

ASI Standards Committee In-Person Meeting – Discussion Notes

17 July 2025 (Virtual)

Attendance ([Standards Committee](#)):

Steve Bater	Olivier Néel
Francesca Fairbairn	Patrick Brading
Hao Wu	Penny Laurance
Gesa Jauck	Piet Wit
Guilbert Ebune	Wenjuan Liu
Jason Koevoet	Yuri Herder
José Rubio	Judith Pietschmann
Louis Biswane	Marcel Pfitzer
Michael Danielson	
Bruce Han	
Nikolas Kelling	

Apologies:

Abiba Diallo	Nicholas Barla
Abu Karimu	Soumah Dominique
Marina Wangurra	Sankon Mohamed
	Vishwas Kamble

ASI Secretariat Participants

Cameron Jones, <i>Director of Risk and Assurance</i>	Klaudia Michalska, <i>Supply Chain Analyst</i>
Chelsea Reinhardt, <i>Standards Director</i>	Jessica Pereira, <i>Human Rights Specialist</i>
Chinelo Etiaba, <i>COO and Membership Director</i>	Vicky Tran, <i>Assurance and Claims Manager</i>
Chris Bayliss, <i>Climate Change & Decarb'n Director</i>	Lia Vacheret, <i>Standards Manager</i>
Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, <i>Circularity Research Manager</i>	

Agenda Overview:

1. Opening and approval of June meeting minutes (5)
2. Follow-up discussion on differentiation (20)
3. Thematic subgroup discussions (45)
 - Climate
 - Nature
 - Circularity
 - Workers Rights
4. Plenary: Community Rights – key changes proposed (10)
5. Plenary: Chain of custody and claims (15)
6. AOB and next steps (10 min)

1. Opening and Progress update

- The ASI Secretariat welcomed the new SC members Nikolas Kelling (Audi) and Mr Bruce Han (CITIC Dicastal Co) as well as Hao Wu (Rocky Mountain Institute) who joins as an alternate for Wenjuan Liu. The Standards Committee thanked Judith Pietschmann for her many years of valuable commitment and input to the Committee.
- The minutes from the 19th June Standards Committee call were **approved**.
- The ASI Secretariat gave an update on the overall Standards Revision project status. 15 Working Group meetings have been carried out, drafts are being developed and iterated with input. A [public webinar with interactive input will be held on 24 July](#). July- August will also focus on early pre-consultation input from Members (on feasibility) and auditors, as well as IPAF focus groups
- The Standards Committee raised the following points around revision progress and timeline:
 - There are numerous new criteria in the drafts – do we have a process to review and refine?
 - ASI responded that so far the early draft development has been additive and the next stage will require filtering down, making sure that requirements focus on key issues
 - Standards Committee are encouraged to help support this filtering
 - ASI stressed the importance of considering materiality throughout– focus burden on where impacts are material and ASI can drive change
 - Has further work been done on the structure of public disclosures in the PS? Yes, following the 19th June call, a mock-up was drafted; this will be incorporated into the September updated drafts
 - Consistency in voice/drafting is important, and current drafts need more work on this. ASI clarified that is planned; we will work on this ahead of the updated September version for the Committee

2. Differentiation in the Performance Standard (PS)

- ASI presented an overview of proposed differentiation in the revised PS, which was discussed with the Committee at their May in person meeting. This includes a distinction between minimum and leading practices within the ‘thematic’ areas such as climate, nature, etc.
- The Committee discussed the proposal and noted the following considerations:
 - More work is needed to clarify what constitutes leading practice
 - There is value in the approach whereby Entities would ‘opt in’ to be assessed for leading practice
 - There was general support for Entities being able to make claims about leading practice in specific areas, plus having some sort of clear visual or graphic showing this (e.g. similar to the EcoVadis approach, which is well understood in the sector)
 - There were mixed views on the need for having a higher-level leading practice claim that could be made at certification level, e.g. ‘Certified Level Advanced’ or similar. Several Committee members said they would need more time to consider this and we can return to the discussion later
 - ASI clarified that no decisions are needed at this point, it is more to continue having a steering direction around differentiation that will cascade down to the thematic drafting areas
 - Although having multiple tiers (such as articulated by the [US Green Building Council LEED Rating System](#)) has benefits, this would add complexity. So far with draft development, it has been challenging to distinguish a third performance level – unless we lower the current ‘bar’ and make the entry level below current PS expectation. This is not something the Standards Committee so far wants to do.
 - It is important to consider the audience – who wants to make these claims, and why. ASI asked the Committee to help think about specific consultation questions we can ask towards this point.

3. Breakout Groups

- The Committee split into separate groups to discuss content development around Climate, Nature, Circularity, and Workers Rights. Input from these subgroup discussions will be brought into the next updates to the drafts

4. Update on Community Rights – Proposed changes

- ASI presented an overview of the proposed changes around Community Rights, which is one of the areas where minimum expectations will be increased; mostly for upstream Entities
 - Proposed changes include more detailed and prescriptive criteria overall, more emphasis on community consultation and FPIC, additional monitoring and reporting mechanisms, and new requirements around community benefits, cultural awareness of Entity staff engaging with communities, and capacity building
 - The Standards Committee was encouraged to read through the current working draft and provide any further input to the ASI team

5. Chain of Custody and Claims

- ASI gave a brief overview of work since the May Standards Committee meeting on Chain of Custody and Claims. This has focused on:
 - Streamlining the current group mass balance CoC requirements
 - Adding an additional requirement to the Performance Standard around sharing of origin information, on request, to better support Entities with due diligence requirements (further exploring any supply chain mapping or analytics would be a later stage project, depending on resources)
 - Consulting on potential product carbon footprint offerings – so far, this has shown mixed levels of interest and high complexity. The starting point is likely to be developing product category rules (PCR) that would enable more standardised comparisons of PCF for aluminium products
- Recent discussions with the CoC/ Claims Working Group also explored the potential interest in introducing a site level mass balance offer (in addition to the existing group mass balance), within the streamlined CoC requirements.
- Recent Working Group discussions also highlighted tensions within the Membership and the value chain at large around downstream preferences (for more transparency/ traceability) and the challenges for upstream in segregating aluminium, due to the nature of continuous processes (e.g. alumina refining and electrolysis). Further discussions with the working group are planned for August on the value vs effort of alternate CoC models plus the interest in product carbon footprint/ product category rules

6. Close and next steps

- ASI explained that September will be a critical period for the Standards Committee to engage with the draft development, to take stock and outline a path to get to public consultation
- A set of intensive virtual workshops is being planned, which would include e.g. four sessions over the two weeks beginning **29 September**. Committee members were asked to flag any concerns or blackout dates with scheduling for these weeks