

ASI Workers' Rights and Health & Safety Working Group – Call 6 – Meeting Notes

22 October 2025

Agenda points:

1. Welcome and introductions (5 min)
2. Update since last call (10 min)
3. Key issues for consultation (30 min)
4. Alignment with ISO 45001 and others? (10 min)
5. Wrap up WG/next steps (5 min)

Participants

Christina Widman (GF Casting Solutions, AG)
Ashley Magowan (Constellium)
Ali Ahmad (Qatar Aluminium (Qatalum))
Kendyl Salcito (Nomagaya)
David Pfidze (Rio Tinto)
Dorothea Flockert (Speira)
George Efthimou (Independent Power Transmission Operator)
Thomas van Haaren (DNV)
Piet Wit (Chimbo Foundation)
Paul Marsh (IAI)
Vishwas Kamble (Hindalco)
Hugo Bonilla (Alcoa)
Jørgen Hanson (Norsk Hydro ASA)

ASI Secretariat – Chelsea Reinhardt, Chris Bayliss, Lia Vacheret

Discussion Notes:

1. Welcome and introductions

- ASI welcomed the group and introduced the agenda.

2. Update since last call

- ASI gave an update – since the last Working Group call on 15 September the Standards Committee had held a series of workshops to discuss the latest drafts and key issues in preparation for the public consultation. The Standards Committee had agreed that the revision was going in the right direction, there were a number of open issues in some of the other sections and timing had been adjusted to give time to work those through. The anticipated timing of the public consultation had shifted by a month.
- The Workers' Rights and Protection section had also had a second review by technical experts and comments from the SC and Working Group had been fed in.

3. Key issues for consultation.

Working Hours

- ASI introduced the current requirements in the draft on working hours – the Working Group had had a number of discussions on this previously. Currently as a minimum – regular hours are set at 48 hours (excluding overtime), there is no hard cap on overtime

and there are caveats to allow for collective bargaining agreements and conditions set on the management of overtime); leading practice sets a maximum week of 60 hours including overtime, and has timebound targets to reduce to reduce to a maximum of 48 hours/week (including overtime).

- ASI explained that the discussion with the technical experts and the Standards Committee had led to recommendations to bring in a stronger threshold on maximum hours (including overtime).
- In the latest draft there were now two alternative options proposed to go for wider consultation, these introduced a cap of 60 hours/per week including overtime (option 1); and (option 2) where this was not possible required a 2-year action plan to achieve compliance.
- A participant asked about alignment with the ILO, ASI explained that the language had been checked with ILO guidance and technical experts had also reviewed this. The Working Group discussed whether certain categories of work or workers needed to have different thresholds – there would be questions as to who determines the categories and how, so this would be a challenge. A participant suggested a risk approach could be taken – heat related risks in the aluminium sector could be measured in minutes rather than by hours in a week. This could be factored into guidance ensuring entities demonstrate the safety of their working schedules.
- There was discussion on how contractors/short-term workers would be managed under these requirements. There remained challenges on how/whether exposure to e.g. heat/fumes was measured/managed for short-term contractors and to understand how the requirements would apply in these circumstances.
- A participant raised the need to make clear what the working hours requirements were vs the requirements on health and safety impacts (e.g. heat exposure), and to make allowances in emergency situations.
- The group also discussed the cumulative impacts of exposure over a longer-term period/e.g. 20-year career working on a potline. This was identified as an area where more sector wide research might be useful, but not directly in scope for the ASI standard revision.
- The Working Group agreed to put the options on working hours forward for the Standards Committee to consider ahead of public consultation.

Living wages

- ASI introduced the background – the current proposal was a shift from ‘respect the right to living wage and pay at least minimum wage’ as in current V3 of the Performance Standard, to ‘paying the living wage’ (at least for direct employees) and to have a plan in place for contractors and suppliers. There had been some pushback already from early consultation with Members, but also support from the Labour Union, the Standards Committee and the Working Group to take a step forwards towards a living wage. ASI had started work on how this might be implemented. There would be reference to the IDH database of living wage benchmarks, which we understand will eventually be taken over by the ILO. There were existing credible benchmarks for the top 5 countries having certified entities. More work would be done on implementation guidance.
- A participant said that there had been a move towards living wages in many sustainability standards – where the living wage wasn’t being paid then the focus was on

doing a gap analysis with a timebound plan to bridge the gap (2- years). Where there are no benchmarks – the ILO has criteria on benchmarks so operators could show how they have met the ILO criteria and there were lots of resources that operators could use as a starting point (e.g. using the living wage for another city and adjusting to factor in relevant factors). This could be factored into guidance.

- A participant raised the need to separate out living wage requirements for own workforce and for those in the supply chain. The latter was very difficult to achieve. ASI confirmed that the scope in this section was for its own operations. Supply chain requirements were covered under the Responsible Sourcing section (3). A participant noted that the Living Wage Foundation and the Anker Method as valuable resources that could be used.
- The Working Group agreed with the approach currently being taken in this area.

Alignment with ISO 45001

- ASI introduced the issue – in this section alignment with ISO 45001 in relation to health and safety management system (2.3/8.7). ASI currently recognises ISO 45001 and 14001 (many ASI members were also certified in these) so in theory, where members were already ISO certified in these areas, auditors should be just verifying those valid certifications and that any non-conformances were being managed.
- The Working Group discussion focused on the need for ASI to have very explicit requirements for auditors on which criterion should be met by valid ISO certifications, and what (if anything) requires additional checking. A participant said that where harmonization was possible it was welcomed because many companies have many standards and audits, so the more streamlined the process could be the better.
- ASI would analyse where the alignments/gaps were in terms of the new requirements with ISO 45001 but hold off making any adjustments until after consultation (after which many of the requirements were likely to shift based on any feedback). We would seek to keep the current alignment and seek to be clear what the assurance process would be.

Wrap up/next steps

- Thank you to all participants for their input in this first phase of the working group, we would look to reconvene after the public consultation – likely in May/June 2026. Participants would be contacted in due course. Please let the Secretariat know if you'd rather be taken off the distribution list.
- Participants were asked to provide feedback on the Working Group process through a short questionnaire - <https://forms.cloud.microsoft/r/DMZ6BrQxG>
- The draft would stay open for any final comments until 24 October.