

*ASI Chain of Custody and Claims Working Group –
Call 8 Meeting Notes
4 May 2026*

Agenda

- Welcome (5 min)
- Timeline (5 min)
- Overview of public consultation feedback (30 mins)
- Your input on feedback received on options 1, 2 and 3 (45 min)
- Close (5 min)

Participants

Chris Bayliss (ASI)
Jørgen Hanson
Tegan Hoddy
Aysha Isa-Karawan
Gesa Jauck
Yeoh Kerlee
Marientina Lazaridou
Alison Lee
Klaudia Michalska (ASI)
Johanne Milliard
Marcel Pfitzer
Chelsea Reinhardt (ASI)
Roxanne Sharif
Manuel Sobreviela Peña
Sunny Sun
Panagiotis Tserolas
Lia Vacheret (ASI)
Marieke van der Mijn (ASI)
Melanie Williams
Piet Wit

Discussion Notes:

1. Welcome and introduction

- ASI gave an update on the ASI Standards Revision, including the close of the first public consultation period, which ran from 17 Feb – 30 April 2026 (including a slight extension due to the conflict in the Middle East).
- In total 47 completed surveys and 50 responses were received via the consultation inbox, together including more than 1400 comments (of which 69 individual comments related to chain of custody, from 27 organisations/ individuals). Separate engagement with affected communities was carried out and has led to more than 200 targeted questionnaires being completed.

However, these focused on priority areas under the Performance Standard and did not cover Chain of Custody (CoC).

- After today's working group call, a summary of input will be discussed with the ASI Standards Committee on 21 May and the Standards Committee will meet in person in mid-June to discuss the options for CoC models in more detail and the path forward. The CoC/ Claims Working Group will have another session in July to consider the outcomes of the Standards Committee session and the updated CoC draft (Doodle poll to be shared after the meeting).

2. Summary of consultation input on COC and key themes

- ASI shared a summary of high-level themes relating to CoC from the consultation, including:
 - There was general support for the streamlining of the CoC standard, and some detailed comments received against individual requirements (these will be reviewed by the ASI Secretariat over the next few weeks, but were mostly non-substantive).
 - Upstream respondents expressed that market signals they receive are limited – and do not currently incentivise further investment in an evolved (beyond Entity level) Coc approach.
 - There is support for ASI to play some role in supporting downstream Entities to set responsible sourcing commitments (not necessarily limited to ASI Material), and recognising that sourcing commitments are driven by individual business decisions.
 - Some respondents expressed a view that none of the CoC models (Option 1, 2, or 3) would deliver the enhanced traceability or transparency that fully meets expectations from downstream Entities. A number of respondents who supported option 2 and 3 cited enhanced traceability as part of their rationale, which suggests they may not fully understand the limitations of a mass balance CoC model.
 - ASI shared the breakdown of survey responses related to the CoC models, noting that total responses on this question were only 23.
 - Option 1 (maintain group/ Entity level mass balance): **35%** preferred this option
 - Option 2 (Entity- level with min. sourcing requirement): **26%** preferred this option
 - Option 3 (transition to site level mass balance): **39%** preferred this option
- In terms of position by type of stakeholders:
 - Civil society/NGO - Strongly favours Option 3
 - Downstream (Manufacturing) - Favours Option 3; conditional Option 2 (100% sourcing), without which it questions CoC value
 - Midstream (Transformation, inc recycling) – Most favour Option 1
 - Upstream (Primary) - Favours status quo (Option 1), but questions CoC value more broadly
- Other suggestions raised during consultation (aside from the CoC Options as above), included:
 - Further work on verified product carbon footprint/ recycled content claims – these would sit outside the COC standard development, but would likely require some type of COC offering in the future
 - Controlled blending – however, this was discussed earlier with the Working group and would require batch level traceability
- The Working Group discussed the summary of consultation feedback:

- A question was raised about what the value of ASI material could look like and whether that means pricing – this question was not addressed due to anti-trust policy, but participants were invited to give any feedback on similar issues directly to the ASI team via email.
- One participant noted that comments about the value of CoC certification is not only about granularity (and what the different options can deliver) but also about the fact that any of the CoC models would be in addition to anything else companies need to do to meet changing regulation. ASI responded that this point will be noted, and it also relates to the role of the Performance Standard as well (e.g. in supporting due diligence efforts).
- A question was raised: For Option 2, what does the 10% mean when it comes to shipping orders of ASI Material? ASI clarified that some respondents supported option 2 but only with 100% minimum sourcing requirement. The minimum sourcing level means that X percentage of your ASI Material output, must be met by the physical input of ASI Material to that site. It does not mean that you must sell the full 100% of the ASI input to a site onwards with the 'ASI material' status, nor that a given percentage of your output must be ASI Material.

3. Plenary work to provide additional input on consultation feedback

- The Working Group spent 45 minutes reviewing anonymised comments from consultation relating to Options 1, 2, and 3 on an online whiteboard. Participants were asked to fill out any additional considerations on sticky notes and to use icons to either 'upvote' or 'downvote' existing comments.
- The final ten minutes were spent in a plenary discussion to reflect on the exercise:
 - One participant questioned whether there was a difference in views between mines and smelters when it came to support for Option 1. A participant responded that in her view, there is limited ability to sell ASI material by non-integrated businesses because in such cases they have limited ability to source ASI material; they also noted that CoC is not required to evidence their due diligence obligations and so there is limited value if customers are not demanding ASI material.
 - It was raised that there is a difference between the *value of ASI material* and the *value of CoC certification*. ASI explained they are working on improved messaging especially for downstream Entities about this distinction and about the value of sourcing ASI material. This is not only related to on-product labelling, but also is key to drive greater impact throughout the aluminium value chain – and to help create return on investment for upstream Entities/ safeguard future supplies of responsibly produced (certified) aluminium.
 - It was noted that the ASI Performance Standard and relevant requirements around due diligence are important for Entities and help them meet EU regulation on due diligence (CoC may play an enabling role in some companies' DD processes).
 - One participant shared his view that the current CoC model doesn't work as they don't see sufficient demand from downstream; they anticipate this also has to do with the types of claims that can be supported by the CoC. ASI responded that they have not yet had a strong consensus about additional high priority claims. Although, there has been some recent increase in downstream Members making public claims about their sourcing of ASI Material, which is viewed as positive.

4. Next Steps

- The next meeting will be either Monday 13 or Monday 20 July– A Doodle poll will be sent out to WG this week.
- Purpose of the call will be to provide an update from the in-person Standards Committee meeting discussions in Kuala Lumpur on 16 - 18 June.