

## ASI Workers' Rights and Health & Safety Working Group – Call 3 – Meeting Notes

30 June 2025

### Agenda points:

1. Welcome and introductions (5 min)
2. Focus areas for today's discussion (5 min)
3. Breakout discussions (2 groups, 2 discussion points) (45 min)
  1. Informing and Engaging Workers
  2. Occupational Health and Safety
4. Shareback and plenary + OHS Specific Risks (30 min)
5. Next steps (5 min)

### Participants

Jørgen Hanson (Norsk Hydro ASA)  
Ashley Magowan (Constellium)  
Andrew Mathewson (ERM-CVS)  
Lineke Roberts (Nespresso SA)  
Andree Treffenfeld (Treffenfeld & Co. GmbH)  
Thomas van Haaren (DNV)  
Christina Widmann (GF Casting Solutions AG)  
Piet Wit (Chimbo Foundation)  
Paul Marsh (IAI)  
Pietro Gomes (Qatalum)  
Dorothea Flockert (Speira)  
Kendyl Salcito (Nomogaia)  
Modh Khalil Saeed (Aluminium Bahrain)  
George Efthimiou (Ipto SA)

ASI Secretariat – Chelsea Reinhardt, Chris Bayliss, Lia Vacheret

### Discussion Notes:

#### 1. Welcome and Opening

- ASI shared an update on the project progress so far. Since the last call in late May:
  - Comments have been received from Working Group (WG) members on the draft version on Sharepoint – all comments will be read and incorporated/ responded to by ASI
  - Technical expert review has been completed on the draft version and feedback has been incorporated or flagged for WG members to be aware of
  - Standards Committee discussion took place on 19 June, focusing on the cross-cutting sections (Governance/ Management Systems/ Responsible Sourcing and Due Diligence)

- ASI shared a reminder on the role of the Leading Practices – which are intended to be additive and flexible. Entities achieving some (to be determined) threshold of relevant leading practices in a specific content area would be able to make some type of differentiated claim. This is still very much under discussion with the ASI Standards Committee
- ASI gave an overview of comments made already on the Informing and Engaging Workers and OH&S Sections of the draft.
  - The WG noted that there is an inherent bias towards the ‘safety’ element of H&S and ASI will need to ensure equal focus is made on health
  - ASI explained that incorporating more outcome-based criteria was one of the initial objectives for the revision, to complement the management system focus in the current standard/ drive positive impacts and improve credibility of the standard.
    - In many WG discussions so far, we are finding that outcome-based requirements are hard to design in practice – they may not be applicable to all companies, may not accurately reflect the outcomes we want to see, data may not be available, etc.
    - WGs are encouraged to not only critique the initial (draft) outcome-based indicators, but also to suggest new or better examples

## 2. Breakout discussions

- The Working Group split into two groups to consider requirements in the *Informing and Engaging Workers* section and the *Occupational Health and Safety* sections
- On the health and safety breakout topic, the group discussed the following:
  - The requirement around having a medical screening and surveillance programme needs to be mindful not to lead to any health-related discrimination (guidance note to be added)
  - For health and safety, there were a number of concerns about the feasibility of the proposed outcome-based indicators (such as zero fatalities or demonstrated improvements in health and safety outcomes). Suggestions were made to focus more on leading indicators and to consider serious injuries
  - 10.6 on ‘stop and ask’ approach for safety was recommended to be moved to a minimum expectation
- For Informing and engaging workers section: the breakout groups noted the importance of confidential and anonymous worker feedback.
  - There was a suggestion made to remove proposed requirement 2.2 on reporting the number of workers participating in the voluntary feedback process, as this could create some tension against the ‘voluntary’ nature of the
  - It was noted that there is a lot of complexity within these indicators – many different processes for soliciting worker feedback (available to all workers? Only some? How to quantify feedback?). It was noted that clear and detailed guidance and assurance manual information will be important
  - From an auditing perspective, Entities don’t get to see the grievance mechanisms of their suppliers. An auditor might get to speak to a few contracted workers on site

but not get the full story (can't speak to the actual contracting organization). If the Entity required their suppliers (of contract workers) to actually report on how grievance mechanism is being used, this would be very helpful. As an example, contracted workers might be prevented from joining trade unions, but this wouldn't necessarily get picked up during a standard audit

- Feedback from the breakout discussions will be reflected in the drafts, circulated to the Working Group, and taken to the Standards Committee for discussion at their next call (17 July). The Canva boards used to capture comments will be left open for WG members to add further comments if they wished to.

### 3. Plenary on OHS Specific Risks

- ASI asked the Working group to step back from the detail and to consider the desired a desired outcome for the Working Group, expressed by a member of the WG during the first call: "*Workers are given a workplace with appropriate conditions e.g. that is free from disrespectful behaviours & safe for them to work there.*"
- Would the requirements as drafted achieve this? Were there any gaps?
  - A Working Group member raised the need to include requirements on the risk of workplace reprisals/retaliation (for example, due to coercive union or management structures, etc).
  - Other Working Group members supported this inclusion - **ASI Secretariat would consider this and incorporate into the working draft**
- On outcome-based criteria – a Working Group Member raised that if the outcome is number based, Entities may focus on achieving a number and there is less focus on the underlying intent/ concept. One indicator we might consider is a low level of grievances reported, with a high level of disciplinary action.

### 4. Next steps

- Feedback will be incorporated into the working draft and shared out with the Working group ahead of the next meeting
- Next call – 28 July 1400 – 1530 CEST. The focus will be on *Wages and Working Hours + Non-discrimination/equal opportunities*.
- Doodle polls would be sent for calls in September October, November.