

ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes
21 May 2026 (Virtual)

Attendance ([Standards Committee](#)):

Abiba Mayaki Diallo	Olivier Néel
Abu Karimu	Patrick Brading
Bo Han	Penny Laurance
Francesca Fairbairn	Piet Wit
Gesa Jauck	Sankon Mohamed
Guilbert Ebune	Soumah Ibrahim Dominique
Jose Rubio	Vincent Ekka
Louis Biswane	Vishwas Kamble
Marcel Pfitzer	Yuri Herder
Martin Alles	
Mike Danielson	

Attendance – Other

Kishore Mahbubani (observer) – alternate for Arconic during June SC meeting
Vaishali Surawa (observer) – potential alternate for Hindalco during June SC meeting

Apologies (Standards Committee)

Li Didi	Nicholas Barla
Margriet Biswane	Wenjuan Liu
Marina Wangurra	Jason Koevoet

ASI Secretariat Participants

Cameron Jones, <i>Director of Assurance</i>	Lia Vacheret, <i>Standards Manager</i>
Chelsea Reinhardt, <i>Standards Director</i>	Mark Annandale, <i>Director of Research and IPAF</i>
Chinelo Etiaba, <i>COO and Membership Director</i>	Rhiannon Prescott, <i>Educational Manager</i>
Chris Bayliss, <i>Climate Change Director</i>	Thomas Robertson, <i>Assurance and Risk Manager</i>
Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, <i>Circularity Research Manager</i>	

Agenda Overview:

- Welcome and agenda (10 min)
 - Welcome new member and alternate (observers) joining for today
- Consultation update and summary of feedback (45 min, including discussion)

- For approval – TOR for new Working Group on Mine Closure and Rehabilitation (10 min)
- June In-Person Meeting: Discuss agenda and priorities (15 min)
- AOB/ Close (10 min)

Welcome and agenda

- The meeting opened with a welcome to participants and housekeeping reminders regarding interpretation channels and antitrust requirements. Martin Alles was welcomed as a new member to the Standards Committee. Kishore Mahbubani and Vaishali Surawar were joining today as observers as they are potential alternates for the next Standards Committee meeting in June

Consultation update and summary of feedback

- The Secretariat presented an overview of the first round of public consultation on the draft revised ASI Standards. The consultation ran from 17 February – 30 April 2026, including a short extension to support participation from stakeholders affected by conflict in the Middle East.
- Feedback had been received through online questionnaires, by email, and targeted community questionnaires facilitated through IPAF members. There had been more than 500 responses, amounting to over 1,500 qualitative comments (not yet including comments from the IPAF-led questionnaires, which were still being analysed). Working Groups had reconvened to begin reviewing consultation feedback and identifying key issues requiring refinement or clarification.
- ASI presented the key themes coming out of the consultation feedback, mainly based on what had been received through the survey and excel/consultation inbox.
- On the draft Performance Standard V4 (see slides 7 – 15):
 - Structural changes to the standard had been positively received, including the separation of criteria from requirements, restructuring of principles and creation of dedicated sections on circularity and community rights.
 - Views on the overall level of ambition in Version 4 were mixed – some stakeholders supported stronger requirements relating to community impacts, circularity, workers' rights, mine closure and progressive rehabilitation. Other stakeholders expressed concern that minimum certification requirements had become too burdensome and could discourage companies from certifying or maintaining certification.
 - The concept of 'Leading Practice' was broadly supported, although respondents raised concerns regarding complexity, comparability, materiality and implementation.
 - SC members discussed approaches being considered by other initiatives including Responsible Steel and CMSI. While a couple of SC participants supported the concept of a 'three tier' approach, others mentioned in the meeting chat that this would be complex to integrate

- It was noted that ASI's proposed Leading Practice model is intended to remain voluntary, unlike for example CMSI approach where there is mandatory progression across levels.
- There were some concerns that companies operating in higher-risk environments or companies already demonstrating advanced ESG performance could unintentionally be disadvantaged.
- The feedback received on streamlined downstream certification options had been generally supportive, with some concerns about this approach lowering the credibility of the standards. Some respondents thought that requirements on workers rights and health and safety in particular were important to maintain.
 - One SC member thought that the size of the downstream entity needed to be taken into account and the focus needed to be on materiality.
 - One participant added a comment in the meeting chat suggesting that for downstream Entities, the main risks are upstream in the supply chain. Another SC member added that perhaps strengthened responsible sourcing requirements, combined with leading practice related to specific supply chain risks, directed towards downstream, might incentivize downstream to prioritize ASI certified materials in their supply chain
- There had been strong pushback on proposed new requirements and performance expectations in the climate section of the standards. Industry respondents expressed that requirements were too complex and challenging, while CSOs felt that the minimum emissions reduction expectations were too weak and lacked credibility.
 - SC members noted the importance of ensuring climate requirements remain practical, auditable and applicable across different operating contexts and entity types. Further discussion on climate-related issues during the June in-person meeting was planned.
 - On smelter thresholds – one participant noted through a comment in the chat that for countries where coal has historically been the primary energy source, the proposed threshold is not possible. If the threshold is maintained, ASI may need to consider similar targets for other topics e.g. waste circularity, no net loss for biodiversity, or freshwater consumption
- One theme highlighted by several upstream industry respondents was a concern that the main burden of certification effort was felt by upstream ASI members, but they did not yet see a corresponding market incentive for this certification. ASI explained that this input extends beyond the Standard and that it also touches on issues around Membership value and engagement.
- Affected community feedback – There had been strong interest in requirements related to community impacts, mining agreements, monitoring, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, leading practice and legacy issues

- The feedback received through the questionnaires distributed to affected communities was still being analysed and would be mapped by topic/criterion and areas for deeper analysis would be identified.
 - One SC member asked whether the feedback from impacted communities included anything on the role of governments – ASI explained that this was not an explicit focus of the consultation
 - Regionalisation – some respondents wanted to see more consideration of regional differences. Feedback suggested some thought that the Performance Standard was already too EU-focused, others think it should do more to account for highly regulated contexts such as Europe.
- On the draft Chain of Custody Standard V3 (see slide 16):
 - There had been broad support for the streamlining of the CoC Standard and focusing on key material accounting requirements. Respondents from the public consultation had divided views on whether and how to evolve ASI's current mass balance approach.
 - Some respondents, especially upstream industry, had concerns about the lack of market incentives/demand for ASI material; and there were divided views on whether options for a more stringent mass balance approach would in fact deliver more value, or only create more implementation effort. Some respondents suggested they would see value in being able to make product-related claims such as on recycled content or carbon footprint (not possible using the current COC model).
 - One SC member added a comment in the meeting chat that CoC only survives if there is a market pull – is the value of CoC related to product claims, or is better serving supply chain risk and due diligence? Perhaps that second pathway is more valuable. ASI explained that while we do see continued demand for ASI material, there are also many COC certified Entities not handling any ASI material currently.
 - One SC member questioned the purpose of the COC Standard, noting that beyond driving uptake of the Performance Standard, the value of COC itself has not been realised – this discussion would be a good starting point for the SC in-person meeting in June
- ASI highlighted areas where the SC will need to take some clear positions at the upcoming June meeting to enable further development of the draft documents. These 'Big 4' areas include:
 1. Leading practices – how this will work in practice, any adjustments needed
 2. Streamlined certification option for downstream
 3. Climate-related requirements, including emissions reduction and smelter thresholds
 4. CoC models

- One SC member said that they would like to discuss legacy issues, and removals in more detail. The importance of future-proofing the standards was also discussed, since the changes being discussed now will likely still be implemented well into the mid-2030s.

For approval – TOR for new Working Group on Mine Closure and Rehabilitation

- The Secretariat presented a proposal to establish a new dedicated Working Group on Mine Closure and Rehabilitation. Discussion by the SC focused on how to ensure appropriate expertise on the diverse issues covered by the proposed Working Group – social impacts, FPIC and community considerations, rehabilitation planning, closure planning and financial provisioning. It may prove a challenge to identify people with the right profile. ASI noted this and explained that some members of the Nature Working Group had expressed an interest in joining; there would be flexibility in membership and carefully managed agendas to ensure the relevant expertise at the meetings.
- SC members discussed overlaps between the proposed new Working Group and the Nature Working Group – would it make sense to merge the two WGs? ASI acknowledged that there were some overlapping issues, but they went beyond Nature, there were links with circularity as well as community participation. It was thought better to have a stand-alone group and ensure that links were made where relevant.
- The SC **approved** setting up the new Working Group and its Terms of Reference. SC members were asked to express an interest to the Secretariat if they wanted to join the Working Group.

June in-person meeting

- The Secretariat presented an overview of the planned agenda and structure for the June in-person SC meeting in Malaysia (slides 22 – 23).
- Participants were encouraged to review and provide comments or suggestions ahead of the meeting. Arrangements were being made for remote participation during the afternoon sessions; one SC member said they may be able to join the morning sessions remotely too.
- Participants were invited to attend the Assurance SC sub-group session (afternoon of 15 June, the day before the full SC meetings started) if interested.
- Pre-reading materials were expected to be circulated on 3 June, which will include a PPT summary of main consultation feedback and a few additional short pre-reads.

Any Other Business

- One SC participant highlighted the importance of consistency across the Performance Standard – the fact that the draft had been separated out by section and worked on separately came through as you read the re-merged full document. ASI noted this concern.

- Notes of the meeting and slides would be circulated to the SC along with access to a recording of the call.