

ASI Standards Committee – Minutes – Teleconference

Date: 25 October 2017

Antitrust Statement:

Attendees are kindly reminded that ASI is committed to complying with all relevant antitrust and competition laws and regulations and, to that end, has adopted an Antitrust Policy, compliance with which is a condition of continued ASI participation. Failure to abide by these laws can have extremely serious consequences for ASI and its participants, including heavy fines and, in some jurisdictions, imprisonment for individuals. You are therefore asked to have due regard to this Policy today and in respect of all other ASI activities.

Participants:

Chair: Jostein Soreide (Norsk Hydro)

Committee Members: Catherine Athenes (Constellium), Karl Barth (BMW), Christophe Boussemart (Nespresso), Giulia Carbone (IUCN), Roland Dubois (Rio Tinto Aluminium), Justin Furness (Council for Aluminium in Building), Philip Hunter (Verite), Justus Kammueller (WWF), Bjoern Kulmann (Ball), Adam Lee (IndustriALL Global Union), Jerome Lucaes (Rusal), Jean-Pierre Mean (Independent anti-corruption expert), Stefan Rohrmus (Schueco), Josef Schoen (Audi), Neill Wilkins (Institute for Human Rights and Business), Tom Maddox (Fauna and Flora International).

Proxies/Alternates: Jostein Soreide (Norsk Hydro) proxy for Rosa Garcia Pineiro (Alcoa).

ASI Secretariat: Fiona Solomon, Sam Brumale, Krista West

Apologies: Annemarie Goedmakers (Chimbo Foundation), Rosa Garcia Pineiro (Alcoa), Marcel van der Velden (Arconic), Marie-Josée Artist (VIDS - Association of Village Leaders, Suriname), Robeliza Halip (Tebtebba Foundation), Brenda Pulley (Keep America Beautiful).

Invited: None

Documents circulated:

1. Meeting Agenda (including Meeting Action Log)
2. Minutes of previous meeting 10 October 2017 v1
3. Updated Log of Feedback and Comments from 2017 Public Consultation
4. ASI Performance Standard (Version 2, draft 3d WIP)
5. ASI Performance Standard Guidance (Version 1, draft 3d WIP)
6. Alternate Form [Word]
7. Proxy form for this meeting [Word]

Meeting objectives:

1. Adopt minutes of the previous meeting.
2. Discuss and review the suggested revision to the ASI Performance Standard (Version 2, draft 3) and the Guidance (Version 1, draft 3) for Principle 7 (Water), Principle 8 (Biodiversity) and the remainder of Principles 11 (Occupational health & Safety) based on the comments from the 2017 public consultation.

Items discussed:

1. Preliminaries
 - a. Welcome.
 - b. Apologies and proxies received as noted.

- c. **RESOLUTION** to accept minutes of previous teleconference meeting held on 10 October 2017 (*version 1*).
- d. Review of Actions Log – see list at end of Agenda.
 - Action 110 and 117 will be covered during today’s teleconference. Feedback for other key actions will be discussed at the next meeting.

2. Standards Committee Update

- a. **elementAI Pilot Phase** –The Pilot phase has now concluded and officially closed 9 October 2017. Key statistics and feedback gathered during the pilot include:
 - 104 active users have accessed the platform
 - 56 self assessments initiated with 36 for the Performance Standard and 20 for the Chain of Custody Standard
 - 64 Support Tickets were raised with 20 for trouble shooting, 18 requesting access for additional users, 10 relating to clarification about the Standards/Guidance or the Assurance Process and the remainder relating to functionality or suggestions for improvement. Over 95% of support tickets were responded to within 24 hours.
 - Questions re the standards/guidance covered a range of topics with no specific theme. Many questions were related to users not yet being familiar with the suite of documents (i.e. issues covered in the Assurance Manual or CoC Standard) and needing to be pointed in the right direction for available information.
 - The next step is to finalise the auditor dashboard functionality
 - Post-launch, the Secretariat will continue to be the front line response to questions submitted through elementAI.
- b. **Auditor Applications** – The Secretariat is currently reviewing 4 applications from auditing firm.

3. ASI Normative Documents and Public Consultation

- a. **Performance Standard and Guidance on Principle 11 Occupational Health and Safety (*continued from last meeting*)** – Discussed and reviewed remaining (continued from previous teleconference, 10 October 2017) updates and comments related to the remaining Principle 11 Occupational Health and Safety in the ASI Performance Standard (Version 2, draft 3d WIP) and Performance Standard Guidance (Version 1, draft 3d WIP):
 - It was noted that some of the items in the comments log were not included in the teleconference presentation as these were either minor, easy to respond to and did not affect the intent of the standards. However, all comments are noted in the comments log circulated to all Committee members and published on the ASI website.

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
<p><i>Criterion & Guidance 11.1 Occupational Health & Safety Policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition/edits to criterion for policy to recognise Workers’ health and safety rights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. to know fully and completely about the hazards of their work and receive the necessary training, education, and equipment to do it safely; ii. to refuse or shut down unsafe work without fear of reprisals; iii. to fully and meaningfully participate 	<p>At the last teleconference, the proposed changes to criterion 11.1d was:</p> <p>11.1 Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) Policy. <i>The [Entity] shall</i> <u><i>d. Include in the Policy the rights of Workers to understand the hazards and safe practices for their work, and the authority to refuse or stop unsafe or uncontrolled work.</i></u></p> <p>Based on the discussion at the 10 October 2017 meeting and from Action 117 to clarify wording regarding the rights of workers, the following change is proposed:</p> <p>11.1 Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) Policy. <i>The [Entity] shall</i> <u><i>d. Include in the Policy that Workers have the right to understand the hazards and safe practices for their work, and the</i></u></p>	<p>The meaning of the term ‘ ‘uncontrolled’ work was discussed with it being work with risks that was not specifically addressed in the health and safety procedure (for example, the work is not permitted or is not endorsed by the organizations policy).</p> <p>There was a general consensus that uncontrolled is potentially unclear and does not be added to the requirement which should focus simply on whether the work is unsafe.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Remove the reference to ‘uncontrolled’ from the revision in 11.1.</i></p> <p>The response is accepted with the above modification.</p>

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
<p>via Joint Health and Safety Committees (JHSC) and union safety representatives in all aspects of health and safety policies, programmes and procedures – from planning through risk assessment to implementation, including inspections, audits, accident and incident investigations. The only people with the moral authority to assess a risk are those who must face the risk.</p>	<p>authority to refuse or stop unsafe or uncontrolled work.</p> <p>Additional suggestions have been added to the Guidance.</p>	
<p><i>Criterion 11.2 Occupational Health & Safety Management System</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested revision as follows: <i>11.2 OH&S Management System. The [Entity] shall have a documented Occupational Health and Safety Management System that defines roles and responsibilities within the internal responsibility system and considers: materials; tools; equipment; the work environment; job/task design; management and worker priorities, capacity, and decision-making; and is compliant with applicable national and international standards.</i> 	<p>Criterion 11.2 edited to relate the OHS systems with assessed OSH risks, as follows: 11.2 OH&S Management System. <i>The [Entity] shall assess and manage its occupational health and safety risks using have a documented Occupational Health and Safety Management System that is compliant conformant with applicable national and international standards</i></p> <p>Details about the contents of the OHS management system added to guidance including a cross reference to the Guidance for criterion 2.3 Environmental and Social Management Systems.</p>	<p>A comment was raised that the first part of the suggested change narrows the scope of the requirement.</p> <p>An additional concern raised was whether the first part of the suggested change is not consistent with the wording used elsewhere in Performance Standard (i.e. in other parts of the Standard there is reference to just a ‘system’).</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Remove the first part of the suggested change in 11.2 and move it to the Guidance.</i></p> <p>The response suggesting change from ‘compliant’ to ‘conformant’ was accepted.</p>
<p><i>Guidance for Criterion 11.2 Occupational Health & Safety Management System</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include ISO45001 in standards here and/or in guidance, depending on whether DIS2 is approved later this year Wider set of hazards included, particularly wrt psychological health and safety, with additional hazards suggested Suggested additions as follows: <i>Ensure that the assessment of health and safety risks and the identification of actions and controls are conducted jointly, and</i> 	<p>Added to the Guidance the following note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Consider implementing a standardised approach, such as OHSAS 18001 Occupational Health and Safety Management System or ILO-OSH 2001 Guidance on Occupational Safety and Health Management Systems. Typically these cover the following elements:</i> <p><i>Note: ISO is currently developing a new standard, ISO 45001, Occupational health and safety management systems - Requirements, which will be referenced here once available.</i></p> <p>Have added additional hazards to guidance as suggested.</p> <p>Also added to the Guidance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ensure that the assessment of health and safety risks and the identification of actions and controls are documented and that this</i> </p> </p>	<p>Response accepted and no further changes suggested.</p>

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
<i>documented.</i>	<u>process is conducted in a joint effort with Workers (or their representatives) and management.</u>	
<p><i>Criterion 11.3 Employee engagement on health & safety</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worker agency beyond “discussion” should be formalised • Mandate a Joint Health and Safety Committees as suggested: <p><i>11.3 Employee engagement on health and safety. The [Entity] shall have functional and effective Joint Health and Safety Committees, with worker representatives freely chose by the Workers themselves, by which they can raise and discuss Occupational Health and Safety issues with management.</i></p>	<p>Have modified criterion (and Guidance) as follows:</p> <p>11.3 Employee engagement on health and safety. <i>The [Entity] shall provide [Workers] with a mechanism, such as a joint health and safety committee, by which they can raise, and discuss <u>and participate in the resolution of Occupational Health and Safety issues with management.</u></i></p> <p>Have not mandated a Joint Health & Safety Committee as this may not be appropriate in all organisations.</p>	Response accepted and no further changes suggested.
<p><i>Guidance for Criterion 11.3 Employee engagement on health & safety</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add ability to freely choose representatives • Add process for recording actions 	<p>Have modified Guidance for criterion 11.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Workers should ideally be able to <u>freely choose their representatives or in the process...</u></i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>A record of meetings should be maintained, including matters discussed and actions undertaken <u>with clear actions for any action items.</u></i> 	<p>A comment was raised that the addition of ‘freely’ in this requirement weakens other components of the Standard.</p> <p>Several Committee members noted that there is not freedom of association in many jurisdictions; for instance workers in Mexico making a choice under the eye of management or armed guard was given as an example. Another example given was situations were managers provide a list from which workers can make a choice. The inclusion of ‘freely’ was therefore important.</p> <p>Response accepted and no further changes suggested.</p>
<p><i>Criterion & Guidance for 11.4 OH&S Performance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For future revisions to the performance standard, a focus on specific risks may be valuable (as for environmental criteria), e.g. working at height, noise-related risks, ergonomics, wellness & psychological health and safety. • Introduce leading and lagging indicators • Guidance seems to be focused on lagging indicators, there is an opportunity to look at systemic, leading indicators as measures of 	<p>Criterion 11.4 and Guidance has been revised to include leading indicators as well as lagging indicators, as follows:</p> <p>11.4 OH&S Performance. <i>The [Entity] shall evaluate its [Occupational Health and Safety] performance <u>using lagging and leading indicators</u>, compare this with peers and best practices and strive to continuously improve</i></p> <p>The following added to the Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Identify relevant health and safety leading and lagging indicators, according to specific industry guidance, and monitor performance relating to these indicators on a regular basis.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Lagging indicators are the traditional safety metrics used to measure the reactive nature of safety performance. Lagging indicators include injury frequency and severity, lost time and</u> 	<p>There was a comment that specifying lagging and leading indicators is not a necessary change.</p> <p>There was a comment raised that comparing lagging and leading indicators with peers does not add value and may be inappropriate as there may be varying methodology or conditions.</p> <p>ACTION: <i>Make the following change to 11.4: “... with peers and best practices, <u>where available</u>, and strive to continuously improve.”</i></p> <p>Response accepted with above noted change.</p>

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
<p>performance as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify relevant leading health and safety indicators, according to specific industry guidance, and monitor performance relating to these indicators on a regular basis with discussion at the Joint Health and Safety Committee. 	<p><u>workers compensation costs. Leading indicators in safety provide a means to predict performance and used to drive activities that identify hazards, and prevent or control the severity of injuries. Leading indicators include number of safety audits, number or Workers trained, reduction in risk profiles or Worker survey results. Both leading and lagging indicators can help Entities measure and improve its occupational health and safety performance.</u></p> <p><i>o Larger workplaces or organisations often monitor progress against targets and it is noted that smaller business may not always be able to compare its performance with peers.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Performance indicators should be jointly agreed with management and workers (or their representatives).</u> 	

b. Performance Standard and Guidance on Principle 8 Biodiversity – Discussed and reviewed updates and comments related to Principle 8 Biodiversity in the ASI Performance Standard (Version 2, draft 3d WIP) and Performance Standard Guidance (Version 1, draft 3d WIP):

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
<p><i>Principle 8 Biodiversity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general lack of reference to ecosystem services in the standard is surprising, as referring to biodiversity and ecosystem services is fairly standard practice in business-environment discussions. Focusing solely on biodiversity risks focusing solely on endangered species etc... The importance of biodiversity is also defined by the benefits it provides to people, particularly rural people in areas of mines. Propose to quickly revisit the discussion on this topic, as it represents a major shortage in relation to best practice status quo. 	<p>This was a topic of significant discussion in the Montreal Standards Committee meeting, and it was agreed to not include 'ecosystem services' in the current minor revision process, noting that the concept is included for context in the Guidance. It was also agreed to establish a Biodiversity Working Group to work on this in preparation for a future revision.</p> <p>A draft Terms of Reference for the Biodiversity & Ecosystems Services Working Group has been developed and circulation amongst Standard Committee with expertise in Biodiversity:</p> <p><u>Biodiversity and Ecosystems Working Group Terms of Reference (draft)</u></p> <p>Scope <i>Define & establish requirements to manage biodiversity and ecosystem services related impacts for the aluminium supply chain Priority to be given to those supply chain activities with the highest potential impact to biodiversity values and ecosystem services.</i></p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To develop guidance to support implementation of the Biodiversity criteria in the Performance Standard.</i> <i>To review existing Biodiversity related criteria and propose changes/additions to the Performance Standard regarding biodiversity and ecosystem services.</i> <p>For Consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>New WG deals exclusively with the issues that are time-sensitive and need to be addressed before the next major review period (circa 2022).</i> 	<p>A point was raised that in Version 1 of the Performance Standard 'dependencies' was included in the original criteria 8.1 on biodiversity and that dependencies refers in that context to ecosystem services. In order to look at dependencies it was argued that one must do an analysis of ecosystem services in any case. From this perspective, adding ecosystem services at this point in the Performance Standard should not be considered a major change.</p> <p>It was noted that the 'dependencies' reference in V1 was removed from criterion 8.4 in the V2 draft reviewed at the Montreal meeting and then put out for consultation. Summary of these events will be noted at the next meeting.</p> <p>The Chair reiterated that the Standards Committee discussed this topic at length at its Montreal meeting, and that a decision was formally made to not include reference to ecosystem services in the criteria in V2 of the Standard, but to discuss in the Guidance and do further work on the topic through a Working Group.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat to review previous minutes regarding the decision to remove 'dependencies' from the consultation draft of the V2 Performance Standard.</p>

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Include in scope the proposal to expand No Go Areas beyond World Heritage properties.</i> - <i>Alternative approach may be for new Working Group to deal exclusively with expansion of No Go Areas beyond World Heritage Sites.</i> - <i>Membership/participation to be determined.</i> 	
<p><i>Criterion 8.4 Commitment to “No Go” in World Heritage properties</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many other areas that society and leading corporations consider “no go” for the development of industrial facilities and mines. • Initiate discussion to expand the “no go” list to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IUCN category I-IV protected areas and marine protected areas I-V ○ World Heritage Sites & Nominated World Heritage Sites (natural&cultural) ○ Ramsar Sites (wetlands) 1 ○ Core areas of UNESCO biosphere reserves ○ Areas where indigenous peoples live in (voluntary) isolation ○ High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA) ○ Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA standard criteria A-E - v1.0) ○ Operating mines in areas adjacent to the above sights, where these operations will have a direct or indirect impact on these sights. 	<p>8.4 on "no go" is an exact cut and paste from the ICM Mining and Protected Areas Position Statement. However, we have included these aspects as key areas to consider in biodiversity assessments under 8.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) is an example of a tool that can be used as a first step to identify the location of relevant key biodiversity areas. It is designed to facilitate access to up-to-date and accurate biodiversity information to support critical business decisions. It uses a central database for globally recognised biodiversity information including key biodiversity areas and legally protected areas. These include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IUCN category I-IV protected areas and marine protected areas I-V ○ World Heritage Sites & Nominated World Heritage Sites ○ Ramsar Sites (wetlands) ○ Core areas of UNESCO biosphere reserves ○ High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA) ○ Key Biodiversity Areas 	<p>Two issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding the no-go commitment in the Performance Standard beyond World Heritage Sites to include other areas of high biodiversity and legally protected areas • Concern that it is not credible to certify operations inside a designated protected area (noting that there may be differences between legally protected areas and No Go areas but where there is an actual or perceived biodiversity value). It was noted this could create a communications risk for ASI if NGOs started a campaign on it. It was noted that other draft standards (for example, steel) included these broader requirements. <p>It was noted that extending the no-go commitment in the Standard to areas beyond World Heritage Sites would have huge impact on mining companies and their participation in ASI. A decision to make such a commitment would need to go to Board level of these companies, and would be evaluated in terms of the potential commercial disadvantage compared with competitors who did not voluntarily restrict themselves.</p> <p>It was countered that it shouldn't impact a company commercially as they can still operate in protected areas, those sites just couldn't be certified under the proposed addition. The no-go proposal is a binary evaluation, different from a systems type approach where improvements can be made to management of an issue. It was noted that IUCN agreed a resolution in 2016 relating to businesses not starting new operations in all categories of protected areas, though the treatment of existing operations was different (Reference - 2016 IUCN Resolutions, Recommendations and other Decisions, World Conservation Congress held in Hawaii 6-10 September 2016 Resolution/ Recommendation Number WCC-2016-102 <i>Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development</i>).</p> <p>It was raised that the topic was thoroughly considered in the development of the Standard and the Committee should not delay the planned launch. A process has been set out and followed, and it is better to complete it than further extend the time and continue to debate issues – “better done than perfect”.</p>

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
		<p>A compromise was raised that ASI move ahead with launch now and note in the Guidance that this is under review in order that companies can plan and manage risk accordingly. Companies want to progress and start the ASI program, recognising that there will always be improvements that can be made.</p> <p>Several Committee members raised the view that if this is critical to the integrity of ASI the Committee should take the time to review the issue and delay the launch of the program by a couple of months.</p> <p>The Chair noted if the Committee decides to open the process to a major revision, this topic should not be the only one on the table in fairness to topics that other stakeholders are interested in seeing added or expanded. The process must also afford the same level of involvement to interested stakeholders.</p> <p>Secretariat noted that the process for a major revision would need to follow the ASI standards-setting procedure. It would require additional public consultation processes which would need more time than just a couple of months, and more likely 6-9 months.</p> <p>A member also noted that this type of change would have a major impact on the uptake and growth of the ASI standards as the supply chain needs to be able to implement it, starting at the mine site.</p> <p>It was reiterated that if the Committee opens up to make one major change it must open up to other major changes.</p> <p>It was noted that there can always be concerns raised as to potential 'credibility problems', and that these can be either addressed directly or by showing a willingness to address them over time, which was the approach taken in 2014 in the climate area.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted that while the next planned Standard revision is currently framed as to be completed within five years, the Committee could look at a shorter timeframe overall such as 3 years.</p> <p>The Chair noted there are 2 choices in simple terms, and a vote may be necessary in the absence of consensus between groups who wish to finalise the standard by year end as planned, vs those who wish to take more time.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat to define two options regarding the Performance Standard minor and major review with an analysis of pros and cons in a paper to be circulated to the Committee which can be the basis of a voting resolution. Two options put forward are:</p>

Feedback:	Comments & Proposed changes:	Discussion Notes
		<p>a. <i>The Standard Committee continues with the minor revision scope and timelines as planned. Consideration can be given to signals, processes and timing re future work and company activities related to the identified topic/s.</i></p> <p>b. <i>The Standard Committee open a major revision process that can consider the proposed change in the biodiversity area, and other major changes that may be considered important by other stakeholders. A timeline for this process in 2018 would be set out for consideration.</i></p>

- At this time the meeting time ran over and discussion on the remaining Principle 8 and Principle 7 related comments will continue at the next committee teleconference on 8 November 2017. This meeting will commence with a review of the paper outlining the two options regarding the last action.

4. AOB

- No other business.

5. Next Committee teleconferences:

- Next meeting:
 - Wednesday 8 November 2017** – Review paper with minor/major options agreed at the end of this meeting, and continue with review of the public consultation comments for Principle 7 (Water) and Principle 8 (Biodiversity). Other Outstanding action items including the 2 papers on scheme claims and semi-fab/credits will also be scheduled in the agenda.
- Remaining meetings for 2017:
 - Tuesday 21 November 2017 – Target finalisation of normative documents for Board endorsement (and translation)
 - Wednesday 6 December 2017 – Work planning for 2018

ASI Standards Committee Meeting Action Log Summary - (Open and from previous meeting)

#	Meeting	Subject	Action	Assigned to:	Due Date	Status
77	5-7 April 2017	ASI Performance Standard – Ecosystem Services	Convene a Biodiversity WG with biodiversity experts to explore the addition of ecosystem services and legally protected areas in the next revision.	ASI Secretariat / Biodiversity WG (To be convened)	30 September 2017	Open
103	26 Sept 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 5.3	Basis for the 8 t CO ₂ eq per metric tonne incorporated into version 1 of the ASI Performance Standard to be recorded.	ASI Secretariat/ Committee Members that were part of Perf. Std Version 1 development.	25 October 2017	Open
104	26 Sept 2017	Performance Standard Guidance for Criterion 5.3	Secretariat to facilitate expansion of the GHG Working Group's terms of reference to include guidance and methodologies to support Entities throughout the supply chain establish context based and	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Open

#	Meeting	Subject	Action	Assigned to:	Due Date	Status
			meaningful GHG reduction targets, based on scientific rationale.			
109	26 Sept 2017	Performance Standard for Criterion 6.7	Secretariat to work with the Committee Members with smelting activities to review the proposed changes to the criteria in 6.7 with due consideration to the comments received.	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Open
111	10 Oct 2017	Guidance for Performance Standard Criterion 9.4	Incorporate the agreed change in the Guidance for criterion 9.4 about what is meant by 'expansions' for major changes.	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
112	10 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 10.1	Review the suggested change related to Applicable Law in both 10.1a and 10.1b to allow for cases where applicable law curtails freedom of association and collective bargaining.	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
113	10 Oct 2017	Guidance for Performance Standard Criterion 10.1	The language in the Guidance added for criterion 10.1 to be reviewed to ensure it is presented as supporting guidance.	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
114	10 Oct 2017	Performance Standard and Guidance for Criterion 10.5	Revise the suggested inclusion for criterion 10.5 to include cases where worker representatives do not exist, and confirm that there are examples of worker representatives in the Guidance.	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
115	10 Oct 2017	Migrant Workers	Review the relevant criteria in the Standard to ensure that the basic rights afforded to Workers that are citizens of the country or State in which they work in explicitly cover Migrant Workers and that the particular risks faced by Migrant Workers are addressed in the Guidance. Expand the definition of Workers in the Glossary to specifically mention Migrant Workers.	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
116	10 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 10.7 Expansion	Review Criterion 10.7 to capture the additional risks associated with remuneration and include reference to relevant ILO convention(s).	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
117	10 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 11.1d	Review the wording of criterion 11.1d to clarify the rights of workers and their obligation /authority to act in unsafe conditions.	ASI Secretariat	8 November 2017	Closed
118	10 Oct 2017	Additional Standards Committee Meetings	A meeting invitation will be sent to the Committee for an additional meeting (if required) for Wednesday 8 November 2017.	ASI Secretariat	11 October 2017	Closed
119	25 Oct	Performance	Remove the reference to	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Closed

#	Meeting	Subject	Action	Assigned to:	Due Date	Status
	2017	Standard Criterion 11.1d	'uncontrolled' from the revision in 11.1.			
120	25 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 11.2	Remove the first part of the suggested change in 11.2 and move it to the Guidance.	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Closed
121	25 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 11.4	Make the following change to 11.4: "... with peers and best practices, where available, and strive to continuously improve."	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Closed
122	25 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Criterion 8.1	Secretariat to review previous minutes regarding the decision to remove 'dependencies' from the consultation draft of the V2 Performance Standard.	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Open
123	25 Oct 2017	Performance Standard Minor vs Major Review	<p>Secretariat to define two options with an analysis of pros and cons in a paper to be circulated to the Committee which can be the basis of a voting resolution.</p> <p>Two options put forward are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Standard Committee continues with the minor revision scope and timelines as planned. Consideration can be given to signals, processes and timing re future work and company activities related to the identified topic/s. b. The Standard Committee open a major revision process that can consider the proposed change in the biodiversity area, and other major changes that may be considered important by other stakeholders. A timeline for this process in 2018 would be set out for consideration. 	ASI Secretariat	25 October 2017	Open