

ASI Nature Working Group

29 April 2025

Attendance, highlighted in Green

Apologies, highlighted in Yellow

Marc Banks	Capral Aluminium
Dr. Jasminka Jaksic	Emirates Global Aluminum
Débora de Oliveira Rizzati	Companhia Brasileira de Alumínio
Annemarie Goedmakers	Chimbo Foundation
Stephen White	Alcoa
Nikolas Kelling	Audi AG
Patrícia Carla Guerrero	Companhia Brasileira de Alumínio CBA
Paul Marsh	IAI
Genevieve Campbell	Re:wild and IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group
Dmitry Pavlov	Rusal
Jayden Flint	Rio Tinto
Fernanda Tonizza Moraes	Proeco
Faizan Mehmood	Qatalum
Ibrahim Al-Mulla	Qatalum
Patrick Brading	Norsk Hydro ASA
Al-Maha Al-Majid	Qatalum
Shyamalendu Mohapatra	Hindalco Industries Limited
Emilia Poljakov	Aluminium Norf GmbH (Alunorf)
Elisangela S Matos	Ardagh Metal Packaging – South America
Felipe Martínez Rodríguez	Hydro
Heidi Northshield	European Aluminium
Tuna Alper Sezgin	Self-employed (on behalf of TÜV Rheinland)
Christine Carey	CRC
Mayra Barral	Hydro
Fred Pearson	Constellium
Annie Borla	Loreal
Piet Wit	Chimbo Foundation and Daridibo

Chelsea Reinhardt, *Standards Director*
Chris Bayliss, *Climate Change and Decarbonisation Director*

Mark Annandale, *Director of Research and IPAF Adviser*
Laura Brunello, *Standards Coordinator*

Agenda points:

- Welcome and introductions (10 mins)
- Standards Revision – process and role of Working Groups (15 min)
- High level proposed changes in content and structure (10 min)
- ASI Nature Working Group – focus areas, outcomes, early areas for input (30–35 mins)
- Working Group housekeeping (5–10 min) – scheduling and next steps

Discussion Notes:

1. Overview of the ASI Standards Revision and WG processes and role

- Participants were asked to think about objectives for the Working Group process – what are they hoping to accomplish? See responses below:

<i>“What is one key objective you would like to see this Working Group accomplish?”</i>
No Net Biodiversity Loss
How to assess biodiversity impacts of aluminium mines
Reviewed and updated standards guidance – gaps
Practical outcomes are achievable for all facilities across the value chain
Address gaps in nature protection/conservation
Better aligned measurement and reporting
Define nature needs for mines and downstream operations as they are different in requirements
Strong alignment through the industry in the topics discusses
A shared view of Ecosystem Services, mitigation of impacts during operations and re-establishment of agreed options after closure
Rigorous, auditable expectations to ensure that ASI certified companies protect Biodiversity and Ecosystems to the maximum extent possible – not just on paper
Alignment with existing frameworks
Consideration of cumulative impacts

- The ASI team presented an overview of the ASI Standards Revision: context, key objectives, timeline and multi-stakeholder development process. The ASI team then presented the role and process of the ASI Working Groups, emphasizing the need for active engagement and contribution from participants.
- The ASI team shared some early proposed changes around the Performance Standard structure and content, including cross-cutting overarching themes like Governance, Responsible Sourcing/Due Diligence and Management Systems, and

other structural changes such as separating out requirements from criteria and exploring different performance levels. More discussion on the nature of differentiation is still to come – for now the main emphasis is on getting the level of ambition right for Level 1 (minimum expectations for compliance); everything beyond that can be grouped for now under 'leading practice'

- a. It was clarified that current thinking is that all requirements would be applicable for Level 1 (minimum expectations for compliance) – however, for leading practice it's possible that Entities might be recognized for meeting only some of the applicable requirements (e.g. 2 out of 4)
- b. ASI team shared a strawmodel draft (overview) of the topics under Nature and asked for any missing elements or gaps. A participant asked about Waste Management, and it was clarified that that has been moved under the circularity topic area as it ties into resource use. For those resources that cannot be repurposed/reused might sit in the Nature topic area. WASH and water governance was noted as another possible gap.
- The ASI team presented the focus areas for the Nature Working Group, and the proposed changes and feedback on the Nature draft so far.

2. **Discussion topic: upstream vs downstream differentiation.** Participants were asked to think about what the biodiversity requirements for downstream companies should be, notably in terms of relevance and level of ambition. The following points were raised in the discussion:

- i. Direct ('within-the-fence') impacts may be limited for a downstream company, but the sourcing of material/services may have a significant impact on nature and communities. It was also noted that Ecosystem Services is different from Biodiversity alone (it's about looking more holistically at impacts), and ASI would need to provide good guidance on Entities on how to understand and manage those ES impacts.
- ii. Need to adjust the requirements for downstream on what will actually drive impact. Requirements like increasing vegetation and creating pollinator habitats don't drive as much change, compared to a requirement for increasing land use efficiency within operations.
- iii. It was suggested that ASI could consider an approach that sets out poor practices to be avoided, rather than only emphasizing good practice in criteria'.
- iv. One participant noted that the expectations should be similar upstream and downstream. In this view, companies need to understand their impacts on biodiversity and manage them, regardless of size or position in the value chain.

One participant expressed the view that this requirement (take actions to improve biodiversity) has shifted to a 'no net loss/net gain' conversation, rather than an impact management conversation, and so may not fit within this impact identification and mitigation criterion

3. **Public disclosure requirements.** The group was asked to provide initial thoughts on what role public disclosures play in the ASI Performance Standard and what value do they add. The following points were raised:

- a. A participant noted that for some downstream processes (i.e. extrusion) public disclosure related to water or biodiversity are relatively immaterial for them.
- b. Public disclosure is something that a lot of companies already need to do regardless of ASI Certification. Environmental Management Plans published are often very generic and exist as a box-ticking exercise. It was suggested that disclosure of the *management* of any impacts identified would add more value.

4. Next steps

- a. The next Working Group call will be held the last week of May
- b. Drafts or pre-reads will be shared two weeks ahead of the call to allow participants to have time to review and provide feedback