

ASI Chain of Custody and Claims Working Group – Call 9 Meeting Notes

20 July 2026

Agenda

1. Welcome (5 min)
2. Overview of CoC discussions - ASI Standards Committee meeting in June
3. Feedback received from implementation of Option 3 (site level mass balance)
4. Discussion and WG input on implementation of Option 3 (site level mass balance)
5. Close and next steps

Participants

Melanie Williams	Pernelle Nunez
Penny Laurance	Marcus Vinicius Vaz Moreno
Debora de Oliveira Rizzati	Björn Kulmann
Elliot Mari	Marientina Lazaridou
Tegan Hoddy	Marc Bisserie
Alison Lee	Christine Carey
Julio Oliveira	Jasminka Jaksic
Manuel Sobrevela Pena	Daniil Ukhanov
Roxanne Sharif	

From the ASI team: Marieke van der Mijl, Chris Bayliss, Chelsea Reinhardt, Vicky Tran, Gabriel Carmona Aparicio

Discussion Notes :

1. Welcome and introduction

- The ASI team (ASI) welcomed the Working Group and reviewed the agenda for today's session.
- ASI gave a summary of progress on the Chain of Custody (CoC) Standard revision since the close of public consultation on 30th April, including the most recent meeting of the CoC Working Group in May and discussions from the Standards Committee in June.

2. Summary of CoC Discussions by the ASI Standards Committee

- ASI presented a summary of the Standards Committee discussions related to consultation feedback on the different mass balance options for the chain of custody (Maintain group level, maintain group level with minimum sourcing commitments, or transition to site level mass balance).
- The Standards Committee discussed the consultation feedback in June, noting that:
 - Generally, downstream respondents indicate a preference for site level mass balance (Option 3), citing greater transparency and stronger connection between material claims and physical supply chains.

- One downstream Committee member raised a strong opposition to Option 1, which in their view does not provide sufficient physical connectivity between physical ASI material and the claim/ status of shipments.
- Upstream prefers status quo (Option 1), indicating a lack of clear value from moving to Option 3; also, additional reporting, assurance burden and implementation costs. However, upstream views are not fully aligned. Some integrated companies expressed views closer to downstream stakeholders.
- The Committee also discussed where there is sufficient market value to justify changes:
 - If CoC does not deliver value to customers, there is little reason to change the system.
 - Some members questioned whether Option 3 would create additional market demand. The Secretariat explained that none of the three options presented during consultation appeared to fully meet stakeholder needs.
 - Several participants questioned whether CoC is the right mechanism to solve physical traceability challenges.
- In conclusion, the Standards Committee determined that the likely outcome would be to move ahead with **Option 1 (Entity level mass balance) as the primary proposal** – but, acknowledging some considerations and concerns from the discussion, they wanted to first consider two additional questions from COC Working Group (July):
 1. Upstream/midstream – estimate for additional effort/ cost to transition to site level (considering ASI assurance proposal).
 2. Downstream – potential impact of site level on sourcing ASI material and requesting ASI certification from suppliers.

3. Feedback received on implementation of Option 3 (site level mass balance)

- As discussed with the Standards Committee, ASI had reached out to all industry representatives from the CoC Working Group and Standards Committee to ask for further input on the questions above.
- ASI shared a summary of the responses received:
 - Upstream/ midstream were asked about the additional effort required to move to site level mass balance. Out of 7 responses:
 - 2 said this would be very challenging
 - 4 said it would be doable but would require additional cost or effort
 - 1 said this would be easy to do.
 - Downstream participants were asked whether moving to site level mass balance COC model would lead them to source more ASI material. Out of 6 responses:
 - 2 indicated that yes, site level mass balance would lead them to change their sourcing approach
 - 4 respondents said no, this would not have an impact.
 - Downstream participants were also asked whether moving to site level mass balance COC model affect their requirements/ requests for suppliers to be ASI certified: Out of 6 responses:

- 2 indicated that yes, this might increase their requests for suppliers to be certified
- 4 respondents said no, this would not have an impact on supplier certification.

4. Discussion and WG input on implementation of Option 3 (site level mass balance)

- The Working Group discussed the feedback received on the level of effort to move to site level mass balance and the potential implications on sourcing ASI material and supplier certification.
- The Working Group noted the following points:
 - Does this discussion on group or site level mass balance reflect the 3-5 year plan for Chain of Custody for ASI? ASI clarified that shorter term decisions around mass balance would not preclude further work to develop new offerings such as recycled content claims or pilot/collaboration initiatives around physical traceability. These could be done in parallel or after the current revision timeline.
 - One participant asked about the specific cost/effort concerns which were mentioned by upstream companies who indicated that site level mass balance would be challenging. These were clarified as being mainly related to systems implementation, including procedures, training and IT system changes; especially for complex or integrated Entities with many sites.
 - Whether there is a benefit in having site level mass balance as a 'leading practice' type offering in the Chain of Custody, similar to the two tiers of requirements in the draft Performance Standard V4. It was discussed that some Entities may do site level only because they are single sites, and for site level mass balance to deliver any additional value for downstream in the form of ASI Aluminium sourcing, the whole chain would need to implement site level mass balance.
 - Have end consumers or other stakeholders been consulted? ASI clarified that this has not happened specifically apart from the public consultation opportunity; however, ASI has consulted with consumer-facing downstream brands, such as those in the packaging sector. There are only a few companies using on-product ASI claims, but they remain committed and are generally happy with the status quo (group level mass balance). The WG member was not satisfied with this approach but accepted the answer from ASI.
 - Is the response rate sufficient on these additional questions? ASI explained that the upstream/ midstream responses are fairly high and additional downstream input would be helpful. The response rates roughly mirror the trend seen in the flow of ASI material, which is much higher upstream and very low by the end of the value chain.
 - In terms of validating or adding to input from the recent survey questions, two additional upstream working group members indicated they would also be Option B '*Doable but with cost or effort impacts*' when it comes to the additional work to implement site level mass balance.
- ASI summarised the discussion input and reflected again on the questions where the Standards Committee has asked for additional input:
 - How challenging is implementation of Option 3 (site level mass balance) → *Feedback indicates it is challenging based on responses so far*
 - Would Option 3 (site level) impact downstream sourcing of ASI material or support for ASI certification → *Limited enthusiasm from responses so far*

5. Close/Next steps

- The Standards Committee will review this topic again on 23 July at their next virtual meeting, including the input from the Working Group.
- The next Working Group meeting will be scheduled for September or October 2026 – a meeting invite will follow.