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Today’s presentation

Sam Brumale (ASI, Director of Standards and Assurance)
• Overview of the ASI Standards setting and revision process
• Project timeline for the 2020 – 2021 review cycle
• Scope of the revision

Topic Update: ASI Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Working Group (BESWG)
• Perspectives from civil society and mining participants in the BESWG
  • Giulia Carbone (IUCN, Deputy Director Global Programme on Business & Biodiversity)
  • Miles Prosser (Executive Director, Australian Aluminium Council)
ASI Principles for Revision of Standards

- The process for the development, approval, publication and revision of ASI Standards is described in the ASI Standards Setting procedure.
- The Principles stated in the Procedure commits ASI to:
  - be open and transparent in its standards development and review process
  - encourage input from a wide range of stakeholders
  - treat input from stakeholders with integrity and respect
  - report publicly on submissions received, including how comments have been addressed in subsequent drafting
  - align with the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice (Standards Setting Code, Impacts Code and the Assurance Code).
The ASI Board initiates standards review process. The revision cycle (normally 5 years) was brought forward by the Board to commence in 2020, as per the approved ASI Strategy.

- Standards Committee responsibility is to oversee the process and approve the final content.
- Board then adopts the Standard.
Standards setting & reviewing – who’s involved?

• All participants are invited to express their views (this includes public consultation processes).
• Allocate sufficient time to discuss and debate decisions.
• Allow additional time and/or information to be requested to help facilitate a consensus outcome.
• General agreement through positive indication of acceptance or the absence of sustained opposition.
Revision Timing

- Time for public consultation, and review of diverse input is time-consuming, but important:
  - RJC Code of Practices 2019 - 18 months
  - Alliance for Water Stewardship – 2 years

- 2 year program for ASI revision cycle
2020-2021 Standards Review Schedule
Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Working Group (BESWG) Update

Giulia Carbone, IUCN
IUCN experience in the WGBES

• IUCN participation is driven by the need to strengthen the biodiversity commitments.
• This need is now an imperative as recently reinforced by the IPBES report.
• Precise proposals that can support ASI the leadership position:
  – Reintroduction of ecosystem services
  – Introduction of No Net Loss and Net Biodiversity Gain as targets for the Biodiversity Action Plans
  – Expansion of the No Go for mining in Categories I to VI
“The health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever. We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.

The Report also tells us that it is not too late to make a difference, but only if we start now at every level from local to global. Through ‘transformative change’, nature can still be conserved, restored and used sustainably – this is also key to meeting most other global goals.

By transformative change, we mean a fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values.”

IPBES Chair, Sir Robert Watson.
Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Working Group (BESWG) Update

Miles Prosser,
Australian Aluminium Council
A mining industry perspective on biodiversity issues

June 2019

Miles PROSSER

Australian Aluminium Council
ASI context

• Identify good producers.
• Other materials.
• Range of situations – country, scale, ownership.
• Multi-issue – sustainability.
• Stage of implementation – less than 2 years in
Our view on biodiversity

- Key issue.
- Could be an effective differentiator.
- All aspects - not just ‘where to mine’.
- Risk management approach.
- Not a crisis for ASI.
- Interacts with other issues (social, indigenous).
Our view on ‘no-go’ areas

• Only one tool of many.
• Countries are inconsistent.
• Implementation difficulties:
  • See other standards.
• Opposite of ‘no-go’ isn’t ‘go’.
• Doesn’t protect biodiversity values.
What have we proposed?

• Strengthened risk management approach.
• Respecting all legally protected areas.
• Extend no-go areas – IUCN Ia, Ib, II and III.
• Progressive rehabilitation and better reporting.
• Willingness to discuss.
What else is needed?

• More time.
  • Ecosystem services.
• Compromise.
• All voices – social, indigenous.
• Context:
  • Role of Governments.
  • Other materials and standards.
Aluminium Stewardship Initiative
Biodiversity Considerations
So what’s in the scope of the revision process?

Environment, Social, Governance Issues:
- Biodiversity
- Indigenous Peoples rights
- Human Rights
- Bauxite residue

Bauxite mining
Alumina Refinery
Aluminium Production
Semi-Fabrication
Product Manufacture/Use
Recycling

Biodiversity
Indigenous Peoples rights
Human Rights
Bauxite residue

GHG Emissions
Spent Pot Lining
Dross

Material Stewardship
Human/Labour Rights

Material Stewardship
Human/Labour Rights

Material Stewardship
Human/Labour Rights

ASI Performance Standard
ASI Performance Standard - Guidance
ASI Chain of Custody (CoC) Standard
ASI Chain of Custody (CoC) Standards - Guidance
ASI Assurance Manual
ASI Claims Guide
Looking Ahead:
Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum

IPAF representatives: Nicholas Barla (India), Heather Rose (Australia), Mark Annandale (Australia)
Looking Ahead:
2020 ASI AGM Week: Longkou, China

Fiona Solomon, ASI
Chunjming Dong, Sunlight Metal Consulting
2020 ASI AGM – Longkou, Shandong Province, China

Hosted by the Nanshan Group
Closing Thanks

Daniel Weston, ASI Board Chair
Thanks to 2019 ASI AGM Supporters and Sponsors