

ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

21 October 2025 (Virtual)

Attendance ([Standards Committee](#)):

Bo Han	Olivier Néel
Francesca Fairbairn	Patrick Brading
Gesa Jauck	Penny Laurance
Jasminka Jaksic (alternate)	Piet Wit
José Rubio	Sankon Mohamed
Louis Biswane	Soumah Ibrahima Dominique
Nikolas Kelling	Yuri Herder

ASI Secretariat Participants

Cameron Jones, <i>Director of Assurance</i>	Klaudia Michalska, <i>Supply Chain Analyst</i>
Chelsea Reinhardt, <i>Standards Director</i>	Laura Brunello, <i>Standards Coordinator</i>
Chris Bayliss, <i>Climate Change & Decarbonisation Director</i>	Lia Vacheret, <i>Standards Manager</i>
Jessica Pereira, <i>Human Rights Specialist</i>	Mark Annandale, <i>Director of Research and IPAF</i>
	Thomas Robertson, <i>Assurance and Risk Manager</i>

Agenda Overview:

1. Welcome and agenda
2. Community Rights and Participation
3. Mine and Refinery Closure
4. Next steps - planning for consultation

1. Welcome and agenda

- The ASI Secretariat gave updates on readiness for public consultation of the different drafts and presented a proposed adjusted timeline with a 2 tier approach (with the Community Rights, and possibly Chain of Custody draft moving back to January approval. This would mean and public consultation shifting back slightly - likely *10 February to 13 April*, and the in-person SC meeting moving to June 2026.
- A Standards Committee (SC) member asked about reducing the length of first public consultation to 30 days instead. The Secretariat clarified that the 60-day minimum period is to comply with ISEAL requirements and ensure that sufficient time is given to all stakeholders to give their feedback, including those harder to reach or needing more time.
- The SC **approved** the meeting minutes from the previous meetings of 2 October 2025 and 6 October 2025.

2. Community Rights and Participation

- The ASI Secretariat gave an overview of the different topics covered by this thematic area and noted that this is one of the areas with the most substantive changes compared to V3, in line with the discussions and decisions that were had during the SC meeting in September 2024.
 - Resettlement/displacement is proposed to be pulled out to become a modular section aligned fully with IFC PS5 (which will also allow updates more easily when IFC revises this standard).
 - In terms of materiality, many requirements are upstream-only, midstream requirements are largely unchanged vs V3, while for downstream (fabricators) this section would be optional if ASI

moves ahead with the ‘streamlined certification’ approach discussed at the SC meeting on 30 September.

- The Secretariat presented the strengthened definitions around *affected communities* and *consultation*. [The SC agreed with the proposed changes.](#)
- **On considerations around the Indigenous Peoples definition and inclusion of ‘land-connected communities’:** the Secretariat clarified this the proposed inclusion of land-connected communities was the outcome of an iterative, year-long process that was shaped by many different voices, including the FPIC Working Group and Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum (IPAF). Information was gathered from multiple sources including ICM, UN reports, and ASI Member’s Indigenous Policies.
- The Standards Committee discussed the proposed inclusion of land-connected communities into the draft, and raised the following points:
 - Upstream Entities said they are likely to find this addition problematic due to implementation complexity. In their opinion, some land-connected communities lack structured governance systems, making it hard for Entities to understand who the ‘consent-giver’ is for the purpose of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). No specific examples were presented, but this was taken as an action to come back with specific cases of concern. FPIC is already difficult to operationalise properly, so expanding this risks making it unworkable. It was noted that ASI should expect strong pushback in public consultation.
 - There are also related concerns about diluting the rights of Indigenous Peoples with respect to FPIC, by expanding it to other groups. It was clarified by ASI that to their knowledge, there are no cases of certified bauxite mines where there are both Indigenous Peoples and land-connected communities present.
 - At the same time, there is a risk of excluding groups just because of (perceived) weaker governance structure. From this perspective, communities without formal structures can still be affected and deserve consultation. A Secretariat member further gave example in Guinea where two certified Entities already treat land-connected communities equivalent to Indigenous Peoples: all such communities had representative structures.
 - It was asked how land-connected communities are defined and who decides which group ‘qualify’. The Secretariat clarified that the standard requires participatory mapping and engagement to identify Indigenous Peoples (and now land-connected communities). To date, in the experience of the ASI team and IPAF representatives, land-connected communities always self-identify and have established governance structures in place; there are no known cases where they do not. It was further added in the chat by another participant that an understanding of the ecosystem services dynamics and users might also be useful inform the identification of land connected communities.
 - It was recommended for ASI, with input from concerned upstream Members, to collect specific, concrete examples where this conflict and problems around implementation will materialize. Then it will be on ASI to explain how these situations will be handled by auditors or what companies will need to do to still remain compliant.
- [Action: the SC agreed to progress this work through gathering more information on concrete examples of the land-connected communities referenced in the definition \(from ASI\) and to collect more specific examples from concerned members about where and how this proposal will create concerns.](#)
- **On defining ‘significant impacts’:** the Secretariat presented a proposed approach for defining ‘significant impacts’ (in the context of requiring FPIC) based on IFC PS1, UNGP Guidance, World Bank, and IPAF input. The intent is consistent with V3 of the Performance Standard, which requires FPIC for *material impacts* on Indigenous Peoples, but this revision aims to bring more clarity and improve consistency of

implementation. The proposed definition has been discussed with the Community Rights Working Group and emphasises that affected communities play a role in determining what constitutes a significant impact.

- A participant stressed the importance of auditor competence for evaluating these issues; the Secretariat agreed this will need to be considered in the context of updates to the assurance manual around audits for upstream Entities in general.
- **On the definition of ‘Area of Influence’:** the Secretariat gave an overview of the current definition of area of influence and noted that associated facilities are already incorporated into this definition under V3 of the Performance Standard. It was raised by one participant that although this may already be included in V3, it might be that Entities raise concerns now that they are actually starting to see this in practice; especially around how FPIC processes could be implemented for associated facilities where the Entity does not have direct control
- It was discussed whether creating a possible distinction between a direct and indirect associated facility might help to address the issue.
- A secretariat member noted that IPAF feedback focuses on linear infrastructure (roads, conveyors, rails) and energy supply and ports. There is a need to better understand what such associated facilities are, in some instances this may be obvious, but would still be good to have some examples.
- **Actions:** Standards Committee members to share with ASI more detail on any specific concerns around associated facilities so we can explore options to modify that definition or its relation to the FPIC requirements.

3. Mine and Refinery Closure

- The Secretariat gave an overview of where closure-related requirements appear across the draft standard and gave an overview of the main changes since V3.
- The SC discussed the scope and structure of mine and refinery closure. There was a broad agreement that refinery closure is important but too different to treat identically to mining, especially when it comes to time frames.
- A participant strongly supported inclusion of refinery closure but said content must reflect refinery-specific processes and impacts, not just adapt mining text.
- A participant queried whether there should be smelter specific closure criteria in addition to refineries.
- The Secretariat outlined different drafting options, noting the need to balance complexity within the Standard:
 - a) Create a separate section for refineries
 - b) Keep generic closure section with refinery-specific sub-criteria
 - c) Include annexes for each supply activity
- A participant favoured an overarching generic structure applicable to all, with sub-criteria for mining/refining, to maintain coherence and avoid duplication.
- A Participant noted that the institutional dimension of closure (land ownership, access, governance post-closure) is under-developed and should be worked further. A Secretariat member supported this, noting that no mine globally has yet been fully rehabilitated and returned to local communities, highlighting the need for a clear methodology for long-term community land restitution.
- **Action:** The Standards Committee **agreed to remove refineries from the current mining closure section (10), and draft separate closure criteria for refineries and possibly smelters.**

4. Next steps

- First set of drafts (all but Community Rights and possibly Closure) to be circulated by the Secretariat by 24 October for final Standard Committee content check through to 10 November 2025. Review focus is on overall ambition, accuracy and consistency (no detailed edits/guidance edits at this stage), target final approval mid-December.
- Community Rights: additional review period; target final approval 12 January 2026.
- Public webinar: 12 November 2025 - Secretariat invited volunteers from SC to give short reflections as part of the webinar
- In-person SC: Now aiming for **June 2026**; SC members to provide any blackout dates.