

## ASI Community Rights and Participation Working Group – Call 4 – Meeting Notes

4 September 2025

### Agenda points:

1. Welcome and updates
2. Discussion / feedback: Community Impacts criteria
3. Discussion/ feedback: Resettlement/ Displacement criteria
4. Next steps

### Participants

WG:

Daniel O Campo

Linn Aakvik

Cathal Doyle

Kendyl Salcito

Rania Tayeh

Alessandra Ribeiro

Francesca Fairbairn

Johannes Danz

Hugo Bonilla

Yuri Herder

Lauren Brandi

ASI Secretariat:

Chelsea Reinhardt

Mark Annandale

Lia Vacheret

Jessica Pereira

### Discussion Notes:

#### 1. Welcome and updates

- The working draft had been updated since the last call
- Input from selected civil society organisations has been received and will be incorporated

#### 2. Community Impacts Criteria

- The Working Group discussed the proposed criteria related to Community Impacts and raised the following points:

- Cumulative impact assessments – do these relate only to new projects/ major changes, or are they intended to be ongoing/ iterative? Clarity is needed here. It was discussed that if the intent is only to carry these out for major projects, this is already covered under the Management System section; this should be cross referenced and noted
- But, it may be useful to also include some periodic updates or review of the impact assessments
- ASI clarified that this is intended to put more emphasis on the cumulative impacts; intent is for new projects/ major changes (aligned with V3, but with more specificity)
- **Action:** *ASI to incorporate impact assessment elements together with the related criterion under Management Systems, and include a clear cross reference under Community Impacts section*
- It is important to mention vulnerable and marginalized groups specifically with respect to identifying impacts
- Consider structuring requirements around outputs – e.g. all requirements related to ESIA's should be in one place, as this makes it easier for Entities/ auditors
- On FPIC – ASI explained that following the last Working Group call, we are drafting some options to look at applying FPIC based on severity of impacts
  - i. It was noted by one WG member that presence of Indigenous Peoples alone should not automatically require FPIC in all cases
  - ii. The WG expressed input in having a further discussion on when FPIC is triggered/ relevant
  - iii. **Action:** *ASI to offer a dedicated side call specifically on FPIC for Working Group members (or colleagues) to join*
- On Community Impacts for mid/ downstream Entities:
  - i. Are waste pickers/ informal scrap suppliers covered under affected communities? Likely not, this might fit better under 'Responsible sourcing of scrap' section in Responsible Sourcing – however, expectations specifically for waste pickers are not included and more input is welcome on this issue
  - ii. The group discussed whether 'other workers' e.g. those in the area of the operational site might be included (e.g. downwind and affected by emissions to air)
  - iii. It was questioned whether ASI intends this to a risk-based approach for community impacts or to apply to all sites? E.g. some vertically integrated companies may determine these issues are only material at upstream sites. ASI explained that we have not intentionally changed the approach from V3 on this relevance; generally it would be applicable at site level but auditors might use a risk lens and not assess if risks are low

iv. It was discussed whether affected communities will always be aware of the grievance mechanism, and how this requirement (8.4) could be audited in practice. **Action:** *ASI to adjust language and move specific reference to grievance mechanism to guidance*

- NOTE: Additional specific comments provided by the Working Group during the call via the virtual whiteboard will be reviewed and incorporated directly into the update of the draft requirements

### **Resettlement/ displacement**

- The Working Group discussed the proposed criteria related to Resettlement and Displacement and raised the following points:
  - Guidance on 19.1 is not feasible – companies in reality will not be able to fully address all impacts; consent to close may not be possible
  - Legal processes can take a long time – need to consider the timeframe of ongoing processes
  - In some cases, communities and affected peoples do not engage with the process (or just take the money offered and leave) – what happens in those cases?
  - ASI explained that at least during the audit, the process should ensure that affected community perspectives are represented – either directly or via community advocates or NGOs, etc.
  - When it comes to providing compensation, important to consider if this benefits the whole household or only head of household. Consider bringing in more reference to vulnerable/ marginalized groups or gender lens (or emphasis on ‘household welfare’?)
- NOTE: Additional specific comments provided by the Working Group during the call via the virtual whiteboard will be reviewed and incorporated directly into the update of the draft requirements

### **3. Next steps**

- Two further Working Group calls to be scheduled for October
- Separate side meeting on FPIC to be offered for those interested