ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

29 October 2026 (Virtual)

Attendance (Standards Committee):

Abiba Mayaki Diallo
Bo Han
Francesca Fairbairn
Gesa Jauck
Kishore Mahbubani
Louis Biswane
Marcel Pfitzer
Martin Alles
Nicholas Barla
Pamela Moreno
Patrick Brading
Penny Laurance
Piet Wit
Sankon Mohamed
Soumah Ibrahima Dominique
Vishwas Kamble
Vincent Ekka

Apologies (Standards Committee)

Marina Wangurra
Mike Danielson
Wenjuan Liu
Abu Karimu
Olivier Néel
José Rubio
Li Didi
Yemi Oyetola

ASI Secretariat Participants

Cameron Jones, *Director of Assurance and Risk*
Chelsea Reinhardt, *Standards Director*
Chinelo Etiaba, *COO*
Chris Bayliss, *Climate Change Director*
Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, *Circularity Research Manager*
Klaudia Michalska, *Supply Chain Analyst*
Mark Annandale, *Director of Research and IPAF Advisor*
Marieke Van der Mijn, *Director of Partnerships*

1. Agenda Overview:

- Welcome, housekeeping
- Latest Standard reviews – key comments
- Guidance development
- Chain of custody – recap on status and next steps
- Timeline for remainder of 2026 and AOB

2. Welcome, housekeeping, approval of previous meeting minutes

- The Secretariat opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.
- The Secretariat extended a thank you to three departing members of the Standards Committee, Guilbert Ebune (Arconic), Jason Koevoet (VDL Bike Technologies), and Yuri Herder (Tetra Pak) – recognising their significant contributions to the Committee and the Standard revision process so far.
- The Secretariat welcomed three new joining members (Industrial User category): Kishore Mahbubani (Arconic), Yemi Oyetola (GZI Industries), and Pamela Moreno (Crown Holdings)

- The Committee **approved** minutes from the 28 September virtual meeting, subject to the proposed amendments which had been shared with the Committee ahead of the call.

1. Latest Standard reviews – key comments

- The Secretariat explained that the SC currently has until 4 November to review the latest Standard drafts and raise any final content-related concerns, ahead of the second public consultation. So far only minor comments have been received.
- One participant said their latest review indicates that public disclosure elements have increased compared to the PS V3, and some new public disclosure requirements have appeared since the last Committee discussion on this (examples noted under Circularity). Given this growth in requirements, it is especially important to make sure these are driving the impact they intend to. The participant offered to share the detailed Excel table they have pulled together, which includes the specific requirement text (e.g. is it data, policy, etc. that needs to be publicly disclosed).
    - The Secretariat explained that under Circularity, some of the requirements after the first public consultation moved to leading practices, which might have left a gap against the PS V3 requirements. Recent changes have been aimed at addressing some of these gaps, with disclosure of general approaches or plans.
    - *Action: The Secretariat will review the draft Excel table from the SC member, and once reviewed can make this available to the full Committee to help guide any further review/ discussion on public disclosure elements*
- One participant remarked that feedback from US-based Entities around some key issues on Workers' Rights seems not to have been addressed with changes (for example, on working hours, DEI requirements, psychosocial risks, and gender pay gap analysis). There seem to still be some important gaps between where North America is and where ASI wants to go with the Standard.
    - The Secretariat responded that while these issues were reviewed and discussed with the Working Group, in some cases changes may not have been made if the concerns represented a minority set of responses from the first consultation. For example, this was the case around total working hours – there were concerns from a few US-based respondents; but on balance the overall input was strongly pushing for clear maximum limits on working hours.
    - *Action: Secretariat to reach out to this SC participant directly to follow up on the set of concerns relating to Workers Rights, and to share the filtered set of first consultation comments and responses that relate to these points.*
- The Secretariat explained that a legal review of the draft Standards is also currently underway and an initial gap analysis against the CMSI Standard is also being carried out with high level outcomes to be shared with the Committee

2. Guidance development

- The Secretariat introduced the state of current PS V3 Guidance, which sits as a separate comprehensive document, which includes background, applicability, implementation guidance, auditing guidance, and other resources
- The ASI Standard Setting Procedure was updated back in 2024; this now distinguishes between essential guidance (e.g. the Explanatory notes in the current drafts), which is part of the full Standard-setting process and subject to the same process as the Criterion and requirements. For any other guidance, the SC can determine the process and the level of oversight/approvals required
- The Secretariat proposed four different categories of guidance that will be developed along with the revised Standards in this revision:
    - *Explanatory notes* – first line of clarifications/ intent/ explanations; integrated within the draft PS V4 document next to requirement text. This is still a category of guidance and is not normative; non-conformance cannot be raised against text in the Notes directly.

- *Implementation guidance* – this would be additional implementation guidance, developed by section, based on migrating some content from PS V3 guidance but building this out over time based on input from the WGs or second consultation feedback. The SC will be able to do an optional review before consultation, but no formal approval required before consultation.
- *Conformance guidance* – to be built by the ASI Assurance team, currently covers 9 PSV3 criterion which have been most complicated for auditors and the Assurance team.
  - The current format is in Excel – these will be updated for PSV4 and will be expanded to add a few new criteria, e.g. around Community impacts, FPIC, etc.
  - Audience will be not only auditors but also certifying Entities and will be developed concurrently with the guidance. ASI will be getting input from the Assurance SC subgroup on these as well as from some experienced auditors.
- *Online 'resource hub'* (to develop longer-term): a dedicated online site which could include other additional resources, ASI training modules, videos and case studies. This could be updated much more frequently; would not require SC oversight or approvals.

- For the second consultation, ASI aims to have early drafts prepared for Implementation Guidance, and perhaps a couple examples of Conformance Guidance.
- The SC discussed the proposed approach to guidance. It was clarified that Explanatory Notes will remain at least for the consultation draft, and the Implementation Guidance will be developed as separate PDFs for each section (eventually a consolidated PDF may also be published with all Guidance).
- There was some support for the overall proposed approach and making the guidance more streamlined. It was requested to prioritize interpretive guidance, with a focus on helping Entities to identify material risks. Once material risks are identified, Entities typically will need to engage qualified specialists to carry out work in those areas, so there is less need for ASI in this guidance document to provide comprehensive guidance on technical content areas (e.g. No net loss).
- A concern was raised about not rushing the timeline for guidance development and making sure that consultation on guidance (with more materials to be reviewed) does not detract from the key focus on the Standards, especially since consultation fatigue can be common in second consultations.

3. Chain of custody – recap on status and next steps

- The Secretariat provided an overview of the Working Group (WG) and standards development processes around Chain of Custody (CoC) since early 2025.
  - This included the early WG discussions around different CoC models, and the first consultation period to seek views on three mass balance approaches.
  - It also included the initial decisions made by the Standards Committee in June 2026, on the basis of the consultation feedback, to retain the Entity-level mass balance model (Option 1), unless additional information was gathered to change this decision.
  - This initial agreement in principle on Option 1 was revisited at the 28 Sept SC Meeting, after the Secretariat had pursued additional information and explored alternate options, including a proportional mass balance approach. None of the additional information or options had emerged as viable improvements over the default decision around Option 1 (Entity level mass balance).
- The Secretariat highlighted some of the key challenges that have made these negotiations complicated:
  - Current mass balance options don't fully meet the needs of many stakeholders. They don't deliver physical traceability (as downstream wants), nor will they directly increase market

demand for ASI material (as many upstream/ CoC Certified Entities want) – subject to independent business decisions.

  - There are key tensions between the effort to implement CoC and the return on investment/ value delivered – many CoC certified Entities don't currently see significant demand for ASI material, and don't want to invest further in moving to site level mass balance unless this increases.
  - At the same time, some downstream Entities, like OEMs, feel that maintaining a group level mass balance (Option 1) will limit the value of ASI / CoC certification for them. They support Option 3 (transition to site level) as it better meets their needs.

- The Secretariat explained some of the main changes in the most recent CoC Standard drafts, which aim to find a slight compromise in stakeholder positions – this will introduce more clarity in the option to implement material accounting at site level (even as the overall CoC model remains at Entity-level mass balance). No additional claim can be made for Entities implementing at site level, but this may provide more transparency and monitoring of site level material accounting over time.
- The Standards Committee discussed this recap on CoC and made the following remarks:
  - One downstream participant noted that from their perspective, ASI should be striving for continuous improvement, and the retention of the group level mass balance COC model is disappointing because it does not demonstrate improvement. In their view, this may mean less uptake because the CoC system is not showing improvement from the current approach.
  - Another participant added that in their view, even site level mass balance does not provide a fundamental change from group mass balance in terms of the level of traceability or transparency provided. Therefore, the extra effort to move to site level mass balance (especially for multi-site Entities) was not justified. In their view, site level mass balance still may not achieve the desired outcomes (e.g. in uptake).
  - The Secretariat responded that the mass balance CoC model is not currently about delivering supply chain transparency – it is largely about connecting the supply of certified aluminium with demand and helping to ensure there is market value (subject to independent business decisions). One SC member agreed that having clarity over the key purpose of CoC is fundamental and may be one reason why this revision process has been challenging. Going into the next public consultation we may not be able to move the CoC model much further, but we should be thinking about what comes next further down the road.

4. Next Steps

- Two additional Standards Committee calls will be scheduled for the remainder of 2026 – depending on the extent of feedback and timing of the legal review, it is likely there will be one final discussion on content on the 25 November call, with an approval meeting on 14th December.
- The Secretariat will be working in the meantime on guidance development and will be working towards an expected launch of consultation by 11 February 2027. This would mean a potential in-person Standards Committee meeting in June 2027 (subject to budget availability – still to be confirmed).
- The Committee was reminded that this is the final window for key content concerns, and asked to please raise any of these now if they need to be addressed before the second public consultation.
- On AOB – the Secretariat informed the Committee that benchmarking work is underway for the downstream streamlined certification approach; with the aim of being able to bring this into the second consultation.