

ASI Workers' Rights and Health and Safety Working Group – Call 1

28 April 2025

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 Workers' Rights/Health & Safety 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. Standards Revision – process and role of Working Groups

- ASI team presented an overview of the working group procedures and standard revision timeline
- 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>
Labor Rights / DE&I
Raise the level of ambition for the ASI Performance Standard, while making it clearer and more accessible for companies
Better protections for workers through auditable and verifiable criteria.
Impacts from US landscape
Strengthen the standard
Incorporate latest developments in H&S recommendations into the standards
Bring transparency to current Health & Safety biggest challenges in our industry and provide guidance along the value-chain
Occupational Health & Safety level improvement and Decent work.
Simplified health and safety standards incorporating sustainability principles
best available standard for social management
Sharpen requirements, making it easier to see performance and not only process.
safe and healthy work environments
Making the standards more accessible within the US landscape
Revision would capture all current needs and expectations
standard should be auditable
Advance worker rights in alignment with international norms and peer voluntary sustainability standards
Clarity
Better alignment on indicators that can be used to measure and audit H&S performance

2. High level proposed changes in content and structure

- a. ASI team shared some early proposed changes around the Performance Standard structure and content, including 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’
- b. It was clarified that current thinking is that all requirements would be applicable for Level 1 (minimum expectations for compliance) – however, for leading practice its possible that Entities might be recognized for meeting only some of the applicable requirements (e.g. 2 out of 4)

3. Outcomes under Workers Rights and Health and Safety

- a. Participants raised the following outcomes they would like to see in terms of the positive benefits of certification against the ASI Performance Standard (with respect to Workers’ rights/ H&S)

<i>“What is one key objective you would like to see this Working Group accomplish?”</i>
Reduced risk in daily processes for workers – leading to less accidents
Increased adoption of ASI certification by (new) companies thereby increasing (global) worker protection
Awareness on right PPE and provision to all workers
Proven engagement of Top Management to H&S
reduce communication gap between workers and management team to improve health and safety at work (workers participation, top management engagement)
Focus on leading vs lagging indicators
Increase company-wide awareness of occupational illness risk across the production chain. Not just safety- also REALLY health
serious accidents and fatalities (SIF) prevention
Strong social improvements for workers across the value chain. Living wages and balanced working hours
Fair working conditions – especially with regards to overtime
People at the heart. Genuine care rather than licence to operate or regulatory requirements
clearly formulated requirements for the management system and performance
psychological safety at work (people feel safe to speak), psychosocial risks identification and management
Equitable access to employment for local populations
Better alignment on indicators for measurement and auditing H&S performance

- b. ASI team shared a strawmodel draft (overview) of the topics and criteria under Workers Rights and asked for any missing elements or gaps:
- c. It was suggested that Human Rights is a key focus area and to be mindful that we don’t move away from this headline concept with the reframing around workers’ rights

4. **Discussion topic: risk-based approach.** Participants were asked to think about some of the pros/cons and considerations around taking a risk-based approach to child labour/ forced labour requirements. The following points were raised in the discussion:
 - i. Limitations of audit approach are well established (snapshot in time); however, even where monitoring and management systems are set up, there are still benefits to audit process and learnings
 - ii. There is value in having different approaches for different risk levels – similar to water topics, where withdrawals in a water stressed area will have much greater impacts than in a different context
 - iii. Subcontracting is a major challenge – easy for companies to hide behind subcontractors and not take full responsibility. This will need to be considered in the revision
 - iv. There are likely to be challenges and stakeholder pushback in determining levels of risk – for example around child labour in the US context
5. **Discussion topic – Health and Safety issues.** The group was asked to provide initial thoughts on how additional detail and specificity on OH&S related risks could be better integrated into the Performance Standard. The group discussed the options (ranging from guidance references only, to incorporating specific risks/ practices into PS criteria directly). The following points were raised:
 - a. There was some general support for this type of approach –as a single commodity standard, ASI can add value with more specific and clear expectations around health and safety areas. For example, smelters are a major risk area (caustic burns, etc.) and issues are different at different types of facilities
 - b. Currently many ASI auditors may not have detailed knowledge to explore specific health and safety risks and performance, unless they have specific expertise (e.g. hygienist). There is value in providing more detail for auditors to use as a reference
 - c. More specific requirements could help simplify the audit process – however, need to be mindful of the overall risk that standards get more complicated
 - d. Views differed on whether it would be better to integrate elements of specific H&S risks directly into the standard or to leave as guidance (or a compromise solution – e.g. external reference table). More discussions will be carried out with the working group on this
 - e. The importance of consolidating and aligning with other standards was mentioned; it was noted that CMSI has a similar approach around tiered expectations/ performance levels
6. **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