ASI Standards Committee Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes

28 September 2026 (Virtual)

Attendance (Standards Committee):

Abiba Mayaki Diallo
Abu Karimu
Bo Han
Li Didi
Francesca Fairbairn
Gesa Jauck
José Rubio
Kishore Mahbubani (alternate)
Louis Biswane
Marcel Pfitzer
Olivier Néel
Patrick Brading
Penny Laurance
Piet Wit
Sankon Mohamed
Soumah Ibrahima Dominique
Vishwas Kamble
Vincent Ekka
Yuri Herder

Apologies (Standards Committee)

Margriet Biswane
Marina Wangurra
Martin Alles
Mike Danielson
Nicholas Barla
Wenjuan Liu

ASI Secretariat Participants

Chelsea Reinhardt, *Standards Director*
Chris Bayliss, *Climate Change Director*
Gabriel Carmona Aparicio, *Circularity Research Manager*
Jessica Pereira, *Human Rights Specialist*
Klaudia Michalska, *Supply Chain Analyst*
Lia Vacheret, *Standards Manager*
Mark Annandale, *Director of Research and IPAF Advisor*
Marieke Van der Mijn, *Director of Partnerships*

Agenda Overview:

- Welcome and housekeeping (5 min)
- Chain of Custody – update and agreement on next steps (15 min)
- Performance Standard – Key content issues and 'taking stock' (55 min)
    a. Climate section changes
    b. Public disclosure approach
    c. Other priority issues
    d. Taking stock and timeline to second consultation
- Guidance development (10 min)
- Next steps/ AOB (5 min)

1. Welcome and approval of previous meeting meetings

- The Secretariat opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.
- The Secretariat shared a progress update since the July meeting of the Standards Committee (SC).
- The Secretariat shared that in early October an election process will open to fill two vacant Industrial User seats on the SC and encouraged Committee members to vote.

- The Committee **approved** minutes from the 22 July Standards Committee meeting.

2. Chain of Custody Updates and Agreements on Next Steps

- The Secretariat shared an overview of feedback since the July SC meeting on Chain of Custody (CoC) model development.
    - Feedback had been requested from the CoC Working Group on an alternative 'proportional allocation' site level mass balance model, which was raised at the July SC Meeting.
    - Four industrial Members provided feedback; all raised concerns and did not support further development of this alternative option.
    - On this basis, the Secretariat proposes to move ahead with the Option 1 (group level mass balance) approach, combined with further work to increase demand for ASI material, subject to independent business decisions.
    - The discussion on 28th September was the continuation of an agreement in principle that had been discussed by the Standards Committee at their June 2026 in-person meeting, see pg. 8 of meeting notes here: https://aluminium-stewardship.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/ASI_Std_Comm_Mtg_Notes_June_2026.pdf
- The Committee discussed this recommendation, noting the following:
    - Some SC members would still like to see a transition timeline to site-level mass balance; while others noted that this would be difficult to do given the lack of very strong support for site level (and some strong opposition to it).
    - One downstream participant noted they do not support a group level mass balance approach for the next decade. They suggested to include a timeline to transition to site level mass balance. It was clarified that this would in effect be the same as the consultation Option 3 (transition to site level)
    - It was suggested to include the proposed definition of site (similar to the consultation draft and aligned with the FSC site definition) in guidance or supporting materials so that Entities can be recommended to already set up systems for material accounting at site level (especially those looking for CoC certification for the first time)
    - It was clarified that Entities can still implement site level mass balance (and many do today) – however, as their suppliers may still have a more flexible Entity-level mass balance, this would not allow any different type of claim to be made.
    - It was recommended that ASI develop guidance for new Entities looking to get CoC certified for the first time, encouraging them to implement site level material accounting systems from the beginning, recognizing the likelihood of more granular material accounting boundaries in future.
    - It was discussed whether rules for material accounting systems vs attribution (e.g. attributing ASI material status) should be separated out in the CoC standard.
    - It was noted that regardless of the mass balance model, many downstream customers see value in ASI certification as helping to de-risk supply chains, and ASI could do more to communicate the due diligence requirements that apply even to 'non-ASI material' and the value this delivers. One SC member gave the example that downstream customers are requiring ASI certified suppliers to track material through the whole value chain and provide assurances, e.g., around labour risks.
    - Building demand for ASI material (subject to individual business decisions) is an important part of the question around CoC models and the value delivered to ASI Members. *Further discussion on value and pricing was curtailed due to ASI's anti-trust policy.*
- Next steps: The Secretariat will further develop the second consultation draft of the CoC Standard following the Option 1 (Entity level) mass balance approach and will work to address the points raised by the Committee in parallel, including through guidance development.

3. Climate Section proposals

- The ASI Secretariat explained the latest changes made on the Climate-related criteria, following the SC discussions in Malaysia in June and further input from the Climate Working Group.
- The draft now includes three sections: Disclosures, Climate Transition Planning, Climate Transition Performance (with differentiated performance expectations based on supply chain activity and context)
- The smelter threshold has been integrated under performance expectations, with more stringent performance expectations for coal-fired smelters (2% annualised); newer (post 2020) coal fired smelters still excluded from certification.
- Recent discussions with the Climate Working Group highlighted concerns about public disclosure of near-term emissions reductions targets, with some Entities reluctant to publicly disclose targets that they are unable to meet. The Secretariat outlined some potential options to address this, including partial disclosure of the Climate Transition Plan, with targets disclosed only to the auditor (not publicly).
    - It was also proposed to include targets or reporting on other elements of the Climate Transition Plan beyond emissions reduction targets (such as long-term investments or R&D),
- The SC discussed these proposals, and raised the following considerations:
    - Some SC members expressed that public disclosure of targets should remain a minimum expectation; any uncertainties or associated risks can also be disclosed. The role of public disclosure is accountability.
    - Other SC members felt that public disclosure of Paris-aligned targets is too sensitive given the lack of control that some companies have, e.g. due to geopolitics and changes in sourcing areas. Targets need to be reasonably achievable before companies can share them publicly.
    - It was discussed whether the current language in the Standard requires 1.5-degree aligned targets, allows for beyond 2-degree scenarios, or is not specific. ASI clarified that the current language (Paris alignment) does allow for some flexibility (1.5 degree or "well beyond" 2-degree scenarios, although the latter is less clearly defined for individual Entity action) but clear guidance will be important
    - The Secretariat explained that with climate performance expectations softened compared to the PS V3, any weakening of disclosure elements may affect credibility and will need careful messaging.
- Next steps: The Secretariat will work on updating the draft to maintain some element of public disclosure of climate-related targets, but to allow flexibility in how these targets are set (and to ensure guidance is clear on these points).

4. Public Disclosure

- As time on the call was limited, the Secretariat outlined briefly the discussion topic on public disclosure and asked SC members to share further feedback by email:
    - A definition of public disclosure is now proposed to be included in the ASI PS V4 Glossary (currently only in guidance for the PS V3).
    - ASI has also carried out a review of the number of public disclosures in the current PS V4 drafts compared to the PS V3.
    - 10 new public disclosure additions are proposed, 10 are adjusted (mostly within Nature, asking for disclosure of progress against plans, as well as the plan itself), and 8 PS V3 public disclosures are proposed to be removed.

- The Secretariat encouraged the SC to review the remaining public disclosure requirements with the aim of being able to explain clearly how they contribute to impact and accountability.

5. Next Steps

- Slides from the meeting will be shared; the discussion on Guidance development will be rolled over to the next Standards Committee call in late October.
- The second public consultation period is anticipated to launch in January – the SC would have three more virtual meetings in 2026 (late October, late November, mid-December). Given the amount of content in the drafts, most comments will be worked through offline through the drafts or via one-to-one outreach to SC Members.
- There will be a three-week final review period for the SC to look at the updated drafts in October, once the next set of Working Groups have met in early October.