following situations may arise:

1. The deadline has passed and no response has been received from the multinational enterprise.
2. A response has been received within the given deadline in which the good offices of the NCP are rejected.
3. A response has been received in which the good offices of the NCP are accepted.

In the event that either of the situations outlined in points 1 or 2 occurs, the process must proceed to the next stage, referred to as the Conclusion of the Process.

Once the response has been received (complemented and clarified, where applicable), the NCP, together with its Executive Secretariat, will assess whether it is appropriate to initiate a specific instance, through which mediation or conciliation may be carried out.

Conclusion of the process

Every submission to the NCP will conclude with the preparation of a Final Statement, which will indicate, as applicable:

1. The agreements and commitments adopted by the Parties.
2. The timelines and actions for the follow-up of those commitments.
3. The reasons why the Parties were unable to reach an agreement, along with the comments and proposed actions of the NCP.
4. The rejection of the NCP's good offices by the company concerned (whether by failing to respond within the deadline or by explicitly declining the offer of good offices).
5. The reasoning on the basis of which the NCP considered that the issues raised did not merit further consideration.

III. Submission of the specific instance request

The submission was filed by UNI Global Union and UNI Americas, on behalf of its affiliate SUTRAGRISA, on 3 June 2014, before the Chilean Consulate in São Paulo, Brazil (addressed to the Chilean NCP), which subsequently forwarded the information to this NCP (via Official Message No. 210, dated 3 June 2014).

The aforementioned request indicated that the National Contact Points of Colombia and Peru had also been informed of the matter.

It is in this context that, on 16 June 2014, this NCP sent a message to UNI Global Union and UNI Americas acknowledging receipt of the request, stating that, after reviewing it and prior to forwarding it to the multinational, it would carry out the necessary coordination with its counterparts in Peru and Colombia in order to assess the potential specific instance, with the aim of providing assistance to the parties¹.

In this regard, on 25 July 2014, this NCP received a letter from its counterpart in Peru, who – despite not having yet received the aforementioned specific request – stated that *“As the case involves alleged violations of Peruvian labour law, we hereby express our full willingness to support you by providing information that may assist your efforts to guide the parties towards a positive, negotiated, and mutually beneficial resolution [...]”*².

Likewise, on 29 August 2014, the NCP contacted its counterpart in Colombia, who indicated that, as of that date, no communication had been received from the requesting parties. This situation was communicated to the latter through letters No. 5074 and No. 5075, both dated 3 September 2014.

On 22 September 2014, UNI Americas sent a letter (dated 15 September of the same year) indicating that the request had been sent to the NCPs of Peru and Colombia, also stating that it would forward proof of said communications.

On 8 October 2014, the Colombian NCP informed this NCP that it had received a copy of the request from UNI Americas.

Having notified the aforementioned NCPs, coordinated the actions of each, and reviewed the merits of the available information by the Executive Secretariat of this NCP, the request and its supporting documents were forwarded to the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A., by letter No. 6726 (dated 10 December 2014).

¹ Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines. Coordination between NCPs in Specific Instances. Number 24.

“When issues arise from an enterprise’s activity that takes place in several adhering countries or from the activity of a group of enterprises organised as consortium, joint venture or other similar form, based in different adhering countries, the NCPs involved should consult with a view to agreeing on which NCP will take the lead in assisting the parties”.

² The Peruvian NCP was notified of the request on 26 September 2014.

IV. Principles of the Guidelines allegedly breached

1. Principle N° IV. Human Rights.
2. Principle N° V. Employment and Industrial Relations.
3. Principle N° VII. Combatting Bribery, Bribe Solicitation and Extortion.

V. Grounds for the submission

The submitters state that their claim is specifically motivated by the fact that the Peruvian subsidiary of the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. has systematically violated the provisions of the Guidelines and Peru's national legislation through serious actions that undermine trade union freedom, including the following:

1. The attempt to suppress the existence of SUTRAGRISA.
2. The obstruction of the organisation of trade union branches.
3. The dismissal of trade union leaders and members.
4. Retaliation against those who lodge complaints with the national authorities of Peru.
5. Breaches of national laws.
6. Racial and gender discrimination.
7. Harassment and intimidation of workers.
8. The creation of a highly confrontational working environment.

In this context, the submitters state that *"RIPLEY has demonstrated—and continues to demonstrate—a systematic pattern of obstruction and violation of the collective and trade union rights of its workers, along with an unacceptable culture of abuse and corruption, since 2007, when the Sole Union of Workers of the Ripley Group S.A. Peru (SUTRAGRISA) was founded.*

From that moment until the present day, the company has taken harmful actions against the union, its leaders, members, and the company's workers, with the aim of undermining their trade union freedom, blocking the right to collective bargaining, and hindering the union's activities—even its very existence.

In order to defend themselves against the company's anti-union actions, the union and the affected workers have had to take legal action against RIPLEY on several occasions, seeking to have its unlawful conduct overturned by the courts. Each of these legal proceedings not only takes several years—during which the illegal situation persists and causes irreparable harm—but has also progressively worsened the relationship between the union and the company, increasing the level of conflict [...]”³.

In this regard, the submitters state that the Peruvian subsidiary of the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. has displayed a pattern of socially irresponsible behaviour, which has manifested in multiple irregular actions, including: “[...] dismissals, non-renewal of temporary contracts, non-transparent dealings suspected of involving corruption with trade union leaders, improper surveillance of the private and union-related activities of its employees, misuse of judicial proceedings, acts of gender-based violence and racism [...]”⁴. They conclude that these incidents constitute violations of the Guidelines under the following chapters and paragraphs, which I will outline below:

1. Chapter I, paragraph 2.
2. Chapter IV, paragraph 1.
3. Chapter IV, paragraph 2.
4. Chapter IV, paragraph 5.
5. Chapter IV, paragraph 6.
6. Chapter V, paragraph 1, subparagraph a).
7. Chapter V, paragraph 1, subparagraph b).
8. Chapter V, paragraph 2, subparagraph a).
9. Chapter V, paragraph 2, subparagraph b).
10. Chapter V, paragraph 2, subparagraph c).
11. Chapter V, paragraph 3.
12. Chapter V, paragraph 4, subparagraph b).

³ Initial questionnaire. Pg. 4.

⁴ Initial questionnaire. Pg. 17.

The submitters also state that the actions of the Peruvian subsidiary of the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. have violated the spirit of Chapter VII of the Guidelines, which relates to combating corruption and the need to ensure transparency in its operations.

Finally, they add that, *"UNI has attempted to resolve the conflict by engaging in dialogue with the highest authorities of RIPLEY CORP, during the regular meetings held between both parties. However, RIPLEY CORP has failed to take action regarding the systematic violations of the Guidelines in Peru"*⁵.

VI. Desired outcome sought by the submitters of the specific instance

The submitters wish to initiate a constructive dialogue between themselves, their affiliated union, and the multinational company RIPLEY Corp. S.A., both at its highest level of management and at its operational levels in Peru, with a view to reaching a negotiated agreement that addresses the issues raised above in this Final Statement. This is intended to normalise the relationship between the company and the local union SUTRAGRISA, thereby putting an end to the climate of conflict affecting the company.

In this regard, the submitters request that the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. adopt internal policies that are consistent with the Guidelines, particularly with respect to matters concerning labour relations and Human Rights.

VII. Ripley Corp. S.A's Response.

On 16 January 2015, the company Ripley Corp. S.A. responded to the communication sent by this NCP, stating that the submission presented by the unions UNI Global Union and UNI Americas, on behalf of their affiliate SUTRAGRISA, was the result of pressure aimed at negotiating collective agreements currently underway in Peru from a stronger bargaining position⁶.

It also states that the events described as anti-union practices have been resolved by the Peruvian courts in favour of Ripley Corp. S.A.'s subsidiary in Peru.

⁵ Initial questionnaire. Pg. 21.

⁶ Ripley Corp. S.A.'s Response. Pg. 3.

"It is evident that the sole purpose of the complainant is to exert pressure through the use of international mechanisms, with the aim of improperly imposing its own terms in the ongoing negotiation process between Ripley Peru and SUTRAGRISA. The submission of this complaint to the NCP clearly does not contribute to the negotiation process currently being conducted and overseen by the relevant Peruvian authorities".

Finally, it rejects the Good Offices offered by this NCP, based on the grounds set out in the following paragraph.

VIII. Grounds for the response by the multinational enterprise

The multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. puts forward the following substantive arguments in response to the communication sent to them by this NCP on 10 December 2014, namely:

1. Both Ripley Chile and Ripley Peru respect the labour rights of their workers, particularly with regard to trade union freedom and their collective rights.
2. Trade union activity at Ripley Peru is carried out in a completely free manner, without any form of restriction. Currently, Ripley Peru has trade union organisations representing 604 workers, including even supervisors and deputy managers of Ripley Peru, whose positions are of full trust.
3. Ripley Peru has signed two collective agreements with SUTRAGRISA, which include various improvements for the benefit of affiliated workers and their families.
4. Ripley Peru and SUTRAGRISA are currently engaged in negotiations for a new collective agreement for the 2014–2016 period, before the Directorate for the Prevention and Resolution of Conflicts of the General Directorate of the Ministry of Labour and Employment Promotion of Peru. “Therefore, it is clearly neither acceptable nor appropriate for a parallel procedure to be conducted in a country other than the Republic of Peru”⁷, adding that “[...] the sole purpose of the complainant is to exert pressure through the use of international mechanisms, with the improper aim of imposing its own terms in the negotiation process currently underway between Ripley Peru and SUTRAGRISA.”⁸.
5. The accusations and claims made by the submitters are outright false, unproven, or have already been dismissed by the Peruvian courts, which is why “The complaint itself lacks any factual basis and is nothing more than a partial and biased account of the events”⁹.

⁷ Ripley Corp. S.A.’s Response. Pg. 2.

⁸ Ripley Corp. S.A.’s Response. Pg. 3.

⁹ Ripley Corp. S.A.’s Response. Pg. 2.

In conclusion, "It is on the basis of all the aforementioned considerations that my client has decided not to submit to the good offices of your institution. It has been decided to respect the decisions made by the relevant Peruvian authorities, without undermining their jurisdiction or the ongoing negotiation processes between the parties in the Republic of Peru"¹⁰.

IX. Competence of the NCP regarding the specific instance request submitted

1. Multinational enterprise

In accordance with the foreword of the Guidelines, their purpose is "[...] *ensure that the operations of these enterprises are in harmony with government policies, to strengthen the basis of mutual confidence between enterprises and the societies in which they operate, to help improve the foreign investment climate and to enhance the contribution to sustainable development made by multinational enterprises.*"¹¹.

Although the Guidelines do not provide a definition of a multinational enterprise, they do offer elements or characteristics that help identify what is meant by a multinational enterprise, stating that "*They usually comprise companies or other entities established in more than one country and so linked that they may coordinate their operations in various ways. While one or more of these entities may be able to exercise a significant influence over the activities of others, their degree of autonomy within the enterprise may vary widely from one multinational enterprise to another. Ownership may be private, State or mixed. The Guidelines are addressed to all the entities within the multinational enterprise (parent companies and/or local entities)*"¹².

In the context of assessing the admissibility of the submission presented, this NCP had to determine whether the companies referred to in the submission—regarding alleged breaches of the Guidelines—align with the concepts and ideas outlined in the preceding paragraphs.

On this matter, it is important to note that the status of a multinational enterprise has not been denied or disputed in the response or statements submitted to this NCP on 16 January 2015 by the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A. or its subsidiary in Peru. Therefore, this NCP considers it unnecessary to explore this point further, as the multinational nature of the company is not a contested fact.

¹⁰ Ripley Corp. S.A.'s Response. Pg. 3.

¹¹ OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Preface.

¹² OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Concepts and Principles. Number 4.

2. Binding nature of the Guidelines

The provisions contained in the Guidelines are not legally binding rules, but rather *"recommendations addressed by governments to multinational enterprises"*¹³ and although *"the Guidelines extend beyond the law in many cases"*¹⁴, clearly indicate that *"in countries where domestic laws and regulations conflict with the principles and standards of the Guidelines, enterprises should seek ways to honour such principles and standards to the fullest extent which does not place them in violation of domestic law"*¹⁵.

The above reflects the idea that the Guidelines constitute international standards of good conduct for multinational enterprises, relating to general principles.

3. Parallel proceedings

On the other hand, the existence of ongoing legal proceedings or parallel procedures before the National Contact Points (a non-judicial and non-adversarial mechanism) cannot be used by the NCP as an excuse for not addressing the requests submitted within the scope of its mandate. In this regard, the Commentary on the Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines state that *"[...] NCPs should evaluate whether an offer of good offices could make a positive contribution to the resolution of the issues raised and would not create serious prejudice for either of the parties involved in these other proceedings or cause a contempt of court situation [...]"*¹⁶.

In this regard, the Procedures establish that when there are *"[...] otras acciones nacionales o internacionales que traten paralelamente cuestiones comparables, los PNC no deben decidir que las cuestiones no justifican un examen más profundo simplemente porque las acciones paralelas han existido, están en curso, o podrían ser aplicadas por las partes afectadas [...]"*¹⁷.

¹³ OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Foreword.

¹⁴ OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises Concepts and Principles. Number 2.

¹⁵ OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Foreword.

¹⁶ Commentary on the Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Number 26.

¹⁷ Commentary on the Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Number 26.

It should be clarified, on this point, that this NCP is not responsible for deciding on or interfering in the matters submitted to those bodies, but rather to contribute, through its Good Offices, to the resolution of the issues raised from the perspective of the Guidelines, which is precisely what has been requested by the submitters.

In this context, the NCP carried out the following actions aimed at determining the relevance of its intervention, taking into account the statements made in the response from the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A., dated 16 January 2015. These are:

1. On 21 January 2015, this NCP sent an electronic communication to its counterpart in Peru, requesting additional information beyond that provided by the parties, in order to prepare the relevant Statement.
2. The first part of this information was sent to this NCP on 24 March 2015, while the second part of the requested supplementary documentation was submitted on 8 April 2015.

Having carried out the corresponding initial assessment, based on the evidence presented and the consultations made with the Peruvian NCP and relevant Peruvian public bodies regarding the information provided by the parties, this NCP determined that the issues raised warrant further examination.¹⁸ However, in the absence of agreement from one of the parties to engage in the procedure established by the Guidelines, this NCP is prevented from offering its Good Offices or pursuing further measures aimed at facilitating access to a consensual and non-adversarial mechanism, whose sole purpose is to assist the parties in resolving the matters raised in the request submitted by the already identified trade union organisations.

X. Conclusion of the procedure

From all the foregoing, it can be concluded that the notion that a specific instance (or the submission of a request to this or any other NCP) could in itself be used as a means of coercion to obtain better conditions or a stronger negotiating position in relation to the company whose alleged misconduct is at issue, is entirely unfounded.

¹⁸ Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines. C. Implementation in Specific Instances.

Such a claim not only contradicts the General Principles applicable to specific instances (in particular, the principle of Equitable¹⁹), but also undermines the very nature of the procedure by which NCPs worldwide are required to operate.

In this context, both the Guidelines and the implementation procedures allow NCPs to dismiss any request that is unfounded, not submitted in Good Faith, not related to the Guidelines, or in situations where considering a specific instance — in relation to such a request — would not contribute to the purpose and effectiveness of the Guidelines²⁰.

What is stated in the preceding paragraph reflects the underlying intention behind the creation of the Guidelines, which is to protect multinational enterprises from requests aimed solely at damaging their public image without having sufficient grounds to substantiate the allegations, claims and/or complaints made by those who consider themselves currently affected by the conduct of such enterprises.

Thus, the Guidelines “[...] *acknowledge and encourage the contribution that MNEs can make to local capacity building as a result of their activities in local communities. Similarly, the recommendation on human capital formation is an explicit and forward-looking recognition of the contribution to individual human development that MNEs can offer their employees, and encompasses not only hiring practices, but training and other employee development as well. Human capital formation also incorporates the notion of non-discrimination in hiring practices as well as promotion practices, life-long learning and other on-the-job training*”²¹.

¹⁹ Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines. Guiding Principles for Specific Instances. Number 22. Equitable.

This principle states that “NCPs should ensure that the parties can engage in the process on fair and equitable terms, for example by providing reasonable access to sources of information relevant to the procedure”.

²⁰ Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines. Initial assessment.

“In making an initial assessment of whether the issue raised merits further examination, the NCP will need to determine whether the issue is bona fide and relevant to the implementation of the Guidelines. In this context, the NCP will take into account:

- the identity of the party concerned and its interest in the matter.
- whether the issue is material and substantiated.
- whether there seems to be a link between the enterprise’s activities and the issue raised in the specific instance.
- the relevance of applicable law and procedures, including court rulings.
- how similar issues have been, or are being, treated in other domestic or international proceedings.
- whether the consideration of the specific issue would contribute to the purposes and effectiveness of the Guidelines”.

²¹ OECD Guidelines. Commentary on General Policies. Number 5.

Likewise, the Guidelines state that it is multinational enterprises that "[...] can have an impact on virtually the entire spectrum of internationally recognised human rights. In practice, some human rights may be at greater risk than others in particular industries or contexts, and therefore will be the focus of heightened attention. However, situations may change, so all rights should be the subject of periodic review. Depending on circumstances, enterprises may need to consider additional standards."²² Thus, within the framework of applicable legal and regulatory provisions and prevailing practices in the field of employment and industrial relations, the Guidelines state that enterprises should "[...] Respect the right of workers employed by the multinational enterprise to establish or join trade unions and representative organisations of their own choosing [...]"²³, as well as "Respect the right of workers employed by the multinational enterprise to have trade unions and representative organisations of their own choosing recognised for the purpose of collective bargaining, and engage in constructive negotiations, either individually or through employers' associations, with such representatives with a view to reaching agreements on terms and conditions of employment"²⁴.

On the other hand, it should be noted that, according to information provided by the Director of Labour Conflict Prevention and Resolution and RSEL at the Ministry of Labour and Employment Promotion of Peru, the matters subject to collective bargaining are not related to the issues raised by UNI Global Union and UNI Americas in their submission dated 3 June 2014. For this reason, this NCP does not perceive any contradiction or connection with the administrative proceedings currently under review in Peru between SUTRAGRISA and the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A.

In this regard, the Implementation Procedures of the OECD Guidelines states that "*When assessing the significance for the specific instance procedure of other domestic or international proceedings addressing similar issues in parallel, NCPs should not decide that issues do not merit further consideration solely because parallel proceedings have been conducted, are under way or are available to the parties concerned. **NCPs should evaluate whether an offer of good offices could make a positive contribution to the resolution of the issues raised and would not create serious prejudice for either of the parties involved in these other proceedings or cause a contempt of court situation.***"²⁵ ²⁶

²² OECD Guidelines. Commentary on Human Rights. Number 40.

²³ OECD Guidelines. Employment and Industrial Relations. Paragraph a).

²⁴ Ibid. Paragraph b).

²⁵ Initial assessment, Number 26.

²⁶ The text in bold is our own.

In this regard, it can be added that, as indicated by the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A., there are currently ongoing administrative and judicial proceedings in Peru concerning the substance of some of the facts raised and presented as basis by the submitters of the specific instance before this NCP. However, it is worth noting that, in a world driven by globalisation and supranational standards, it is increasingly essential to focus efforts on complying with and providing internal review mechanisms for what is established by international regulatory frameworks, whether or not these are legally binding in the country where the business activities are carried out.

Such international regulations contain content agreed upon by States and are (generally) used as a standard of conduct to which all multinational enterprises must adhere in the relations or investments they undertake in that capacity.

Today, despite the existence of a large number of international tools that regulate or provide guidelines and policies for good and responsible business conduct, *"The Guidelines [are the only ones that] have the particular feature of including a grievance mechanism, through which individuals who believe their human rights have been violated can submit a complaint within the framework of the company."*²⁸

It is in light of this that it becomes essential for every company to periodically review its Corporate Social Responsibility policies, particularly in response to documented concerns that indicate, at the very least, dissatisfaction with the internal working environment, and where such conditions are of a nature that they can be legitimately brought before an instance such as this one.

In this way, a healthy business and economic environment is of interest not only to all parties involved in the actions of this particular company, but also to society as a whole. There must be efforts from all stakeholders — the State (in protecting Fundamental Rights), companies (which must adopt responsible practices), trade unions and civil society (which play a key role in ensuring accountability), and International Organisations (which provide a forum for dialogue, peer learning, and the setting of standards and recommendations to improve business practices).

²⁷ Among which the following can be highlighted: ISO 26000; the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy; the 2011 UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights; the Global Compact; and the Guidelines.

²⁸ D. John G. Ruggie, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises, 2011.

Consequently, this NCP invites the parties to establish objective channels of communication that allow them to bridge the differences that currently divide them, whether through this or other mechanisms that provide guarantees of impartiality and seek to achieve mutually beneficial and lasting outcomes.

Nevertheless, this NCP acknowledges the multinational company Ripley Corp. S.A.'s decision not to voluntarily engage in a specific instance of this nature. However, the undersigned considers it appropriate to extend its Good Offices once again, so that, if both parties deem it pertinent, a working and mediation table may be established with the aim of engaging in open dialogue and seeking a solution to the matters outlined in the request subject to this Final Statement.



GASTÓN FERNÁNDEZ SCHIAFFINO
Chile's National Contact Point
OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises

Sebastián Sufan Piñeiro / Teresa Corrales Bescós
Executive Secretariat of Chile's National Contact Point

Non-official English translation¹

¹ In case of discrepancy, the Spanish version of this Final Statement shall prevail.