

## ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

11 February 2025

### Attendance ([Standards Committee](#)):

Abu Karimu

Abiba Diallo

Francesca Fairbairn

Gesa Jauck

Louis Biswane

Marcel Pfitzer

Nicholas Barla

Jason Koevoet

Jørgen Hanson

José Rubio

Judith Pietschmann

Marina Wangurra

Margriet Biswane

Mohamed Sankon

Olivier Néel

Penny Laurance

Piet Wit

Sankon Mohamed

Steven Bater

Michael Danielson\*

Vincent Ekka

Yuri Herder

Vishwas Kamble

Wenjuan Liu\*

\*US Participants joined a separate earlier call on 4 February 2025 to share input ahead of the full Committee meeting

### Apologies:

Alexander Leutwiler

Guilbert Ebune

### ASI Secretariat

Cameron Jones, *Director of Risk and Assurance*

Chelsea Reinhardt, *Standards Director*

Chinelo Etiaba, *Membership Director*

Chris Bayliss, *Climate Change & Decarb'n Director*

Jessica Pereira, *Human Rights Specialist*

Klaudia Michalska, *Supply Chain Analyst*

Laura Brunello, *Standards Coordinator*

Lia Vacheret, *Standards Manager*

Laura Brunello, *Standards Coordinator*

### Agenda points:

1. Approve minutes from previous SC meeting
2. Review/approve Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Standards Revision, including feedback on objectives
3. Approve ToR for Working Groups
4. Approve release of minor updates to GHG Pathways calculation tool
5. Discuss
  - a. High level structure of the Performance Standard v4
  - b. Agenda for May in-person meeting
  - c. Stakeholder mapping

## Discussion Notes:

### 1. Minutes of previous meeting

- **Decision: The Standards Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting.**

### 2. ToR for the Standards Revision

- Clarification was requested on the audience and purpose of the ToR. The Secretariat informed that the ToR:
  - is a public document which will be accessible on the ASI website and
  - is a requirement of ASI's ISEAL Code Compliance.
  - Purpose is to establish initial objectives and alignment, but these may/will change over the course of the project.
- The Committee exchanged views on wording under the Intended Outcomes section, whether to keep or remove 'more' from 'more sustainable' production, noting that with tightening claims requirements, making statements around 'sustainable' may be hard to justify unless this is clearly defined by ASI (which is not currently the case). With differentiated performance levels anticipated in the revised Performance Standard, a single conceptual threshold for 'sustainable' may not be appropriate.
  - The Committee agreed to update wording: 'work towards more sustainable'.
- It was suggested to make the link to the ASI Strategy/Theory of Change more explicit in the ToR and in all communications related to the revision process.
- **Action: The Secretariat will replace the language with 'supports the aluminium sector to work towards more sustainable production of aluminium'.**
- **Decision: The Standards Committee approved the ToR for the Standards Revision, subject to the change proposed.**

### 3. ToR for Working Groups

- The Secretariat explained the updated format and ToR for a new set of Working Groups (WGs) to support the revision process, proposed to be convened from April 2025.
- Several participants noted by that there is an important distinction in thematic and expert input between Human Rights/Labour Rights/Community Impacts; different specialists would need to participate in these conversations (although they overlap at times).
- A participant noted the importance of specialist input from industrial hygiene and medical professionals on Workers' Health and Safety risks; this is a highly specialized area of expertise, which could merit a separate forum for discussion.
- ASI clarified the different roles played by the Standard Committee subgroups (an informal grouping of SC members to help with drafting of initial content areas) compared to the more formal (part of [ASI Governance](#)) role of Working Groups, which aim to represent participants across ASI's Membership to serve as a sounding board on the draft content development.
- **Action: The Secretariat will create separate Working Groups, with clear scopes of work, for:**
  1. Labour Rights/Occupational Health and Safety
  2. Community Impacts/Human Rights
- **Decision: The Standards Committee approved the ToR for the WGs, subject to the changes above**

### 4. For approval: Minor updates to the GHG Method tool

- The Secretariat reviewed minor corrections and changes proposed to the GHG Pathways calculation tool, used to articulate 1.5 degree aligned Entity-level emissions reduction (PS Criterion 5.3).
- It was clarified that the new version will replace the [current version](#) on the ASI website, and the current version can be allowed to be phased out organically, given that the underlying Method is unchanged; Entities will not be penalized for use of the current version at Audit
- It was clarified that these changes do not impact and are not impacted by the Exemption Process, which applies to GHG Pathways performance, not articulation.
- **Decision: The Standards Committee approved minor updates to and publication of the GHG Pathways calculation tool**

#### 5a. Discuss high level structure of the Performance Standard v4

- The Secretariat shared initial thinking on restructuring of principles under the Performance Standard, and possible options for differentiation of performance levels within each.
- The Committee discussed the proposal, noting the following:
  - It is important to differentiate clearly between expectations of Entities related to their own operations and to their supply chains
  - Alignment with EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) is important – consider dual materiality approach, the main aim should be to avoid duplication or contradiction of this approach
  - Clear auditor guidance on materiality will be important
- There was a discussion on the extent to which the revised Performance Standard should allow Entities to define their own material issues, offering more flexibility and relevance but raising potential reputational risks to ASI if key material issues are not covered and the standard is seen as less credible
  - Clear auditor guidance on materiality will also be important
  - The group discussed potential options, such as defining some ‘mandatory’ material issues, and/or incorporating clear guidance on minimum expected topics to cover.
  - It was recommended to refer back to initial discussions on materiality from the September 2024 SC Meeting in Amsterdam and further develop this work.
- Other points raised:
  - It was suggested to reframe ‘Community Impacts’ pillar as ‘Community Rights and Protections’ (or similar) for more positive framing (and alignment with the Labour Rights and Protections’ pillar.
  - A question was raised about where some topics would fit under the new thematic pillars, for example Air Quality.
  - Recent IPAF discussions noted that determining risk levels is important; for example, impacts on biodiversity surrounding European sites could still be high risk.
  - It was highlighted that there is an important intersection between workers’ rights and protection and impacts on local communities.
- **Action: ASI Secretariat to develop options for incorporating materiality into the proposed restructuring, to be discussed further in subgroups and together in May at the in-person meeting**
- **Action: ASI Secretariat to update working title from Community Impacts to Community Rights and Protections**

#### 5b. Agenda for May in-person meeting in Paris

- Not discussed on the call due to timing. Written feedback will be sought from the Standards Committee to identify which topics are most essential.

#### 5c. Stakeholder mapping

- The plenary meeting did not have time to cover this slide during the 11<sup>th</sup> of February meeting
- During the US pre-call, one participant identified a need to include specific research or academia (in technical experts).
- The important role of traders with respect to CoC Standard revisions was also highlighted