ASI Standards Committee – Minutes – Meeting, Perth, Australia

Date: 25 - 26 May 2018

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:
Co-Chairs: Annemarie Goedmakers (Chimbo Foundation), Jostein Soreide (Norsk Hydro)
Committee Members: Alexey Spirin (Rusal), Catherine Athenes (Constellium), Catherine Munger (Rio Tinto), Christophe Boussemart (Nespresso), Giulia Carbone (IUCN), Jean-Pierre Mean (Independent anti-corruption expert), Karl Barth (BMW), Marcel van der Velden (Arconic), Marie-Josee Artist (VIDS - Association of Village Leaders, Suriname / IPAF), Neill Wilkins (Institute for Human Rights and Business), Nicholas Barla (Odisha Indigenous Peoples Forum, India / IPAF), Rosa Garcia Pineiro (Alcoa), Stefan Rohrmus (Schueco), Steven Bater (EGA), Tom Maddox (Fauna and Flora International).
Alternates: Mark Wielga (NomoGaia) as alternate for Kendyl Salcito (NomoGaia), Tobias Kind (WWF) as alternate for Justus Kammueller (WWF)
Proxies: Chairs for Pamela Ravasio (EOG), Christophe Boussemart for Rolf Varis (IGORA), Jostein Soreide for Alexey Sprin (Rusal) for voting purposes.
ASI Secretariat: Fiona Solomon, Sam Brumale, Krista West
Apologies: Adam Lee (IndustriALL Global Union), Hugo Rainey (Wildlife Conservation Society), Justin Furness (Council for Aluminium in Building), Justus Kammueller (WWF), Kendyl Salcito (NomoGaia), Pamela Ravasio (European Outdoor Group), Rolf Varis (IGORA).
Invited: None

Documents circulated
1. Meeting Agenda (including Meeting Action Log)
2. Minutes of previous meeting 8 May 2018 v1
3. ASI Oversight Mechanism (draft 5, 1 May 2018)
4. ASI Monitoring & Evaluation Plan (draft 6 , 17 April 2018)
5. Alternate Form [Word]
6. Proxy form for this meeting [Word]

The PowerPoint presentation slides were also circulated.

Meeting objectives:
1. Agree and finalise the ASI Oversight Mechanism
2. Agree and finalise the ASI Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
3. Discuss and review the recommendations from the Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Working Group
4. Review and discuss progress from other Working Groups
5. Recommend next steps to the Board regarding the biodiversity criteria, timeline and implications.

1. Preliminaries
    a. The co-chairs welcomed everyone to the meeting and all present introduced themselves.
    b. Apologies and proxies received were noted.
    c. The objectives and approach for the meeting were presented.
    d. <u>RESOLVED</u> to accept minutes of previous teleconference meeting held on 8 May 2018 (*version 1*).
    e. There were no open actions to present or discuss other than those included in the meeting agenda.

2. Standards Committee Update:
    a. **Terms of References** - The Standards Committee Terms of Reference taken from the ASI Governance Handbook was presented (refresher for continuing members / orientation for newly elected members). The terms include:
        - Approve new and revised ASI standards and guidance for adoption by the Board
        - Other areas of focus:
            o **Assurance** model, including auditor accreditation and impartiality of certification
            o **Claims**
            o **Monitoring and Evaluation** (M&E) of impacts
        - Convene Working Groups on specific issues
        - Regular updates to the Board as needed
        - Guidance on stakeholder consultation and engagement during standards development processes
        - Roles involved in standards setting including the ASI Standards Committee, the ASI Board, IPAF, ASI Secretariat, Working Groups, Legal Committee and input from other stakeholders.

    b. **Governance and Culture –**An overview of the expected governance and culture for the Standards Committee was presented. Good governance and culture involves:
        - A shared responsibility for good meetings by having:
            o Focused agenda
            o Papers delivered in advance
            o Prepared participants
            o Effective meeting chairs
            o Relevant, robust, inclusive and respectful debate
            o Participants that can balance the need to express individual thoughts with maintaining the overall effectiveness of the group.
        - Making consensus based decisions, wherever possible. Consensus is defined as general agreement, through (i) positive indication of acceptance of the proposed decision; or: (ii) the absence of sustained opposition to the proposed decision by any one or more participants. Thus consensus can be achieved even where there is not unanimity.
        - Participants in the ASI Board, Committees and Working Groups should attempt to reach consensus using a process which takes participants' views into account and reconciles any conflicting arguments. This process should:
            o Ensure all participants in a proposed decision are invited to express their views (in ASI, this includes public consultation processes).
            o Allocate sufficient time to discuss and debate decisions.
            o Allow additional time and/or information to be requested to help facilitate a consensus outcome.
        - ASI does have procedures for voting in the absence of consensus. This may be where
            o a decision is time sensitive, and/or

- o differences will or may not be resolved by allowing further time and/or information than has already been given during the consensus-building process, and/or
- o there has been insufficient participation in the consensus-building process to determine whether a broad consensus exists.
- Consensus-building is still the priority. For example, on the biodiversity issues, the Board has indicated it would like to see the Working Group and Standards Committee take the necessary time to work towards consensus.
- The Committee then participated in a team building exercise, "Blind Drawing" which aimed to reflect on effective communication and interpretation. Reflections included:
  - o It helped to break down communications of the drawing instructions into small parts
  - o Sharing a visual on what was being drawn made for an easier process and more nuanced instructions
  - o Once an artist had developed an assumption about what was being drawn, it tended to not change
  - o Cross-cultural and language assumptions can create challenges.

3. **ASI Oversight Mechanism**
   a. The updated draft ASI Oversight Mechanism (draft 5, May 2018) was presented. The layers of protection featured in the Mechanisms aimed at ensuring credible accreditation and certification decisions were discussed . The ASI Oversight Mechanism circulated for final comment:
   - Aligns with oversight requirements in *ISO/IEC 17011:2006 Conformity assessment – General Requirements for Accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies* and the *ISEAL Codes of Good Practice for Assuring Compliance with Social and Environmental Standards*.
   - Consistent with ISEAL proxy model for accreditation
   - Allows for witness audits of Accredited individual Auditors at Member facilities
   - Incorporates an Independent Accreditation Review Panel:
     - o 4-6 independent technical experts in the field of accreditation and certification audits, and issues pertaining to the aluminium supply chain
     - o Appointed by the ASI board for two year terms (up to 3 consecutive terms). One IARP position is reserved for a person familiar with issues related to the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum. All must be independent from ASI activities (including Board, Committee and Working Groups) and decision making including provision of consultancy services and/or audits for Members
     - o Responsible for periodically reviewing accreditation and certification processes and decisions in relation to awarding, maintaining, extending, reducing, suspending and/or withdrawing ASI accreditations and ASI Certifications:
       - – Activities of the ASI Secretariat in relation to ASI Accreditation and ASI Certification
       - – Activities of ASI Accredited Auditors in relation to ASI Certification Audits
       - – Effectiveness of internal systems and procedures, including auditor guidelines
       - – Impartiality of decision-making for accreditation and certification, as defined by the impartiality requirements in the international standard ISO/IEC 17011
     - o IARP will conduct a review two months after the end of each year by sampling evidence, including audit reports, oversight assessments, accreditation approvals and issue of certifications. Matters relating to sensitive and commercial confidentiality will be addressed prior to the start of the review
     - o Findings may result in continual improvement actions (e.g. changes to the processes and procedures) and significant findings may trigger as investigations

about accreditation or certification decisions in accordance with the Complaints Mechanism. Note that the IARP cannot change a certification or accreditation decision.

- Continual improvement feedback (e.g. training, review of procedures, etc.)
- Linked to Complaints Mechanism for formal investigation arising from significant issues
- Outcomes of internal and external audit quality assurance publically reported (ASI Annual impacts Report & issues based).

Committee Discussion:
- ASI will publish an audit report oversight assessment procedure with a checklist of items to confirm have been addressed as per the Assurance Manual.
- There was a suggestion to have other member organisations, such as IUCN, nominate experts on particular topics (e.g. biodiversity), in a similar fashion to the potential for Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum (IPAF) nomination to the Independent Accreditation Review Panel (IARP) which was noted in the circulated draft. It was clarified that the concept of 'nomination' was not about having an institutional representative, but to complement the required skills and competencies on certification/accreditation processes with knowledge about key risks in the value chain.
- It was agreed to clarify this in the document and add into the criteria for participants on the Independent Accreditation Review Panel (IARP) to have both accreditation/certification knowledge plus discipline knowledge relevant to ASI Standards e.g. hotspot areas. This would include knowledge of Indigenous Peoples' rights and/or access to a network that brings understanding of the local nature of some issues, and for other issues such as biodiversity etc. The Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum / Standards Committee would be consulted as appropriate. The ASI Board approves the appointments. More details on the actual setting up of the IARP will be shared in due course.

It was noted that ASI chose a proxy accreditation model, which is valid under the ISEAL Assurance Code, because it was more cost effective and enables learning to be internalised. Other accreditation bodies could become involved in future, for example through witness audits.

b. **RESOLVED** to recommend that the ASI Board approve the ASI Oversight Mechanism, subject to the actions noted above.

4. Working Groups Update:
   a. **Biodiversity Working Group -** Summary and key highlights from the in-person meeting held on 24 May 2018 (Minutes to be prepared and circulated to the Committee) include:
      - A morning session on ecosystem aimed to understand more about the concepts of ecosystem services and then to discuss problems and review how this may work for the aluminium value chain. At the end of this session, the aims were achieved and the WG agreed to work on integration of the concepts of ecosystem services into the ASI Performance Standard. Presentations from Working Group members about ecosystem services were delivered:
        o Tom Maddox (FFI) – *An Introduction to Ecosystem Services*
        o Steven Bater (EGA) – *IFC Performance Standard 6 and Biodiversity Management*
        o Mark Annandale (USC) – *Integration of Ecosystem Services by FSC*
        o Bernt Malme (Hydro) – *Hydro experience linking Ecosystem Services and Bauxite Mining*
      - The afternoon session was about protected areas and no-go expansion also aimed to provide a better understanding of the concepts and the challenges for bauxite mining activities. At the end of this session, it was agreed that the mining industry members would review and strengthen the controls for bauxite mining in the ASI Performance

Standard in relation to protection of biodiversity. Presentations from Working Group members were delivered:

- o Tobias Kind (WWF) – *WWF presentation on Aluminium Overlay Analysis*
- o Giulia Carbone on behalf of Stephen Woodley (IUCN) – *Protected Areas and Biodiversity Management*
- o Giulia Carbone (IUCN) – *KBA's: What they are and the development of the Business Guidelines*
- o Djawa Yunupingu (Gumatj Aboriginal Corporation / Gulkula Mining) – *Indigenous Protected Areas and Bauxite Mining in East Arnhem Land*

- • There was discussion but no agreement reached by the end of the Working Group meeting on the addition of key biodiversity areas in the no go list of the Performance Standard.
- • Further details of the agreements and actions from the BES WG meeting are covered in Agenda item 6.
- • It was noted there had been no opportunity yet to talk with the Working Group about indicator 6 in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

b. **Human Rights Working Group -** Summary and key highlights from the latest Human Rights WG meeting (minutes previously circulated) and workshop held during the AGM Week on 24 May 2018 include:

- • Working Group TOR objectives revised to clarify that the scope of human rights includes labour rights.
- • Tools that assist with HR due diligence (which includes aspects of labour rights) as well as tools/guidance to help with transparent reporting to be developed
- • Discussion about the human rights-related M&E indicators commenced with comments about the importance to provide members and auditors guidance about how to recognise good HR due diligence processes and/or FPIC processes.
- • The Thursday morning session on human rights during AGM Week had been a rich discussion involving upstream and downstream companies, NGOs, IPAF and the Association for Professional Social Compliance Auditing (APSCA).
- • Topics covered included human rights due diligence processes; gender, violence and corruption; the challenges of social auditing in difficult contexts; and the importance of company culture and the kinds of practical steps that can be taken.
- • It was agreed that 'respect' for human rights is an ongoing process, not a state. This will be further emphasised in ASI training.
- • Future Working Group activities identified included:
  - o A series of briefing papers/webinars that dig deeper on topics such as security and human rights and good transparency reporting.
  - o An ASI library of good modern slavery statements.
  - o Calling out best practice examples, for example including that in the Summary Audit Reports.
  - o Adding engagement in multi-stakeholder initiatives as an indicator of transparency and engagement in the ASI M&E Plan.
- • Participants noted these could underpin ASI's role as a change agent, beyond a 'compliance' model. ASI can play an important role as a safe space to share – it was noted that companies never make progress alone.
- • It was agreed that the human rights theme should continue as a strong feature at the 2019 AGM as well.

c. **Greenhouse Gas Working Group -** Summary and key highlights from the latest Greenhouse Gas WG meeting (minutes previously circulated) include:

- Discussion on Objective 1 recommends that its purpose be refocused to recognise the overall contribution of aluminium through both the production and use phases when replacing more GHG-intensive materials.
  - COP21 agreement applied globally and ratified by signatory nations rather than individual companies
  - Study would benefit from input and information sourced from IAI
  - the focus can be the average emissions per tonne of aluminium produced versus the average for non-certified entities
  - the use phase of aluminium where use of aluminium over other products may result in a positive impact to GHG relatively
- Initial agreement about the need to normalise GHG data as per the draft M&E Plan GHG-related indicators. Suggest that data is tagged to production output.

Committee Discussion:
- It was noted that Science Based Targets are within the Working Group scope to generate additional guidance. It is already included in the Standards Guidance as one methodology for setting time-based targets.
- It is anticipated that there will be increased discussion of the GHG criteria for the next revision of the Performance Standard. The current focus is on aluminium smelting as the major emitter, but there are good reasons to extend this to the whole value chain including recycling, to get a more complete picture.
- The Working Group are still reviewing the options for a study looking at the 2deg pathway. It was noted that industry associations can also play a significant role in the process. It is intended to also share the study proposal with the Standards Committee, and where ASI resources are required, it would need Board approval for the funding model. It is intended to publish the study at its conclusion.

d. **Environmental Impacts Working Group -** Summary and key highlights from the latest Environmental Impacts WG meeting (minutes previously circulated) include:
- Discussion about context based target setting initiated. Information currently in the Performance Standards Guidance to be used as a starting point for review.
- Discussion about the environment-related indicators in the draft ASI Monitoring & Evaluation Plan commenced. The importance of being able to normalise data for annual reporting and over time amongst different facilities, recognising variability in factors such as number of members reporting, number of facilities and physical and/or process factors such as ore quality, all of which affect the amount and/or characteristics of waste generated (bauxite residue, SPL and dross) was noted. It was recommended to start with normalisation of data to production output
- It was noted that current indicators focus on the wastes from upstream parts of the supply chain. Other environmental issues addressed in the Standard such as air quality or water and hydrogeology were not presently reflected in the draft M&E Plan. The initial aim for the M&E program is to focus on the subset of issues where there is the greatest impact, known as the 'hot spot issues'. However, these should be revised over time.

Committee Discussion:
- It was noted that sound and light can also impact biodiversity.

e. **Recycling and Material Stewardship Working Group -** Summary and key highlights from the latest Recycling and Material Stewardship WG meeting (minutes previously circulated) include:
- WG agreed that the focus moving forward should be to assist SME's with responsible sourcing practices, and to align with and ultimately implement the ASI Standards.

- o WG will build on work that European Aluminium doing stemming from its sustainability roadmap
- o Focus on support for SMEs to help them align with and ultimately implement the ASI Standards, in relation to responsible sourcing and associated due diligence.
- o WRAP (a UK based organization) identified as another source of tools developed to support sustainability initiatives in SME's
- Discussion about the recycling and material stewardship-related M&E indicators noted:
  - o For #10 the value of understanding the effectiveness of LCA's, and not just number of LCA's conducted and published.
  - o For #11 it was recommended that data on mass of recyclable scrap may require some normalisation and/or supporting commentary
  - o For #12 the group noted that the trick will be to differentiate ASI flows from the total global aluminium mass flows in the supply chain, and that the collaboration with IAI will assist

  Committee Discussion:
  - It was noted that ASI is working with several smaller members in this first year of implementation to help support their participation and gather feedback for how to provide more general support and accessibility for smaller businesses.
  - It was noted that mass data (indicator 11) is being collected as an indicator of CoC integrity. It was agreed (in the discussion under section 5) to integrate the current Indicator 11 under indicator 12 as data collected to support models of global and regional mass flows. Indicator 11 will instead focus on recycling rates of key markets that are participating in ASI.

f. **Standards Benchmarking and Harmonisation Working Group -** Summary and key highlights from the latest Standards Benchmarking and Harmonisation WG meeting (minutes previously circulated) include:
  - It was noted that the WG can also play a role in the assurance and oversight based on outcomes from the oversight reviews (IARP, ISEAL reviews, etc.)
  - The importance to have other schemes recognise the ASI certification program was discussed:
    - o Collaboration with APSCA for cross recognition of social compliance auditors
    - o Initial discussions with BRE Group about Ethical Labour Sourcing Standard and its certification program.
  - Building upon recognition of external standards:
    - o ISO 45001:2018 Occupational Health & Safety Management Systems
    - o ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems for ASI CoC Standard (although not directly aligned with ASI Standards but could be an extension to the ASI Maturity Model)
    - o Other Standards as they come on line such as Responsible Steel standard and the Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA)
  - It was also suggested that the means to harmonise with other internationally recognised standards that are not part of an independent certification program, such as for example, standards set by IFC (International Finance Corporation), World Bank or EBRD (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development)

  Committee Discussion:
  - It was noted that the ASI Board has had discussions about 'Beyond Aluminium …' which could involve in future looking at other commodities within ASI.

5. ASI Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

a. The updated draft ASI Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (draft 6, 17 April 2018) was presented. The ASI Monitoring & Evaluation Plan is a requirement for ISEAL membership and a core part of ASI's long-term strategy. See ASI's Theory of Change at https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/theory-of-change/).
   - Overview of draft ASI Monitoring & Evaluation Plan including theory of change
   - All 30 of the M&E program level indicators including the proposed timing and collection processes were presented and discussed:

   Committee Discussion:
   - It was agreed that a calendar year reporting cycle is good because this aligns with regulatory and other reporting. A 6 month window from the end of the calendar year was agreed – report by 1 July after the end of the previous calendar year.
   - It was agreed to break down some of the multi-faced indicators into 1a, 1b etc.
   - It was noted that ASI will develop some data quality procedures and share these with the Standards Committee, to supplement the M&E process.
   - It was noted that the some of the desired impacts vs outcomes vs pathways in the theory of change needed further discussion – these could be reframed to be more externally focused. Some are too truncated as a description.
   - The connection to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the Plan was a positive way to align ASI's relevance.
   - Longitudinal data will be valuable over time.
   - Further Working Group and IPAF input will be sought on indicators as noted.
   - GHG:
     o Absolute data gets collected for context alongside intensity data.
     o Context can also be provided with uptake data for the Standard.
     o A question was raised re Indicator 2, how not to duplicate data also reported for CoC. The GHG Working Group will consider this further.
   - Wastes:
     o ASI to check indicators against new Performance Standard language for bauxite residue management to ensure intent is capture e.g. change focus to reduced use of lagooning.
     o It was noted that data needs to be specific to production to be able to normalise – this needs to be better defined in the M&E Plan.
   - Water:
     o While water was not identified a hotspot issue and is context specific (e.g. high rainfall vs low rainfall environments), the Environment Working Group could consider this further and whether a consistent methodology could be used because in certain areas these impacts may be of significance.
   - Biodiversity:
     o Further input to be sought from the Biodiversity Working Group.
     o It was noted that data collection may not be through the audit.
   - Human rights:
     o Indicator 9: need to clarify whether includes contractors/seasonal workers. Distribution by region could be useful, though noted that this indicator is an ISEAL common indicator.
     o Should include something about grievance processes e.g. awareness and/or use, as this is core to the UN Guiding Principles alongside due diligence. This could be at the company level and/or at the ASI level. It should not be seen as negative that they are used.
     o Indicator 7: to be tabled for further discussion by the Human Rights Working Group. Could be captured quantitatively and qualitatively through non-conformances and through a case study approach.
   - Material stewardship:

- o Indicator 11: identify the purpose e.g. to oversee CoC integrity, and move under 12, with pre- and post- separated. A new 11 could focus on recycling rates for key markets, as noted earlier, and link in with association data.
- Uptake:
  - o Indicator 14: add 'from launch' before 'date of membership'.
  - o Change 'low barriers to entry' to 'accessibility of standard'.
  - o While 'companies ASI have influenced' is an interesting idea to measure e.g. through implementation of CoC due diligence, quality data would be very difficult to collect.
- Assurance:
  - o Indicator 22: NCs by auditor could be part of the Oversight Mechanism rather than M&E.
  - o Closure of NCs more relevant than number per year, given different entities are audited each year. Look at number per year by audit type.
  - o Indicator 21: CoC Certification entities – consider how to capture scale through scope changes, as these are not necessarily at a single facility level.
- Continual improvement etc:
  - o Indicator 25: as noted earlier: add engagement with other multi-stakeholder initiatives as 25b.
  - o Consider how to express 'completeness' / proportion of the company certified. Number of plants may not be a good indicator for some sectors/parts of the value chain, and may not be able to be aggregated. For example, a percentage of how many ASI members have certified their whole company could be skewed by more single facility companies.

Action: ASI Secretariat to update M&E Plan drawing on the above inputs and seek further input from WGs/IPAF.

b. A discussion of the ASI Summary Audit Reports was added to the agenda. Points noted included:
- Civil society organisations want more information in the reports, for example, where to find the location on a map, whether IUCN red list species are involved.
- An ASI Certified company noted that this was the most transparent audit report they have done and see it as good practice. Stakeholders should be conscious that there are confidentiality aspects, and audit reports are not a communications tool like a Sustainable Development Report, but a summary of a process used to issue certification against an agreed standard.
- More detailed published audit reports would mean the process takes longer and is more expensive. It is also more challenging for an auditor to try to anticipate what a range of different stakeholders might wish to know more about. Audits are not designed to give a total picture of a company but to carry out an assurance process.
- A suggestion was for ASI to also add Sustainable Development Reports and similar to member's pages on the ASI website, to provide more context for stakeholders that want to dig deeper. There are already other measures of transparency in place, including the disclosure requirements in the Performance Standard.
- It was also noted that stakeholders can also ask questions directly of certified members to find out more information.

6. Biodiversity Focus Discussion
   a. Detailed agreements and actions arising from the Biodiversity & Ecosystem Services Working Group were presented. The discussion was divided into two parts:
   - Integration of Ecosystem Services
   - Protected Areas and no-Go Commitment.

b. **Ecosystem Services**:
- At the conclusion of the discussion on integration of ecosystem services into the ASI Performance Standard, the following matters and actions were agreed:
  - The objectives for the session were met in that there was a clearer understanding about the concepts of ecosystem services. Further, the challenges regarding how this may work for the aluminium value chain were discussed and a way forward was agreed.
  - There was general agreement for the integration of Ecosystem Services into the next version of Performance Standard as soon as possible.
  - It was also agreed that detailed guidance tailored for the aluminium value chain was required and that a program about the integration of ecosystem services into the ASI Performance Standard is established and cover:
    – Development of tools for the implementation and auditability of ecosystem services. This will include a review of existing literature, standards and toolkits and undertake case studies
    – Definition of the scope, objectives and expectation for Ecosystem Services in the aluminium value chain
    – Recommended wording changes for the Performance Standard for ES integration
    – Development input for the Performance Standard Guideline.

- The following actions were also identified:
  1. Working Group Participants to identify information to help with the program to integrate ecosystem services into the ASI Performance Standard.
  2. The ASI Secretariat to establish timeline/s with fixed and variable components for the integration of ecosystem services into the ASI Performance Standard. (Note that this action will be part of the broader ASI Performance Standard review process and include changes regarding protected areas and no-go expansion - refer to item 6c.)

c. **Protected Areas and No-Go**:
- At the conclusion of the discussion on protected areas and expansion of the no-go commitment in the ASI Performance Standard, the following matters and actions were agreed:
  1. It was agreed that the mining industry members of the Working group to review the existing Performance Standard criteria and identify potential improvements, including those that could address the concerns behind the no-go proposal. Input to then be provided to the Working Group for further discussion. This study was to be funded by the Australian Aluminium Council and IAI.
  2. The ASI Secretariat to identify potential resources for a mapping study on the layers of bauxite reserves and sensitive biodiversity e.g. Guinea, Australia, etc.
  3. IUCN to organise a webinar presentation by WCMC and IBAT on protected area mapping and databases for ASI.
  4. As an extension to the action for the ASI Secretariat to establish timeline/s with fixed and variable components for implementation of the concepts on ecosystem services into the Performance Standard, the timeline/s will also allow for proposed & agreed changes relating to protected areas and no-go commitment. (Note that this action will be part of the broader ASI Performance Standard review process.)

Committee Discussion:
- Reflections shared by Standards Committee participants on the Working Group meeting included:

- o Various stakeholder expectations of the consensus-building process
- o The value of including relevant expertise in the Working Group
- o The role ASI can realistically play vs unintended consequences
- o How quickly ASI should move on a divisive issue
- o The unknown credibility risks of action/inaction on these issues
- o The merits of a risk-based approach vs a no-go approach
- o The continued importance of FPIC within the context of protected areas
- o There were views expressed both ways about the expansion of the no-go criterion. There was no agreement reached regarding the path forward for this issue however there was agreement about the importance of the issue:
  - – Agreed actions as noted have identified the next steps in the process. It was agreed to share a terms of reference for the industry members' action with the Working Group
  - – The outcomes from the Working Group will come to the Standards Committee
- o ASI's Antitrust Compliance Policy applies to any data sharing from companies relating to current or future production
- o There are three main aspects to revision timelines:
  - – Information gathering
  - – Discussions in the Working Group and Standards Committee
  - – Public consultation periods
- o Biodiversity is not the only topic of relevance to the next revision (e.g. human rights), and the frequency of revisions should be considered accordingly
- o A 5 year revision cycle would need to end in 2022, so would formally commence in 2020. A transition period of 1 year where both standards are available for certification is normal practice. A certification period of 3 years for companies certified in 2018 and 2019 was also noted for context.
- o The value of having face-to-face discussions, noting that ASI operates within a constrained budget; additional company funding could be a potential option to support a second meeting in 2018.

7. **AOB, recap and reflections**
   a. No other business was raised.
   b. Actions for Members and Secretariat noted above in the minutes and members reminded to provide feedback about the Monitoring & Evaluation Plan.
   c. Chairs and participants reflected on the discussion, agreements and matters for ongoing resolution arising from this meeting, as well as the whole AGM Week. Reflections included:
   - Means for an additional face-to-face meeting for the Standards Committee and Biodiversity & Ecosystem Services WG in 2018. Board asked to review budget noting budget has been set, and there is a recognised need for additional resources for staff to support implementation and growth of the program
   - Future reviews to the Standard need to consider other areas beyond Biodiversity such as Human Rights and Working Conditions.
   d. The Chairs thanked all for their participation and the ASI Secretariat for the work preparing and facilitating the entire AGM Week.

8. **Next Committee teleconference –** *3 July 2018*