ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

22 July 2026 (Virtual)

Attendance (Standards Committee):

Abiba Mayaki Diallo
Bo Han
Francesca Fairbairn
Guilbert Ebune
Kishore Mahbubani
Li Didi
Marcel Pfitzer
Mike Danielson
Nicholas Barla
Olivier Néel
Patrick Brading
Penny Laurance
Piet Wit
Sankon Mohamed
Soumah Ibrahima Dominique
Yuri Herder

Apologies (Standards Committee)

Abu Karimu
Gesa Jauck
Jason Koevoet
José Rubio
Margriet Biswane
Marina Wangurra Vincent Ekka
Louis Biswane
Martin Alles
Vishwas Kamble
Wenjuan Liu

ASI Secretariat Participants

Cameron Jones, *Director of Assurance*
Chelsea Reinhardt, *Standards Director*
Chinelo Etiaba, *COO and Membership Director*
Chris Bayliss, *Climate Change Director*
Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, *Circularity Research Manager*
Jessica Pereira, *Human Rights Specialist*
Klaudia Michalska, *Supply Chain Analyst*
Marieke Van der Mijn, *Director Partnerships*
Vicky Tran, *Assurance and Claims Manager*

Agenda Overview:

1. Opening and approval of meeting minutes: 21 May and 16-18 June (5 min)
2. Claims Guide approvals (15 min)
3. Chain of Custody – next steps with input from Working Group (25 min)
4. Leading Practices – updates since June (25 min)
5. Next steps – subgroups and detailed review (10 min)
6. AOB (10 min) - Downstream certification option

1. Opening and approval of meeting minutes

- The Secretariat opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda
- The Committee **approved** minutes from the 21 May and 16-18 June Standards Committee meetings.

2. Claims Guide approvals

- The Secretariat shared an overview of minor proposed amendments to the Claims Guide, for Committee approval. These include minor formatting changes, improved usability, and proposed new

claims around the value of sourcing ASI material. They also include clearer distinctions for specific and general volume claims and processes for their approval by the ASI Secretariat (e.g. "*In X year, we sourced x %/ x tons of our aluminium as ASI Aluminium*" or "All our suppliers are ASI Performance and CoC certified")

- Although additional thematic claims had been included in a draft document shared with the Committee in May, these have since been removed based on concerns from a Board discussion in late May (and recognizing that Members were not asking for these types of claims)
- The Secretariat explained that a couple of ASI Members have asked about alignment with the Empowering Consumers for the Green Transition (EmpCo) Directive in the EU – ASI has explained how we meet these requirements and will be working on making this information more publicly available in future.
- The Committee **approved** the changes to the ASI Claims Guide as proposed

3. Chain of Custody – next steps with input from Working Group

- The Secretariat reminded the Standards Committee of their discussion at the June meeting on Chain of Custody consultation feedback. At this point, the Committee had recognized that the likely path forward would be to maintain a group (entity) level mass balance (Option 1).
- However, acknowledging some considerations and concerns from the discussion, before agreeing they wanted to first consider feedback on two additional questions from the CoC Working Group (July):
    - Upstream/ midstream – estimate for *additional effort/ cost* to transition to site level (considering ASI assurance proposal)
    - Downstream – potential impact of site level on sourcing ASI material and on requesting ASI certification from suppliers
- ASI shared a summary of responses to these questions from the CoC Working Group and Standards Committee:
    - Upstream/ midstream were asked about the additional effort required to move to site level mass balance. Out of 9 responses:
        - 2 said this would be very challenging
        - 6 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 site level might make them 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 might affect their requirements/ requests for suppliers to be ASI certified: Out of 6 responses:
        - 2 said that yes, this might increase their requests for suppliers to be certified
        - 4 said no, this would not have an impact on supplier certification
- The Standards Committee discussed the feedback, noting:
    - The shift to site level mass balance will have cost and effort for most companies, although the extent may vary. Most of this is training for site level staff and administration; site level staff turnover is also higher, which can lead to more effort. Currently, without demand for ASI material, it is hard to justify any increase in cost/ effort
    - One participant raised an alternative suggestion to consider, which, while increasing effort for upstream/midstream even further, in their view has the potential to deliver more value to customers and thus increase the pull for ASI material or CoC certification. In essence it would require:

- Site level mass balance as per Option 3
- No free allocation of ASI material status to outputs (at present shipments can only be 100% or 0% ASI material at output and input)
- Proportional allocation of ASI material (under which ALL shipments out would reflect the percentage of ASI material input to the site)
- A rolling average % for input material (rather than the current reconciliation at the end of a material accounting period) – this would require further guidance and development to determine how this balancing works in practice

  - This alternate proposal would allow entities to communicate to customers the percentage of aluminium that came from certified assets. This may align also with more transparent reporting and communication around volumes of ASI Material sourced, as discussed under the Claims guide updates (E.g. Entity X sourced X percentage of ASI Aluminium in this period).

- **Next steps agreed**:
- The Secretariat to follow up with the Committee member to map out this proposal more clearly, so it can be shared back with the Standards Committee ahead of the next call in September.
- The Secretariat to ask the question of Members whether such an approach would add value for downstream and upstream/midstream to report back to Standards Committee in September
- An agreement on the mass balance model to pursue will be tabled again for the September meeting.

4. Leading Practices – updates since June

- The Secretariat gave an update on progress since the June Standards Committee meeting to review and update the approach to leading practices. At the June discussions, the Committee had agreed to:
  - Maintain leading practice (above minimum) tier, but recognising the importance of a solid foundation of minimum requirements
  - Carry out a review and calibration of leading practices content in each section
  - Move leading practices to their own list within each section
  - Explore an alternate proposal to focus on transparent recognition of leading practices achieved, vs a 'threshold' approach
- The Secretariat shared a progress update and showed an example of the revised set of leading practices from the Nature section. These have been significantly reduced and will now be shared with the Working Group and Standards Committee for further comment.
- The Secretariat also shared a mock-up of the alternate transparent reporting approach to recognize leading practices. These were discussed by the Committee:
  - There was **general support** for this alternate proposal; and a desire to see this further developed, rather than the previous 'threshold' approach.
  - It is important to specify which leading practices have been achieved for each section (e.g. leading practice number or identifier) and to indicate clearly any sections that were not applicable or not assessed
  - It was questioned whether leading practices that align with other Standards or frameworks belong as leading practices, or whether these should be minimum. It was explained that many stakeholders want to see more alignment with other standards – some of these will belong as minimum and others perhaps as leading practice, depending on the nature of the requirement and context. What ASI aims to avoid are similar but slightly different requirements, which create extra work and confusion.
- The terminology around minimum requirements and leading practices was discussed. One participant noted that anything in the optional higher tier should not be called requirements if they are not

required, and that 'leading' may be appropriate as it represents leading in the context of the ASI Standards.

- The Committee were asked to suggest alternate wording for the two levels of expectation via the chat or after the call.
- **Next steps agreed**– the Secretariat will compile these suggestions and share back to the Committee by September to filter and prioritise naming options

5. Next steps – subgroups and detailed review

- **Action requested:** The Standards Committee were asked to carry out a review of the updated drafts by 4 September. These will be shared along with notes after the call.
- The next Committee meeting will be in late September, with an invite to follow shortly.

6. Next Steps and AOB

- The Standards Committee discussed progress on the streamlined certification option for downstream Entities.
    - Since the June Committee meeting, the Secretariat has been starting to develop an approach to bring workers' rights into this proposal, potentially also by recognising other credible labour-related standards (e.g. SMETA, RBA, SA 8000, RSCI)
    - The Committee clarified why workers' rights had been included – this was because the topic is likely to be material across the whole value chain
    - The Committee generally supported the approach to cross recognise other standards, acknowledging that many downstream companies are handling multiple materials
    - It was noted that ILO fundamental principles and rights for workers should be the basic expectation, and it was challenging to prioritise which worker-related criteria might not apply downstream.
- One Committee member asked about any updates on work to address scrap aggregators/suppliers and risks in (post-consumer) scrap supply chains. The Secretariat agreed this is an important area where there is potential to drive change. The short-term approach will look at strengthening the existing responsible sourcing/ due diligence requirements (with a specific additional requirement or criterion on post-consumer scrap), plus additional guidance and tools. The Secretariat will also review current audit findings and survey members to better understand scrap sourcing practices and inform proposals. Longer term, collaboration approaches or looking at more tailored certification options for scrap aggregators might be considered.