

ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

30 September 2025 (Virtual)

Attendance ([Standards Committee](#)):

Bruce Han	Penny Laurance
Francesca Fairbairn	Piet Wit
Gesa Jauck	Sankon Mohamed
Hao Wu	Soumah Ibrahima Dominique
Jose Rubio	Vishwas Kamble
Nikolas Kelling	Yuri Herder
Olivier Neel	

Apologies:

Abiba Diallo	Nicholas Barla
Abu Karimu	Guilbert Ebune
Jason Koevoet	Michael Danielson
Louis Biswane	Patrick Brading
Marcel Pfitzer	Vincent Ekka
Margriet Biswane	
Marina Wangurra	

ASI Secretariat Participants

Chelsea Reinhardt, <i>Standards Director</i>	Lia Vacheret, <i>Standards Manager</i>
Chris Bayliss, <i>Climate Change & Decarb'n Director</i>	Laura Brunello, <i>Standards Co-ordinator</i>
Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, <i>Circularity Research Manager</i>	
Klaudia Michalska, <i>Supply Chain Analyst</i>	

Agenda Overview:

1. Welcome and agenda – approval of meeting minutes
2. Progress update and pre-consultation input and revisiting revision objectives
3. Materiality and downstream certification options
4. Management system/governance feedback
5. Worker's Rights
6. Next steps/AOB

1. Welcome and agenda – approval of meeting minutes

- The Secretariat went through the agenda for the meeting.
- The minutes from 17 July 2025 meeting were **approved**.

2. Progress update, pre-consultation input and revisiting revision objective

- The Secretariat gave an update on the timeline and progress to date for the Standards Revision, including input from Working Groups (WGs) and technical experts. It was clarified that most WGs will finish this first phase of work in October or November. The plan is to reconvene them mid-2026, to help look at consultation feedback that has come through in the first round of consultation.
- The Secretariat gave a summary of changes in the draft PS, including areas where the bar has broadly been raised or lowered.

3. Materiality and downstream certification options

- A participant stressed the need to critically assess the applicability of some requirements in the cross-cutting sections, considering that some foundational requirements apply across the full value chain, not only upstream (e.g., documenting the Area of Influence)
- On downstream certification, the Committee discussed how proposed V4 changes may affect engagement and certification of downstream Entities. A participant asked about implications for Chain of Custody (CoC) processes and claims, emphasising that downstream actors should remain certifiable, with requirements recognising their specific position in the value chain.
- It was noted that aluminium products often do not reach the final consumer directly and that many downstream companies are multi-material; therefore, proportionate expectations for downstream entities may be reasonable. While some see limited perceived value of certification from a downstream perspective, others highlighted its importance for value-chain transparency and performance, reflecting mixed views.
- **Action:** Proceed to public consultation to seek further views on the recommended option. This option would allow downstream Entities to certify (as a minimum) against requirements in *Responsible Sourcing, Climate, and Circularity* -representing the areas of highest materiality/ where downstream can play the greatest role in sector change. Downstream Entities would have the option to certify against other sections of the Performance Standard if they wished.

4. Management system/governance feedback

- The Committee discussed the draft sections on Management Systems and Governance and raised the following points:
- On business changes: A Standards Committee member asked how this is being reported and/or checked. The Secretariat confirm this is part of the Self-Assessment in *elementAI*, so the responsibility is on the Entity to identify and report these ahead of a certification or surveillance.
- On consultation: In the current draft, multiple sections require consultation with affected communities (for example, on environmental plans). This rigid approach can lead to a risk of forced or imposed consultation; some communities may not want to consult on all areas or wish to focus only on priorities from their view. At the same time, affected communities need to be informed and understand key risks to be able to identify their priorities.
 - The Committee discussed the possibility to include the option for communities/ stakeholders to feed in on their priorities, and to take more of a flexible or risk-based approach to consultation. Information-sharing should be a clear prerequisite for meaningful consultation. Another participant noted that in some contexts (i.e. industrial sites), affected communities can become

- hard to identify, leading to artificial, box-ticking compliance. They recommended a risk-based approach to avoid inflating the Standard.
- An IPAF participant stressed that local communities are often among the most affected yet the least consulted. Impacts extend to wages and workers’ rights; companies need to ensure these concerns are addressed
 - A participant proposed that consultation requirements be explicitly linked to materiality and risk assessment, so expectations are proportionate to the issues at stake.
 - **Action:** ASI will work further on some options and present them to the Standards Committee.
- On disclosure of Emergency Response Plans: several members of the Committee generally agreed that public disclosure (even at summary level) is not necessary for Emergency Response Plans and does not drive impact. Instead, the focus should be on making sure that impacted communities have key information they need to anticipate and respond in an emergency. It was noted that in many emergency situations, it will be public authorities who take over responsibility for the emergency response. ASI noted that the current requirement is relatively auditable, whereas proposals to share only key information may be more challenging to implement and audit consistently; this is something to consider.
 - **Action:** ASI to draft revised wording options around communicating key elements of emergency plans to affected communities and other key stakeholders and share back with the Committee for views.
 - On changing standard review cycles (for management plans, etc): Several participants suggested there is no clear rationale to adjust these from 5 years currently down to 3 years. It was explained that reviewing or updating plans can take years so this could add burden without clear benefit. There was broad agreement that any change would need to be justified by a material reason.
 - **Action:** Keep a five-year default (provided no trigger for more frequent review) unless a material justification is provided.

5. Worker’s Rights

- The Secretariat gave a brief update on changes in the Worker’s Rights draft and outlined the issues which are likely to be focus points during public consultation: shifting from minimum to living wages, and overtime hours. A SC member commented from her expertise on the topic of living wages and working hour and reinforced the importance of maintaining credibility of the ASI standards. The Secretariat invited the Committee to raise any major comments or concerns on the draft.
- An IPAF participant shared his experiences of wage inadequacy for some companies and noted that ASI requirements could help drive payment of at least statutory minimums; he also gave examples of elevated risks where work is outsourced to contractors working for very low wages.
- A participant in the chat suggested aligning working-hours limits with ILO expectations, proposing a benchmark of no more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, subject to feedback during public consultation.
- The Committee discussed the important link between living wage issues and working hours – in contexts where wages are not high enough, workers are more likely to want/ need to work overtime hours to achieve a decent quality of life
 - It was clarified that the current draft does not impose a maximum on working hours for minimum requirements (only at leading practice). But there is a new requirement to monitor and report on overtime beyond 60 hours/ week (including monitoring health and safety impacts), and to implement measures to reduce structural overtime

- **Action:** ASI to do further research on living-wage benchmarks and how this maps against countries with ASI certified Entities.
- **Action:** SC members are requested to review the draft and add any further comments/ feedback by end of the week. It was reminded that the draft remains open for comments until the end of the week.

6. AOB/ Election of Standards Committee Co-Chair role

- The Standards Committee co-chair acknowledged the input and hard work from Steve Bater in his role as co-chair during his time at ASI. His technical expertise and committed approach were greatly appreciated by ASI and the Standards Committee, and he will be greatly missed.
- The Standards Committee **agreed to nominate Patrick Brading as co-chair (Industry) for the Standards Committee.**
- The timings for the upcoming SC workshops will be extended to allow the full 2 hours, given the extent of content to cover.