

ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

6 October 2025 (Virtual)

Attendance ([Standards Committee](#)):

Francesca Fairbairn
Gesa Jauck
Guilbert Ebune
Hao Wu
Jasminka Jaksic
Louis Biswane
Nikolas Kelling
Olivier Néel

Marcel Pfitzer
Mohamed Sankon
Mike Danielson
Patrick Brading
Piet Wit
Soumah Ibrahima Dominique
Vishwas Kamble
Yuri Herder

Apologies:

Abiba Diallo
Abu Karimu
Bruce Han
Jason Koevoet
Margriet Biswane
Marina Wangurra

Penny Laurance
Jose Rubio
Nicholas Barla
Vincent Ekka

ASI Secretariat Participants

Chelsea Reinhardt, *Standards Director*
Chris Bayliss, *Climate Change & Decarb'n Director*
Laura Brunello, *Standards Coordinator*

Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, *Circularity Research Manager*
Klaudia Michalska, *Supply Chain Analyst*
Lia Vacheret, *Standards Manager*

Agenda Overview:

1. Welcome and agenda
2. Recap of Chain of custody and claims
3. Climate draft
4. Nature draft
5. Taking stock and next steps

1. Welcome and agenda

- The Secretariat went through the agenda for today's call and recapped the previous call on 02 October:
- Drafts discussed on 02 October: Responsible Sourcing, Circularity, Bauxite Residue and Tailings Management, and CoC (briefly)
 - No major red-flags identified with the drafts so far – focus now should be on asking the right questions for consultation
 - Agreed changes:
 - Responsible Sourcing:
 - Remove separate criterion on due diligence for scrap and fold into guidance

- Add guidance around stakeholder engagement (risk assessment and due diligence process)
- Circularity:
 - Remove social LCA requirement (currently leading practice)
 - Focus consultation questions on the value/ impact of environmental LCAs

2. Recap on Chain of Custody (CoC) and Claims

- The Secretariat summarized the discussion from 02 October on Chain of Custody and the work of the CoC/ Claims working group so far.
- Current work focuses on evolving the existing CoC standard to:
 - streamline the group mass balance model, and
 - add an additional site level mass balance option.
- Adding a site level mass balance option has created additional complexity and questions. There is a perception that site level will deliver more value (e.g. rigour/ transparency) to downstream Entities compared with a group mass balance approach. But, as both are mass balance and involve mixing of ASI and non-ASI material, more input is needed to help define what this additional value might be.
- And, this needs to be balanced against the complexity of having a site level mass balance option (which likely would require full supply chains to opt in to site level mass balance)
- The Committee discussed the options for adjusting the current CoC model and raised the following considerations:
 - It was noted that the current certification scopes for CoC are very broad, and that consolidation of CoC groups could be considered
 - One participant (downstream) voiced support for the option to eventually replace group mass balance with site level mass balance, and said they will do more work to help articulate the specific additional value that would deliver to their Entity
 - It was noted that the current, highly flexible approach to group CoC was designed for, and delivers the greatest benefits to large and integrated companies
- **Next steps:** The Secretariat explained that these options will be further discussed by the CoC and Claims Working Group on their next call on 20th October and invited any SC members who are interested to participate
 - The Secretariat noted that the aim is to help define the options and trade-offs clearly, and use the public consultation to get useful input to inform the next stage of CoC development

3. Climate draft

- A SC member and participant in the Climate Working Group (WG) introduced the proposed changes in the Climate draft. The WG process has emphasized differentiation and materiality (in line with the revision objectives set by the Standards Committee). These are reflected in the latest draft, which includes differentiated expectations for emissions reduction depending on position in the value chain.
- The Committee discussed the proposed changes in the Climate draft, including:
 - One participant queried whether this draft reflects a weakening of the V3 decarbonisation pathway. It was clarified that performance along the 1.5 degree aligned pathway would move to leading practice. But, Entities are still required to map their pathway and set science-based targets. At minimum requirement level, differentiated expectations for emissions reduction are

set by position in the value chain. Since performance along a 1.5 degree aligned pathway on average would require about 4% reduction per annum, these minimum requirements are set somewhere between 0 and 4 (currently at 1% for lower upstream emitters and 2% for higher emitters and downstream consumers, but open to adjust based on further consultation.)

- There was some discussion on where the boundary would be drawn between higher and lower emitting upstream Entities; in order to avoid over complication it was suggested to mirror the leading practice smelter threshold (wherever it lands)
- These adjustments reflect the structural challenges that Entities are having in meeting the current 5.3 criterion (performance along a 1.5-degree pathway), and the fact that the Secretariat does not want to have another exemption process required for V4.
- On smelter thresholds – it was explained that so far the weight of opinion in Working Group among all classes of stakeholder has been in favour of maintaining the existing 11 t CO₂e/t Al threshold, which effectively excludes new coal fired smelters.
 - The Committee discussed the trade-offs between adjusting this threshold: raising it would potentially increase the number of new smelters (though a significantly higher number would require a substantial increase in the threshold) who could participate in ASI certification (and make important improvements not only in emissions but other areas); on the other hand, adjusting the threshold could negatively impact the credibility of the ASI certification
- For requirements that require continual improvement (e.g. improvements in recycled content), is there a risk that this puts a ceiling on progress e.g. those who are already achieving an optimal/ maximum level cannot improve further? It was recommended that if an Entity meets a leading practice in this context, perhaps the minimum requirement in that case could not apply ([Action: ASI to look into possible adjustments](#))

4. Nature draft

- The Secretariat summarised the changes proposed with the next version of the Nature draft, and outlined issues which are likely to be more controversial or focus points for consultation. These include:
 - Hardwiring more rigorous biodiversity impact assessments and management plans for specific supply chain activities (mining/ refining) + other Entities with material impacts
 - What requirements on biodiversity (if any) should apply to Entities who do not have material impacts – e.g. recycling facility in an industrial park
 - Introducing restrictions around bauxite mining operations in critical habitats
 - Adjusting the definition of Protected Areas
- The Committee discussed the proposed changes, raising the following points:
 - *On biodiversity measures for sites without material impacts:* There were mixed views on this – with some Committee members saying that efforts such as bird boxes can feel tokenistic and could detract from resources/ impacts elsewhere and advised applying a materiality perspective instead. If these requirements remain, it was suggested they should not apply to all sites within an Entity, but only a subset of priority sites. However, other members felt that these requirements are still important (even if impacts on biodiversity are limited, the site should still take these into consideration). It was also noted that at least some mid/ downstream Entities already have biodiversity management plans and disclosures in place.
 - ASI clarified that in the latest draft, the minimum requirement has been adjusted to include either biodiversity improvements for the Entities own sites/ local communities/ OR in the value chain (cross reference to the Responsible Sourcing section).

- **Action:** Committee members to weigh in on this section in the current draft; ASI will go through collective comments and adjust the draft based on further input if required.
- *On No Net Loss targets* – it was clarified that No Net loss or Net Gain is required for all high impact Entities, this is part of the biodiversity management plan criterion
- *On ecosystem services* – this has been moved to a separate criterion to give more emphasis but there is more mainstreaming to do. **Action:** ASI to ensure there is a clear cross reference to ecosystem services under Community Benefits (Community Rights section)
- *On the definition of protected areas:* The Committee supported the proposed new definition; noting that this does not change the overall approach to Protected Areas. It should help to make the definition clearer and more consistent.

5. Next Steps

- The Secretariat shared the anticipated project timeline heading into the first of two public consultation rounds in 2026. If there are no major concerns or substantive changes required for the drafts, the aim is to have SC approval in mid-December, and launch the consultation mid-January 2026
- This means the last substantial content reviews will take place between 23 October – 10 November
- Standards Committee members are requested to each review 1-2 sections – ensuring that workloads are balanced but each draft is carefully reviewed
- ***The Co-chair emphasised the importance of all SC members taking time to review the drafts at this crucial stage of the project***
- Next Steps:
 - Final Workshop (4 of 4) will take place on Tuesday 21 October 1300 – 1500 (CEST), covering Community Rights and Mine Closure
 - Subsequent SC meetings – Mid November and mid-December (approval of consultation draft); doodle poll to be shared