

Form 3 - Public Disclosure Form

This form shall be submitted by the CAB no less than thirty (30) working days prior to any onsite audit. Any changes to this information shall be submitted to the ASC within five (5) days of the change and not later than 10 days before the planned audit. If later, a new announcement is submitted and another 30 days rule will apply.

The information on this form shall be public and should be posted on the ASC website within three (3) days of submission (except unannounced audits).

This form shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.

This form should be translated into local languages when appropriate

PDF 1 Public Disclosure Form	
PDF 1.1 Name of CAB	Bureau Veritas Certification Denmark
PDF 1.2 Date of Submission	15/01/2019
PDF 1.3 CAB Contact Person	
PDF 1.3.1 Name of Contact Person	Sølvi Skare
PDF 1.3.2 Position in the CAB's organisation	Lead Auditor
PDF 1.3.3 Mailing address	Oldenborggade 25-21, 7000 Fredericia, Denmark
PDF 1.3.4 Email address	solvi.skare@dk.bureauveritas.com
PDF 1.3.5 Phone number	4550852276
PDF 1.3.6 Other	asc.farm@dk.bureauveritas.com



PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client

PDF 1.4.1 Name of the Client	Cermaq Norway AS
PDF 1.4.1.a Name of the unit of certification	Cerma Norway AS Langøyhovden
PDF 1.4.2 Name of Contact Person	Silje Ramsvatn
PDF 1.4.3 Position in the client's organisation	Sustainability manager
PDF 1.4.4 Mailing address	Cermaq Norway AS Gjerbakknes. 8286 Nordfold. Norway
PDF 1.4.5 Email address	<u>silje.ramsvatn@cermaq.com</u>
PFD 1.4.6 Phone number	0047 41148216
PDF 1.4.7 Other	www.cermaq.com

PDF 1.5 Unit of Certification

PDF 1.5.1 Single Site PDF 1.5.2 Multi-site PDF 1.5.2.a Ownership status PDF 1.5.3 Group certification

х	



PDF 1.6 Sites to be audited

Langøyhovden 68028.2450	standard		recertification, etc.)	harvest)
	N/14051.984I Salmo salar. In sco of the ASC salmon 1.1 standard	pe Owned v	SA1 25-02-2019 and 01- 03-2019	In production

PDF 1.7 Species and Standards

Standard	Species (scientific name) produced	Included in scope (Yes/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used	Version Number
Salmon	Salmo salar	Yes	ASC	1.1

PDF 1.8 Planned Stakeholder Consultation(s) and How Stakeholders can Become Involved

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in- person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted
Mattilsynet	Authorities		1 week before audit	Sending e-mail before Audit
Nordland Fylkeskommune	Local Authorities		1 week before audit	Sending e-mail before Audit
Kystverket	Authorities		1 week before audit	Sending e-mail before Audit
Fiskeridirektoratet	Authorities		1 week before audit	Sending e-mail before Audit



ASC Audit report template - Content

Form 3 - Public Disclosure Form I. Audit report - Opening II. Audit template species specific III. Audit report - Traceability IV. Audit report - Closing V. Audit report - Multi-site specific VI. Internal Auditors Requirements VII. List of sites

History of audit report template revision

Audit report template 1.2 new features (including multi-site requirements):

- 1. The following worksheets are adjusted to include relevant information of multi-site audits (field with numbering in blue).
 - Form 3 Public Disclosure Form
 - I. Audit Report Opening
 - III. Audit report -Traceability
- 2. A new worksheet V. Multi-site specific is added.
- 3. Some clarification/guidance is added in the form of comment to relevant cells.
- 4. VI. Internal auditor qualidications and competencies
- 5. VII. List of sites of a multi-site client (integral part of a multi-site certificate)

Audit report template 1.1 new features:



- A new column to report metrics separately in the audit templates (*Column G* : Value/ Metric Provide values - if applicable for the respective Indicator). For Auditors: Please note down all metrics in this extra column.
- The Sheets "Summary of findings (e.g. Salmon)" are now linked to the respective audit-template and have been changed to serve as a single source of information on NCs.
- → Audit evidence, Evaluation and the Description of the NC need to be filled out by the Auditor only in the respective template. The text will automatically appear in the summary of findings
- In all sheets "Summary of findings ()" section "11 Findings" was amended to fit the new features



ASC Audit Report - Opening

General Requirements

C1 Audit reports shall be written in English and in the most common language spoken in the areas where the operation is located.

- C2 Audit reports may contain confidential annexes for commercially sensitive information.
 - **C2.1** The CAB shall agree the content of any commercially sensitive information with the applicant, which can still be accessible by the ASC and the appointed accreditation body upon request as stipulated in the certification contract.
 - **C2.2** The public report shall contain a clear overview of the items which are in the confidential annexes.
 - **C2.3** Except for the annexes that contain commercially sensitive information all audit reports will be public.
- **C3** The CAB is solely responsible for the content of all reports, including the content of any confidential annexes.
- C4 Reporting Deadlines for certification and re-certification audit reports (in working day)
 - **C4.1** Within thirty (30) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a draft report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
 - C4.2 Within five (5) days the ASC should post the draft report to the ASC website.
 - C4.3 The CAB shall allow stakeholders and interested parties to comment on the report for fifteen (15) days.
 - **C4.4** Within twenty (20) days of the close of comments, the CAB shall submit the final report to the ASC in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
 - C4.5 Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.
 - C4.6 Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducable results.

C5 Reporting Deadlines* for surveillance audit reports

- **C5.1** Within ninety (90) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a final report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- C5.2 Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.
- C5.3 Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducable results.



1 Title Page

1.1 Name of Applicant	Cermaq AS
1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Draft Certification Report/ Final certification report/Surveillance report]	ASC Salmon Cermaq Langøyhovden Draft Report SURV 1 Audit 2019
1.3 CAB name	Bureau Veritas Certification Denmark A/S
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Sølvi Skare
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Report Author: Sølvi Skare, ASC Auditor. Reviewer: Annette Kaalund, Quality Assistant
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Silje Ramsvatn, Sustainability manager
1.7 Date	Date of audit 25.02.2019-08.02.2019. Date of report writing: 2019-04-02

2 Table of Contents

3 Glossary

Terms and abbreviations that are specific to this audit report and that are not otherwise defined in the ASC glossary MOM-B: MOM-B (matfiskanlegg - overvåking - modellering) and MOM-C are surveys of benthic environment at or near farm, according to NS 9410 (Norwegian Standard 9410). ABM: Area-Based Management



4 Summary

A concise summary of the report and findings. The summary shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.

4.1	A brief description of the scope of the audit (<i>including activities of the UoC</i> <i>being audited</i>)	This audit covers all the principles and criteria in ASC salmon standard, version 1.1 April 2017. The audit include interview of the farm workers and review of documentation. Audit covering principle 6 was performed by review of relevant documentation, interviews with the quality management and confidential interviews with the employees. The interview was performed without interruption from management. Harvest was not observed at this SA1 audit. Rationale: There was no harvest planned.		
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	The unit of certification is the entire Langøyhovden seafarm, site number 11238. Langøyhovden is an ongrowing farm for Atlantic Salmon from smolt and until the salmon is ready for slaughtering. Langøyhovden site is located in The farm is located southeast of Dyrøya in Nordland county. Site`s receiving water-body is Børøyfjorden, Ryggefjorden, Hamnfjorden, Sandsetfjorden (Øksnes municipality). The production system is based on 9 cages. Size of cages: 160 meter circumference and depth 24 meters. The MTB is 3120 tons. The last production cycle from May 2017 to October 2018 Smolt supplier: Cermaq Forsan Smolt. The site previous cycle was ended July 2016 and has been fallowed until September 2018. The employees stay on the barge for 7 day, followed by 7 days off. The landbase is used by the employees for for changing into working clothes before entering the vessels and further to the sites.		
4.3	Type of unit of certification (select only one type of unit of certification in the list)	Single farm (<i>owned by client</i>)		
4.4	Type of audit (select all the types of audit that apply in the list)	SURV 1		
4.4.1	Number of sites included in the unit of certification	Owned by client	Subcontracted by client	
	Initial audit - mm/yyyy	Oct-17	N/A	
	Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy	Feb-19	N/A	
	Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy			

Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy



4.5	A summary of the major findings	The site were in compliance with the ASC Salmon Standard v2.1 April 2017 except from the following non-conformities: 2.1.3, 4.3.2, 4.3.5, 4.4.2
4.6	The Audit determination	Based on the audit report the unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant ASC salmon standard - version 1.1

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1	CAB Name	Bureau Veritas Certification Denmark A/S
5.2	CAB Mailing Address	Bureau Veritas Certification A/S. Oldenborggade 25-31, 7000 Fredericia. Denmark
5.3	Email Address	ASC.Farm@dk.bureauveritas.com
5.4	Other Contact Information	www.bureauveritas.dk

6 Background on the Applicant

6.1	Information on the Public Disclosure Form (Form 3) except 1.2-1.3. All information updated as necessary to reflect the audit as conducted.	All information on Form 3 - Public Disclosure Form is updated.
6.2	A description of the unit of certification (for intial audit) / changes, if any (for surveillance and recertification audits)	The unit of certification is the entire Langøyhovden farm. See 4.2 for details.
6.3	Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	None
6.4	Other certification(s) obtained by the UoC before this audit	None
6.5	Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>curren</u> t year	Langøyhovden is fallowed 2019



6.6	<u>Actual</u> annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>previous</u> year	2017 G: 2898 tons
	(mandatory for surveillance and recertification	
	audits)	
6.7	Production system(s) employed within the	Cage
	unit of certification (select one or more in the	
	list)	
6.8	Number of employees working at the unit	5 (+2 shared with site Dypeidet)
	of certification (see notes in comment to this	
	cell)	
6.9	Size, and/or number of ponds, pens (if	Langøyhoyden is a seasite with 9 cages of which all are in use for this generation.
	multi site, per site)	All cages were covered by the audit

ASC Salmon Standard v2.1 April 2019

7 Scope

- 7.1 The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number
- The species produced at the applicant farm Atlantic Salmon/Salmo Salar 7.2 (in English and Latin names)
- 7.3 A description of the scope of the audit of certification covers all production or harvest areas (i.e. ponds) managed by the operation or located at the included sites, or whether only a sub-set of these are included in the unit of certification. If only a sub-set of production or harvest areas are included in the unit of certification these shall be clearly named.

The audit covered all principle and criteria in ASC Salmon Standard, Version 1.1 - April 2017. The unit including a description of whether the unit of certification covers the entire farm. The audit included a review of documentation, processes and handling of equipment. Audit covering principle 6 & 7 was done by review of relevant documentation, interviews with the quality management and confidential interviews with employees. The interview was performed without interruption. The auditor was given access to all places, documentation and employees. The farm does not consider information which is relevant to the ASC certification as confidential e.g. FFDRm, FFDRo, FCR, Mortality rates etc. The farm and Bureau Veritas has therefore decided to include all information which is relevant to the ASC certification in the report. Commercially sensitive information related to the aquaculture operation e.g. cost of juveniles, cost of feed, investments, sales price etc. was not reviewed as part of the initial audit. Commercially sensitive information related to employee salaries, workload and contracts details etc. were reviewed by the Social Auditor. Information on salaries, workload and contracts is not included in the report, but information has been evaluated during audit.



7.4	The names and addresses of any storage, processing, or distribution sites included in the operation (including subcontracted operations) that will potentially be handling certified products, up until the point where product enters further chain of custody.	N/A
7.5	Description of the receiving water body(ies).	The farm is located southeast of Dyrøya in Nordland county. Site`s receiving water-body is Børøyfjorden, Ryggefjorden, Hamnfjorden, Sandsetfjorden (Øksnes municipality). Regional water-body authority is Nordland County. This is a coastal water area. Categorised as a coastal waters, of Euhaline nature (>30‰ salinity). Ecological quality is defined as good. Chemical condition is not defined in public documentation. Details www.vann-nett.no The site is under voluntary ABM system. There is other salmon farming activity in the area. There are natural wild salmon populations in the area. Overview of salmon watercourses in the area are available in map tools from the Environment Agency / Salmon Registry: http://lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no/

8 Audit Plan

8.1 The names of the auditors and the dates when each of the following were undertaken or completed: conducting the audit, writing of the report, reviewing the report, and taking the certification decision.

Sølvi Skare, Lars Windmar. Conduction the audit: 25.02.2019-08.03.2019. Writing the report: 02-04-2019 Review: Annette Kaalund 07-07-2019. Certification decision: Annette Kaalund 11-07-2019.



Previous Audits (if applicable): 8.2

			Standard	
		NC reference	clause	Closing deadline - status - closing date of each NC
		number	reference	
8.2.1	Initial audit - mm/yyyy		2.1.1, 2.1.2,	
			2.1.3, 2.2.1,	
			2.2.2, 2.3.1,	
			3.1.3, 4.7.1,	
			4.7.3, 6.2.2,	
		Nov-17	6.5.1, 6.5.2	22/01/2018
			2.1.3, 4.3.2,	
	Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy	Mar-19	4.3.5, 4.4.2	
	Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy			
	Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy			
	Unannounced audit - mm/ yyyy			
	NC close-out audit - mm/ yyyyy			
	Scope extention audit mm/ yyyy			

Surveillance audit 1 Surveillance audit 2 Recertification audit Unannounced audit NC close-out audit -Scope extention aud

8.3 Audit plan as implemented including:

8.3.2 Onsite audits

- 8.3.3 Stakeholder interviews and Community meeting
- 8.3.4 Draft report sent to client

Draft report sent to ASC 8.3.5

8.3.6 Final report sent to Client and ASC

	Dates	Locations
	January 2019	BVCDK Office
	26.02.2019-	
	08.03.2018	On site audit
S		N/A for this audit
		N/A for this audit
		N/A for this audit
	11/07/2019	BVCDK Office



Names and affiliations of individuals 8.4 consulted or otherwise involved in the audit including: representatives of the client, employees, contractors, stakeholders and any observers that participated in the audit.

Silje Ramsvatn, Sustainability Manager. Aage Willy Andersen, Site manager. Rune Suhr Berg, Health and Safety Manager. Ola Gunder Henriksen, Quality Coordinator. Elisabeth Ann Myklebrest, Fish health Manager. Kietil Lenartsen, Operation Coordinator.

Stakeholder submissions, including written or other documented information and CAB written responses to each submission at different stages of 8.5 the certification process (audit notification, during on-sitt audit, public comment period)

Name of stakeholder (if permission given to make name public)	Relevance to be contacted	Date of contact	CAB responded Yes/No	Brief summary of points Raised	Use of comment by CAB	Response sent to stakeholder

om the scope of ar
om the scope of conditions in F
conditions ir

- 8.6. E5.1.ii Justification for auditing site(s) meeting conditions under E5.1.i 1
- E5.1.1.i List of sites removed after the initial audit 8.7
- E5.2.2 Reason for the removal of sites from the 8.7 certificate. 1
- E5.4 Map of sites included in the unit of 8.8 certification has been attached

E5.5 Site(s) in fallowing period included in the

8.9 audit (only for surveillance and re-certification audits)



Client Internal Management System

Pre-requisite, without which an external audit is not allowed to take pl If not met, a major NC is raised by CAB

Internal procedures		
	Brief description	Status (met/not met)
17.1.3.2.b).iii.A Document control procedure 17.1.3.2.b).iii.B Record keeping and		
retention procedure		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.C Procedure for managing changes to ASC requirements		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.D Procedure for conducting annual management reviews		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.E Procedure for managing complaints submitted to Management by stakeholders and staff members as per specified in the applicable (farm)		
standard 17.1.3.2.b).iii.F Procedure for the evaluation and implementation of corrective and preventive actions		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.G Procedure for conducting root cause analyses for nonconformities, and for addressing identified root causes		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.H Procedures to ensure compliance with legal requirements		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.I Procedures for conducting an annual internal audit, covering ASC requirements		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.J Procedures for planning for and evaluation of the results of internal audits		
17.1.3.2.b).iii.K Procedures for the scheduled reporting of performance of management systems and sites		



17.1.3.2.b).iii.L Procedures for identifying and segregating all products within each site, among sites within the unit of certification, and products that are not included in the unit of certification	
17.1.3.2.b).iii.L.1 Description of how certified products are identified and segregated to prevent mixing with non-certified before the start of the MSC/ASC certified chain of custody	
17.1.3.2.b).iii.L.2 Description of the conditions under which products must be segregated, and measures to prevent mixing directly or indirectly	
17.1.3.2.b).iii.L.3 Procedure for traceback of products from the start of the MSC/ ASC certified chain of custody back to the production unit (<i>cage/net/pen/ pond/tank/raceway</i>)	
17.1.3.2.b).iii.M Procedures for traceability of inputs used for each site as specified in the standard being audited to	
Management review	
17.1.3.2.b).iv Yearly management review is carried out (<i>date of the last review, by whom, outcome, etc</i> .)	
Internal audit	
17.1.3.2.b). v.A A full internal audit has been completed prior to this onsite audit (<i>dates, scope, outcome, etc.</i>)	
17.1.3.2.b). v.A.1 The internal audit included all relevant ASC requirements	

at all sites and the central office



17.1.3.2.b). v.A.1.1+ 2 Social requirements excluded from internal audits and justification	CAB's acceptance
17.1.3.2.b).v.A.3 Internal auditors are competent as required in Annex B	
17.1.3.2.b).vii.B Implementation of corrective and preventive actions	

Traceability

17.1.3.2.b).iii.L.3 Test traceback from
sale(s) by the client's central office back
to production unit(s) of site(s)

Subcontracting

17.1.3.2.b).vi.B.1 All of the operations of subcontracted farms are subject to the same procedures as the rest of the unit of certification	
17.1.3.2.b).vi.B.2 The product produced by the subcontractors is owned by the certificate holder	
17.1.3.2.b).vi.B.3 The central office has the same oversight and right to control over the operations of subcontractors as it has for its own operations	
17.1.3.2.b).vi.B.4 All of the operations of the subcontracted farms are included in the multi-site certificate.	
17.1.3.2.b).vi.B.5 The contract is transparent, mutually accepted by both parties and include the above provisions (17.1.3.2.b.vi.B.1-4)	
17.1.3.2.b).ix Compliance to all relevant ASC requirements of all sites within the unit of certification is monitored	
17.1.3.2.b).x Notification to the CAB of any non-conformities against applicable local regulations that are relevant to the ASC scope of certification within three (3) days of detection	



Risk evaluation

Table E1 - ASC sample size calculator for sites and staff interviews in multi-site certification			
Is this the initial audit of the client or operation?	No		
How many sites does the client or operation have?			
How many sites has the clinte or operation ADDED since the last audit?			
How many employees does the client or operation have?			
Threat	Risk Level		
1. Management system weakness			
2. Weakness of client's internal site checklist			
3. Internal audit weakness			
4. Staff training weakness			
5. Multiple management systems			
6. Records management weakness			
7. Subcontractors including subcontracted farms and subcontracted services (related to			
the operations of the unit of certification			
8. Use of resources			
9. Record of NCs raised by the ASC CAB and response			
10. Complaints resolution weakness			
11. Traceability weakness			
12. Country risk assessment score			

E2. The CAB shall add the list of additional threats (Annex E, E4.2.1.ii) to this table and provide its risk category and an explanation to support it to this table.

Additional risks identified by the CAB (E7.1.1.i, 7.2.2, 8.1.1.i)				
Threat	Thresholds for determining level of risk	Risk Level		
	Low:			
	Medium:			
	high:			

Sample size (Sites)	
Sample size (Employees)	
E2.1.vi Sample size for records	
E9.2 Explanation of sample selection	

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard v1.1

Scope: species belonging to the genus Salmo and Oncorhynchus

INSTRUCTION TO FARMS/AUDITORS:

This audit manual was developed to accompany version 1.1 of the ASC Salmon Standard.

		References in this Audit Manual to Appendices can be found in the	ne ASC Salmon Standard document.			
		PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS	AND LOCAL REGULATIONS			
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Audit evidence Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence. Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanitory text. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe also in the cells below. A. Review compliance with applicable land and water use laws.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Description of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability	Value/ Metric Provide values - if applicable for the respective Indicator
		a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws.	LANGØYHOVDEN A. Electronic copies of laws, regulations and requirements with references to Lovdata with updates and electronic links			
1.1.1		b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable.	in Intelex system. Covered by internal procedures in QMS, "Samsvar vurdering ytre miljø", with "Forskrift om bekæmpelse af lus, IK vassdrag, "Lov om Akvakultur" LOV-			
	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use Requirement: Yes Applicability: All d. Obtain permits and maps showing t preservation areas.	c. Keep records of inspections for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	f 2005-06-17-79. Strict monitored by relevant authorities on these issues. B. Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland			
Requir Applic		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	12.10.2017 for Langøyhovden MTB 3120 tons. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 24.10.2017 for Langøyhovden MTB 3120 tons, licenses N HM0002, N SG0007, N SG0016, N SG0027, N SG0028 N Inspection by Norwegian Food Safety Authority 2018-11-04, 6 non conformities detected. No inspection by Directorate of Fisheries in 2018. No inspections by "Arbeidstilsynet" in 2018. Not within conservation area, seen map from "kart.naturbase.no" with protected areas. Impact on the area is evaluated in permit documents and further risk assessed minimum yearly (last in 2018).	Compliant		
	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating	a. Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CABs will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public.	A. Authorised auditor report/statement for organisation number 961922976, for Period 1.4.2017-31.3.2018 signed by Deloitte was seen at the audit. Deloitte had no critical			
1.1.2	Requirement: Yes	b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	comments. B. Lovdata access to updated versions in quality system Intelex. C Cermaq Norway AS is registered as an Compliant			
	Applicability: All	c. Register with national or local authorities as an "aquaculture activity".	aquaculture activity, see Brønnøysundregisteret, organisation number 961922976 and information regarding Cermaq Langøyhovden at https://www.barentswatch.no/fiskehelse/locality/11238			

		Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	A.Copies of national labor of
	1.1.3	Requirement: Yes	b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	quality system Intelex.
-			a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.	Discharge permit from Fylk
			b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	13.05.2011 for Langøyhovd pollution control act
	1.1.4	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	Operation plan approved b bottom is mainly shell sand A. B. As described in above according to Norwegian leg Langøyhovden, Fallowing si continue to May 2019. C in: Niva, sampling date 27.09. Result from class II-IV, Sam 3846 tons, 75 % of max bio auhtorities/ Altinn end of n assured according to "Proso havbunn og omkringliggen 05.02.18.

codes and laws are available in	Compliant	
esmannen i Nordland den MTB 3120 tons, according to y Directorate of Fisheries.The d and rock/ mountain bottom permits. B and C inspection gislation and NS 9410. For tarted December 2018 and will spection performed by Akvaplan 2018, date of report 02.11.2018. pling performed at a biomass of mass C. MTB reported to nonth. Compliance and updates edyre for miljøovervåking av de miljø matfiskanlegg" ID 332, dt.	Compliant	

PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT. LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1] Footnote [1] Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standar Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 2.1 - Modification of the Benthic Sampling Methodology For farms located in a jurisdiction where specific benthic sampling locations are required under law, clients may request to modify the benthic sampling methodology prescribed in Appendix I-1 locations and/or changes in the total number of samples. Where modifications are sought, farms shall provide a full justification to the CAB for review. Requests for modification shall be support sampling locations. In any event, the sampling locations must at a minimum include samples from the cage edge and samples taken from inside and outside of a defined AZE. CABs shall evaluate client requests to modify benthic methodology based on whether there is a risk that such changes would jeopardize the intent and rigor of the ASC Salmon Standard. If the CA modifications are low risk, the CAB shall ensure that details of the modified benthic sampling methodology are fully described and justified in the audit report. Note: Under Indicator 2.1.1, farms can choose to measure redox potential (Option #1) or sulphide concentration (Option demonstrate that they meet both threshold values. a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification [3] to the CAB. A. Description of sampling sampling points, adapted Indicator: Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and production, current, etc. sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) (reference stations: Cu1 ar request an exemption from 2.1.1c-f, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station Appendix I-1 showed that the bottom of . Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance 2.1.1 sand and rock/mountain be **Requirement:** Redox potential > 0 mV with the requirements of the Standard. Fiskeridirektoratet date 22 perform future environme Sulphide ≤ 1,500 µMol/L d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I-1 (i.e. at the (Remotely operated under time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations). chosen. D. Sampling perfor Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1] e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an % of max biomass. E. Red appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. Option #1 is chosen. G. Tes . For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (μ M) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. If site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC. [2] Farm sites can choose whether to use redox or sulphide. Farms do not have to demonstrate Footnote [3] Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) is defined under this standard as 30 meters. For farm sites where a site-specific AZE has been defined using a robust and credible modeling system such as the SEPA AUTODEPOMOD and verified through monitoring, the site-specific AZE shall be used. Footnote

ds under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix	x VI for require	ments on transparenc	y for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2	2.1.3.
to allow for sampling at different ted by mapping of differences in				
B determines that proposed				
#2). Farms do not have to				
g stations:. Olex map with 6 to site specific bathymetric, and Cu2, stations outside a inside AZE: C1.B. The survey f the plant consisted mainly of shell bottom. Letter from 2.3.2018 describes the decision to ental investigations based on ROV twater vehicle). C. Option #1 is rmed at a biomass of 3846 tons, 75 lox C2: 349 mV. C4: 275 mV. F. NA st results sent to ASC 20.11.2018	Compliant			
that they meet both.				
	and			

		Notes: - Under Indicator 2.1.2, farms can choose one of four measurements to show compliance with Wiener Index (Option #2); BQI (Option #3); or ITI (Option #4). Farms do not have to demonstra - If a farm is exempt due to hard bottom benthos (see 2.1.1b), then 2.1.2 does not apply and t	the faunal index Requirement ate that they meet all four th his shall be noted in the aud
		a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1).	A. Description of sampling sampling points, adapted to
	Indicator: Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1	 b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement. c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1). 	production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 an AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station showed that the bottom of
2.1.2	Requirement: AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score ≤ 3.3. or	d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method.	sand and rock/mountain bo Wiener index is chosen.C. S
	Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or	e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method.	of 3846 tons. Date of samp Wiener index is chosen. E. C2: 3.32. C4: 3.89. F.G. NA
	Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25	f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.	H. Akvaplan.niva report I.
		g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.	
		h. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analyzed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results.	
		i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	
Footnote	[4] "Good" Ecological Quality Classifica	ation: The level of diversity and abundance of invertebrate taxa is slightly outside the range asso	ociated with the type-specifi
Footnote		[5] http://www.azti.es/en/ambi-azti-mari	ne-biotic-index.html.
		a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b.	A.B. See 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.Fie
	Indicator: Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment	b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method.	identification and calculation 17025. Guidance on sampli 19. Water quality - Guidelir
	within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1	c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.	sample processing of marir Evaluation benthos accordi 02:2013 (Anon 2013).
2.1.3	Requirement: ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species	d. Retain documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained. If samples were analyzed by an independent lab, obtain copies of results.	orogram used is primer v5. indicator species were iden 02.11.2018. Sampling perfo
	Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]		
		e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	C survey analyse from field NIVA shows results 1 highly pollution index, within the
Footnote		[6] Highly abundant: Greater than 100 organisms per square meter (or equally high t	o reference site(s) if natural
	Indicator: Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modeling system	a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern.	
2.1.4	Requirement: Yes	b. Maintain records to show how the analysis (in 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modeling using a multi-parameter approach [7].	AZE defined by Akvaplan-n cages.

ent: AMBI (Option #1); Shannon- nreshold values. lit report.			
stations:. Olex map with 6 o site specific bathymetric, d Cu2, stations outside inside AZE: C1.B. The survey the plant consisted mainly of shell ottom. B. option #2, Shannon- Sampling performed at a biomass oling 02.11.2018. D. NA. Shannon- Shannon Wiener Index. C1: 1,18. Shannon-Wiener index is chosen. Test results sent to ASC	Compliant taxa of the type	e-specific communities are present.	
Id work, sorting, specie on according to NS-EN ISO/IEC ing of marine sediments ISO 5667- nes for quantitive sampling and ne soft bottom macro fauna. ing to NS 9410:2016 and guidance C: 3 Taxa that are not pollution ntified. D. Akvaplan.niva report ormed at a biomass of 3846 tons. I8 E. Test results sent to ASC work 27.09.2018 by AKVAPLAN y abundant taxa that are not AZE	Minor	C survey analyse from field work 27.09.2018 by AKVAPLAN NIVA shows results 1 highly abundant taxa that are not pollution index, within the AZE	
abundance is lower than this level)			
iva. AZE is defined as 60 m around	Compliant		

	Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data.	
Footnote	[7] Robust and credible: The SEPA AUTODEPOMO	D modeling system is considered to be an example of a credible and robust system. The model	must include a multi-p

parameter approach. Monitoring must be used to ground-truth the AZE proposed through the model.

		Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site o	f operation [8]
	F	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	
Footnote		[8] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements	for 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2
2.2.1	Indicator: Weekly average percent saturation [9] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [10] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4 Requirement: ≥ 70% [11] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [11]	 Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.1 - Monitoring Average Weekly Percent Saturation of Appendix I-4 presents the required methodology that farms must follow for sampling the average points of the method are as follows: measurements may be taken with a handheld oxygen meter or equivalent chemical method; equipment is calibrated according to manufacturer's recommendations; measurements are taken at least twice daily: once in the morning (6 -9 am) and once in the as salinity and temperature must also be measured when DO is sampled; sampling should be done at 5 meters depth in water conditions that would be experienced be each week, all DO measurements are used in the calculation of a weekly average percent sat If monitoring deviates from prescribed sampling methodology, the farm shall provide the aud due to bad weather). In limited and well-justified situations, farms may request that the CAB aper day. Exception [see footnote 12] If a farm does not meet the minimum 70 percent weekly average consistency of percent saturation with a reference site. The reference site shall be at least 500 is understood to follow similar patterns in upwelling to the farm site and is not influenced by aquaculture, agricultural runoff or nutrient releases from coastal communities. For any such e how the farm has demonstrated consistency with the reference site. Note 1: Percent saturation is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sampling time. c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data. d. If any weekly average percent saturation based on data. d. If any weekly average DO values are < 70%, or approaching that level, monitor and record DO at a reference site and compare to on-farm levels (see Instructions). e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site	f Dissolved Oxygen rage weekly percent saturation afternoon (3-6 pm) as appro- by fish (e.g. at the downstrea uration. itor with a written justification approve reduction of DO mo saturation requirement, the meters from the edge of the nutrient inputs from anthrop exceptions, the auditor shall to the maximum amount that A. Nortek "Realfish" contine minutes) of oxygen, salinity sampling stations (5 and 10 Seen record for the cyclus, oxygen and maximum 1279 oxygen. Minimum 9,9 mg of maximum 13,1 mg oxygen B. C. Seen record for the p November 2018. E. Monito routines verified on site. Go equipment producer availa
Footnote		[10] Averaged weekly from two daily measurement	is (proposed at 6 am and 2 n
Footnote		[10] Averaged weekly from two daily measurement	
Footnote		[11] An exception to this standard shall be made for farms that can demonstrat	e consistency with a referen

2.5.			
on of dissolved oxygen (DO). Key			
priate for the location and season; m edge of a net pen array):			
on (e.g. when samples are missed nitoring frequency to one sample			
farm must demonstrate the e net pen array, in a location that pogenic causes including fully document in the audit report			
it could be present at the same			
uous logging (every 10 y and temperature at 2) meters). average 104 %, minimum 92 % % oxygen per liter and per liter. period from August 2017 to oring of oksygen and calibration ood knowledge, instructions from able. Info submitted to ASC	Compliant		
hat could be present at the same te	mperature and	salinity.	
m).			
ce site in the same water body.			

	Indicator: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from		
	2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/L DO	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/L DO.	
2.2.2	Requirement: 5% Applicability: All	b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	A. Data seen at audit and n /I. B.Info submitted to ASC
	Indicator: For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets [12], demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently	a. Inform the CAB whether relevant targets and classification systems are applicable in the jurisdiction. If applicable, proceed to "2.2.3.b". If not applicable, take action as required under 2.2.4	A. B.C Relevant targets and applicable in the jurisidctic
2.2.3	[13] classified as having "good" or "very good" water quality [14]Requirement: Yes [15]	b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.	objectives for area Øksnes nett.no/). Ecologic conditio state are classified 81,8% p
	Applicability: All farms except as noted in [15]	c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.	presumed very good, 9,1% undefined.EU
Footnote		[12] Related to nutrients (e.g., N, P,	chlorophyll A).
Footnote		[13] Within the two years prior t	to the audit.
Footnote			
reethete	[14] Classificatio	ons of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classi	fication from other water q
Footnote	[14] Classification [14] Classification [15] Closed production systems that can demo	ons of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classi onstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of c	fication from other water qui lissolved nutrients (through
Footnote	[14] Classification [15] Closed production systems that can demo Indicator: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [16] levels on farm and at a	ons of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classi constrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of c a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months.	fication from other water qu
Footnote	[14] Classification [15] Closed production systems that can demo Indicator: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [16] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5 Requirement: Consistency with reference site	ons of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classi onstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of c a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months. b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.	fication from other water qu lissolved nutrients (through N/A. Relevant targets and applicable in the jurisidctic
Footnote	[14] Classification [15] Closed production systems that can demo Indicator: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [16] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5 Requirement: Consistency with reference site Applicability: All farms except as noted in [16]	 bins of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classi constrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of c a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months. b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations. c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. 	fication from other water q lissolved nutrients (through N/A. Relevant targets and applicable in the jurisidctic

esults from 2018 all beoynd 2 mg	Compliant				
d classification systems are on. EU Water Directive 2000 gives community (reference to vann- on and chemical presumed good, 4,5% presumed moderate and 4,5%	Compliant				
ality monitoring systems in other jurisdictions are acceptable.					
biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt from standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.					

classification systems are on see 2.2.3	N/A			
abase. Methods such as a Hach kit are acceptable.				

	Indicator: Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [17]) of the farm on a production cycle basis	 struction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand b) chemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) can be calculated based on cumulative inputs of N and C to the environment over the course of the production cycle. ID = ((total N in feed - total N in fish)*4.57) + ((total C in feed - total C in fish)*2.67). A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient wasted. In s equation, "fish" refers to harvested fish. In this case, farm must submit breakdown of N & C captured/filtered/absorbed to ASC along with method used estimate nutrient reduction. Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting; Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD lculation methodology available at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html. the 1: Calculation requires a full production cycle of data and is required beginning with the production cycle first undergoing certification. If it is the first dit for the farm, the client is required to demonstrate to the CAB that data is being collected and an understanding of the calculations. the 2: Farms may seek an exemption to Indicator 2.2.5 if: the farm collects BOD samples at least once every two weeks, samples are independently alyzed by an accredited laboratory, and the farm can show that BOD monitoring results do not deviate significantly from calculated annual BOD load. 				
2.2.5	Requirement: Yes	a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.				
		b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	Ended cycle 17G : BOD 1773 mTO2, BOD calculated : ((total N in feed 236 – total N in fish 101)*4.57) + ((total C in feed 12129 – total C in fish 1695)*2.67). Ongoing production cycle: The smolt were stocken May 2017. Harvest from November - December 2018. Calculation from Langøyhovden production cycle 17G, period May 2017 - December 2018. Harvested 3391 tons of fish, 3943 tons feed. FCR: 1,09.	Compliant		340
Footnote	[17] BOD calculated as: ((total N in feed – total N in fish) harvested fish. Reference for calculation methodolog	*4.57) + ((total C in feed – total C in fish)*2.67). A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filte gy: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxyger Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available	red or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through on demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture So at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html.	direct collectio ciety Meeting;	n of nutrient wasted. In this equation, "fish" Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: G	refers to ilobal
	Indicator: Appropriate controls are in place that maintain good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs,	a. Document control systems in good culture and hygene that includes all appropriate elements.	A. Procedure "Hygienereglement - Matfisk" ID 127, dt.			
2.2.6	thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	b. Apply the systems ensuring that staff are aware, qualified and trained to proberly implement them.	håndtering av kjemikalier og gasser", ID 473, 06.04.2018. Cermaq is ISO 9001 certified. The implementation of appropriate controls were verified at the audit.	Compliant		

		Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from prod	uction	
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		
		Note: The methodology given in Appendix I-2 is used to determine t	he fines (dust and small frag	
231	Indicator : Percentage of fines [18] in the feed at point of	a. Determine and document a schedule and location for quarterly testing of feed. If testing prior to delivery to farm site, document rationale behind not testing on site.	EWOS and Biomar are feed	
	in Appendix I-2)	 b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations. 	measured according to req calculations ranging from C	
	Requirement: < 1% by weight of the feed Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]	c. Conduct test according to detailed methodology in Appendix I-2 and record results for the pooled sample for each quarter. For first audits, farms must have test results from the last 3 months.	November 2018. Monthly t Intelex procedure "Prosedy dated 27.09.17 % of fines is All below 1%.	
Footnote	[18] Fines: Dust and fragments in the feed. Particles that s	eparate from feed with a diameter of 5 mm or less when sieved through a 1 mm sieve, or parti (e.g., from feed bags after they are de	cles that separate from feed elivered to farm).	
Footnote	[19] To be measured every quarter or every three month demon	is. Samples that are measured shall be chosen randomly. Feed may be sampled immediately prestrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients and > 50% of dissolve	ior to delivery to farm for sit d nutrients (through biofiltra	
		Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive ha	bitats and species	
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		
	Note: If a farm has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e Indicator 2.4.1 as long		t (e.g. as part of the regulaton ng as all components in App	
	Indicator : Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems	a. Perform (or contract to have performed) a documented assessment of the farm's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3.	A. Report "Biodiversitetsfo Vesterålen (Langøyhovden includes sensitive and prot species, lice, escape, treatr	
2.4.1	Appendix I-3 Requirement: Yes	b. If the assessment (2.4.1a) identifies potential impact(s) of the farm on biodiversity or nearby critical, sensitive or protected habitats or species, prepare plan to address those potential impacts.	etc. Includes actions and go biodiversity. In "Intelex": Risk assessme miljø Langøyhovden/Dypei	
	Applicability: All	c. Keep records to show how the farm implements plan(s) from 2.4.1b to minimize potential impacts to critical or sensitive habitats and species.	procedure "Prosedyre for r consequence assessment p 3. Document "Plan for milj Cermaq Group AS annual c sustainability report 2018. assement performed using	

gments) in finished product of fish f	eed which has	a diameter of 3 mm or more.	
d suppliers. Percentage of fines quirements. Registrations and 0,0 to 0,10% in period January to testing according to internal QMS yre fôrmottak og lagring" ID 260, is measured for all feed deliveries.	Compliant		
l with a diameter greater than 5 mm	n when sieved t	through a 2.36 mm sieve. To be measured at	farm gate
tes with no feed storage where it is ation, settling and/or other technolo	not possible to ogies) are exen	sample on farm. Closed production systems	that can
ory permitting process), the farm ma pendix I-3 are explicitly covered.	ay use such doo	cuments as evidence to demonstrate complia	ance with
kusert risikovurdering - , Dypeide)" 07.03.2017, ected habitats, redlisted ments, potential effects of farming, tal state, salmon carrying areas, oals for environment and ent "Risikovurdering Ytre ide" 22.02.2017 and risikovurdering". Impacts berformed according to Appendix I- ø og biodiversitetsledelse". corportae level environmental and Internal impacts consequence g data from reaserch institutes and	Compliant		

2.4.2		Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to Requirements that Farms are not si The following exceptions shall be made for Indicator 2.4.2: Exception #1: For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation o primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management). Exception #2: For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are comp designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not no as a HCVA. Exception #3: For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives	ted within Protected Areas f Nature (IUCN) as Category patible with the conservatio egatively impacting the core was already in operation ar of the protected area and it
	Indicator: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [20] or High Conservation Value Areas [21] (HCVAs) Requirement: None [22] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [22]	conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the plasm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been prote Definitions <u>Protected area:</u> "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed th conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." <u>High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA):</u> Natural habitats where conservation values are consided HCVA are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis f environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high of the second s	otected area. The burden o ected. rough legal or other effectiv dered to be of outstanding s or identifying critical conser conservation values are mai
		 a. Provide a map showing the location of the farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) as defined above (see also 1.1.1a). b. If the farm is <u>not</u> sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Area as defined above, prepare a declaration attesting to this fact. In this case, the requirements of 2.4.2c-d do not apply. c. If the farm <u>is</u> sited in a protected area or HCVA, review the scope of applicability of Indicator 2.4.2 (see Instructions above) to determine if your farm is allowed an exception to the requirements. If yes, inform the CAB which exception (#1, #2, or #3) is allowed and provide supporting evidence. d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA and the exceptions provided for Indicator 2.4.2 <u>do not apply</u>, then the farm does not comply with the requirement and is ineligible for ASC certification. 	A. Fiskeridirektoratet.no m known protected areas def conflict with protected are Cermaq 15.5.2018 None o HCVA, C.D. NA The site is r
Footnote	[20] Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical s	pace, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve th Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Catego	ne long-term conservation o pries, Gland, Switzerland: IU
Footnote	[21] High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA): Natural conservation values—	habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical -both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure	importance. HCVA are desig that these high conservatior
Footnote	 For protected areas cl For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environ For farms located in a protected area if it was designat relevant conditions or regulations placed on the 	[22] The following exceptions shall be ma assified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (nmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The identified as a HCVA ted as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that he farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof wo	de for Standard 2.4.2: hese are areas preserved po burden of proof would be at its environmental impacts ould be placed on the farm to

or HCVAs				
V or VI (these are areas preserved				
n objectives of the HCVA reason an area has been identified				
d provided the farm can is in compliance with any relevant f proof would be placed on the				
e means, to achieve the long-term				
gnificance or critical importance. vation values—both social and ntained or enhanced				
ap and DN Naturbase map with all ined. B. Dypeidet site is not in as - HCVAs or CAs. Statement ^c Cermaq sites are located in a ot situated in a HCVA.	Compliant			
nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." Source: Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008), N. x + 86pp.				

gnated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical n values are maintained or enhanced (http://www.hcvnetwork.org/).

rimarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management). placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been

s are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any o demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected.

		Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including	predators [23]
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	
Footnote		[23] See Appendix VI for transparency requireme	ents for 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.
2.5.1	Indicator: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used Requirement: 0 Applicability: All	a. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs have been used by the farm.	A. No use of ADDs or AHD ADDs devices, dt. 09.05.20 audit. Audit evidence: Inte
		a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.	
	Indicator : Number of mortalities [25] of endangered or	b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.	A. Birdnets located above
2.5.2	Requirement: 0 (zero)	c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.	bird entanglement inciden current production cycle. I
	Applicability: All	d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1)	for Dypeidet
Footnote		[25] Mortalities: Includes animals intentionally killed through lethal action as we	Il as accidental deaths throu
Footnote		[26] Species listed as endangered or critically endangered by the	
FOULIDLE			
	Indicator: Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [27] against a predator:1. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action	 a. Provide a list of all lethal actions that the farm took against predators during the previous 12-month period. Note: "lethal action" is an action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds. 	
2.5.3	 2. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager 3. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority 	 b. For each lethal action identified in 2.5.4a, keep record of the following: 1) a rationale showing how the farm pursued all other reasonable avenues prior to using lethal action; 2) approval from a senior manager above the farm manager of the lethal action; 3) where applicable, explicit permission was granted by the relevant regulatory authority to take lethal action against the animal 	NA. No lethal actions take
	Requirement: Yes [28]		
	Applicability: All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [28]	c. Provide documentary evidence that steps 1-3 above (in 2.5.4b) were taken prior to killing the animal. If human safety was endangered and urgent action necessary, provide documentary evidence as outlined in [28].	
Footnote		[27] Lethal action: Action taken to deliberately kill an anima	al, including marine mamma
Footnote	[28] Exception to these condition	ns may be made for a rare situation where human safety is endangered. Should this be required	d, post-incident approval fro

. Statement regarding non use of 18. This was verified during the prviews with the workers	Compliant			
he net cages are only predator No marine mammals involved. No ts in bird net on the site during the List of endangered or red-listed is included in the risk assessment	Compliant			
gh entanglement or other means.				
gered species list.				
ı at farm	N/A			
s and birds.				
n a senior manager should be made and relevant authorities must be informed.				

Instruction to Clients and CABs on Indicators 2.5.4, 2.5.5, and 2.5.6 - Clarification about the ASC Definition of "Lethal Incident" The ASC Salmon Standard has defined "Lethal incident" to include all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids [footnote 29]. For the purpose of assisting farms and auditors with understanding how to evaluate compliance with Indicators 2.5.4, 2.5.5, and 2.5.6, ASC has clarified this definition further: Total number of lethal Incidents = sum of all non-salmonid deaths arising from all lethal actions taken by the farm during a given time period There should be a 1:1 relationship between the number of animal deaths and the number of lethal incidents reported by the farm. For example, if a farm has taken one (1) lethal action in past last two years and that single lethal action resulted in killing three (3) birds, it is considered three (3) lethal incidents within a two year period. The term "non-salmonid" was intended to cover any predatory animals which are likely to try to feed upon farmed salmon. In practice these animals will usually be seals or birds. Indicator: Evidence that information about any lethal a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.3), keep records showing that the farm made the information incidents [30] on the farm has been made easily publicly available within 30 days of occurrence. available [29] a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.3), keep records showing that the farm made the information 2.5.4 NA. No lethal actions taken available within 30 days of occurrence. Requirement: Yes b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.4a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website). Applicability: All [29] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available." Shall be made available within 30 days of the incid Footnote . Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.3a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required. Indicator: Maximum number of lethal incidents [30] on the farm over the prior two years b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period. 2.5.5 **Requirement:** < 9 lethal incidents [31], with no more NA. No lethal actions taken than two of the incidents being marine mammals . Send ASC the farm's data for all lethal incidents [30] of any species other than the salmon being farmed (e.g. lethal incidents involving predators such as birds or marine mammals). Applicability: All Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). Footnote [30] Lethal incident: Includes all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortali Footnote [31] Standard 2.5.6 applicable to incidents related to non-endangered and non-red-listed species. This standard com Indicator: In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that . Keep records showing that the farm undertakes an assessment of risk following each lethal an assessment of the risk of lethal incident(s) has been ncident and how those risk assessments are used to identify concrete steps the farm takes to No incider undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by reduce the risk of future incidents. the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences 2.5.6 Requirement: Yes b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.6a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents. Applicability: All

at farm	N/A		
lent and see Appendix VI for transp	arency require	ments.	
at farm	N/A		
ties of non-salmonids.			
plements, and does not contradict,	2.5.3.		
nts documented.	N/A		

		PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRI	TY OF WILD POPULATIONS					
		Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and p	pathogens [34, 35]					
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):						
Footnote	tnote [32] Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.							
Footnote		[33] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for	r 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7.					
Instruction to According to specifically, 1) the farm o 2) any efflue	to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1 footnote [32], farm sites for which there is no release of w farms are only eligible for exemption from Criterion 3.1 if it loes not release any water to the natural environment; or nt released by the farm to the natural environment has bee	vater that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exen a can be shown that either of the following holds: en effectively treated to kill pathogens (e.g. UV and/or chemical treatment of water with testing	npt from the requirements under Criterion 3.1. More g demonstrating efficacy).					
Auditors sha	II fully document the rationale for any such exemptions in t	the audit report.						
		a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme.	A. B.C. Participation is a requirement according to national legislation. Records and overview over ABM and ref to "Samordnet plan for kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus 2017-2018 " dt .04.10.17 in zones defined by NESA and					
3.1.1	Indicator : Participation in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme for managing disease and resistance to treatments that includes coordination of stocking, fallowing, therapeutic treatments and information- sharing. Detailed requirements are in Appendix II-1.	 b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including: - coordination of stocking; - fallowing; - therapeutic treatments; and - information sharing. 	2017-2018 dt. 04.10.17 In zones defined by NFSA and companys in ABM. ABM for Nordland 100 % of seafarms in area participaiting in the ABM (Cermaq, Grieg Seafood, Salmar, NRS, Lerøy Aurora). ABM leaded by veterinary service Åkerblå, Ragnhild AukanWeekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. Also regular meetings between participants where ABM issues are discussed 100%	Compliant				
	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with all requirements in Appendix II-1, including definition of area, minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements.	of farms included. Routines and procedures for notification included in ABM related to treatments and diseases according to legislation from NFSA. Record from meeting in the ABM D. Data sent to ASC on the most recent fallowing period 2018-12-01					
		d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.						
		Note: Indicator 3.1.2 requires that farms demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with NGC research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks. If the farm does not receive any request demonstrate compliance by showing evidence of commitment through other proactive means relevant organizations.	bs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed s to collaborate on such research projects, the farm may s such as published policy statements or directed outreach to					
3.1.2	Indicator : A demonstrated commitment [34] to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks	a. Retain records to show how the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups (NGOs, academics, governments) to agree on and collaborate towards areas of research to measure impacts on wild stocks, including records of requests for research support and collaboration and responses to those requests.						
	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	 b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either: providing researchers with access to farm-level data; granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or facilitating research activities in some equivalent way. 	Updated list of projects seen at audit. Date 5 September 2018. Reserach partners include: salmon producers sametinget, universities.	Compliant				
		c. When the farm and/or its operating company denies a request to collaborate on a research project, ensure that there is a written justification for rejecting the proposal.						
		d. Maintain records from research collaborations (e.g. communications with researchers) to show that the farm has supported the research activities identified in 3.1.2a.						
Footnote	[34] Commitment: At a minimum, a farm a	nd/or its operating company must demonstrate this commitment through providing farm-level	data to researchers, granting researchers access to sites, or oth	ner similar non	-financial support for research activities.			

		 a. Keep records to show that a maximum sea lice load has been set for: the entire ABM; and the individual farm. b. Maintain evidence that the established maximum sea lice load (3.1.3a) is reviewed annually as outlined in Appendix II-2, incorporating feedback from the monitoring of wild 	A.B.C. NFSA (Mattilsynet treatment regime for AB "Lusedata.no" with lice k public web-site www.bay	
3.1.3	maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II-2	c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the ABM has set (3.1.3a) and annually reviewed (3.1.3.b) maximum sea lice load in compliance with requirements in Appendix II-2.	procedures in Intelex Qual maximum sea lice load. Pro kontroll og bekjempelse av Procedure "Rapportering a	
	Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	19.06.16. Procedure "Prose 03.03.17. Registered on far compliance.Sealice in fish t records on sea lice load is a Sensitive period for sealice with Slice (Emamektin) per December 2017 D. Data su	
		a. Prepare an annual schedule for testing sea lice that identifies timeframes of routine testing frequency (at a minimum, monthly) and for high-frequency testing (weekly) due to sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles).	A. C. There are legal limit	
	Indicator: Frequent [35] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [36] within seven days of testing Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	b. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for sea lice. If farm deviates from schedule due to weather [35] maintain documentation of event and rationale.	entire ABM and the individ female sea lice all year, exit week 26) were the action I moving lice based on the le control Procedure "Prosed bekjempelse av lakselus" s to count and maximum sea and recorded in FishTalk, a authorities "Altinn" weekly at the audit on BarentsWa (https://www.barentswate no week above limits on the s Sealice is counted evey we if water temperature is bel	
3.1.4		c. Document the methodology used for testing sea lice ('testing' includes both counting and identifying sea lice). The method must follow national or international norms, follows accepted minimum sample size, use random sampling, and record the species and life-stage of the sea lice. If farm uses a closed production system and would like to use an alternate method (i.e. video), farm shall provide the CAB with details on the method and efficacy of the method.		
		d. Make the testing results from 3.1.4b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within seven days of testing. If requested, provide stakeholders access to hardcopies of test results.		
		e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.		
		f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year.		
Footnote	[35] Testing must be weekly during and immediately prio	r to sensitive periods for wild salmonids, such as outmigration of wild juvenile salmon. Testing to test for lice (below 4 degrees C). Within closed production systems, alternative meth	must be at least monthly du ods for monitoring sea lice,	
Footnote		[36] Posting results on a public website is an examp	ble of "easily publicly availab	

set limits and govermental , reported via AltInn. In els, treatment etc. published in the ntswatch.no. Also internal ity System, system to prevent ocedure "Prosedyre for samordnet r lakselus" ID 394, dated 04.04.17. v Lakselus" ID 348, dated edyre for luetelling" ID 321 dated rm in FishTalk. Records confirm calk info on BarentsWatch. The available on BarentsWatch. : week 21 - week 26. Treatment formed May, September and bmitted to ASC	Compliant		
for maximum sea lice load for the ual farm. Maximum 0,5 mature cept in sensitive period (week 21 to imit is 0,2 mature female lice and egal authorities regulations for lice yre for samordnet kontroll og hows regularity of lice count, how a lice load. Sea lice counted weekly nd reported to Åkerblå and v. B. D.E. Seen report and records tch h.no/fiskehelse) for site Dypeidet - ne current production cycle. ek if temperature is above 4 °C and ow 4 °C every 2 week, test results	Compliant		
ring the rest of the year, unless wat such as video monitoring, may be u	er temperatur sed.	e is so cold that it would jeopardize farmed f	ish health

3.1.5	Indicator: In areas with wild salmonids [37], evidence of data [38] and the farm's understanding of that data, around salmonid migration routes, migration timing and stock productivity in major waterways within 50 kilometers of the farm Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmonid Health and Migration In writing this indicator, the SAD Steering Committee concluded that relevant data sets on wilk vast majority of, if not all, jurisdictions with wild salmonids. The information is likely to come f Therefore farms are not responsible for conducting this research themselves. However farms i information in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions rela This Indicator requires collection and understanding of general data for the major watersheds need to demonstrate that there is data for every small river or tributary or subpopulation. Info implies that the population is more or less isolated from other stocks of the same species and Canadian Wild Salmon Policy is an example of an appropriate fish stock-level definition. Howe slight differences in how a wild salmonid stock is defined in the region. For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 ki definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern are salmonids (i.e. including all trout species). Where a species is not natural to a region (e.g. / considered as "areas with wild salmonids" even if salmon have escaped from farms and establ Farms do not need to conduct research on migration routes, timing and the health of wild stoc available. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level f a. Identify all salmonid species that naturally occur within 75 km of the farm through literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. If the farm is not in an area with wild salmonids, then 3.1.5b and c do not apply. b. For species listed in 3.1.5a, compile best available information on migration routes, migration timing (range of months for juvenile outmigration and returning salmon), life history timing for coastal resident salmonids, and stock productivity over time in major waterways within 50 km of the farm. c. From d	A salmonid health and migra rom government sources or must demonstrate that they ated to minimizing potential within approximately 50 km ormation should relate to the hence self-sustaining. A "co ver, it must be recognized the lometers of a wild salmonid hemisphere [39]. Potentiall Atlantic or Pacific Salmon in ished themselves as a repro- cks under this standard if ge or salmonid populations in the A. Atlantic salmon (Salmo se Arctic char (Salvelinus alpir area. B. Migratory routes a "environmental statistics" carrying rivers, and Laksere Also map from DN with rive "Risikorapport norsk fisked Marine Research, publishe en kunnskapsoppdatering" 2014. C. Sensitive period di endring i forskrift om bekje than 0,2 adult female lice p
Footnote	[37] For purposes of these standards, "areas with	h wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route	or habitat. This definition is
Footnote	[38] Farms do not need to conduct research on migratio	n routes, timing and the health of wild stocks under this standard if general information is alre region, as such information is needed to make management decisions rel	ady available. Farms must d lated to minimizing potentia
		a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.	
	Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Arctic char, with results made publicly	b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.	A. Atlantic salmon (Salmo s Arctic char (Salvelinus alpir area. B.C. D. Surveillance c
3.1.6	available. See requirements in Appendix III-1. Requirement: Yes	c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids is in compliance with the requirements in Appendix III-1.	is managed by Institute of instituttet) https://www.ir Assessment for Norway, fis sealice issues are covered. sitaution "Smolt - kunnska
	Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	d. Make the results from 3.1.6b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within eight weeks of completion of monitoring.	and "Risikovurdering av No Institute report on measur salmon". E. Results sent to

ation are publicly available in the r from research institutions. y are aware of this basic l impact on those wild stocks.		
n of the farm. A farm does not e wild fish stock level, which onservation unit" under the hat each jurisdiction may have		
d migration route or habitat. This ly affected species in these areas Chile) the areas are not oducing species in "the wild".		
neral information is already their region, as such information is		
salar), trout (Salmo trutta) and hus) are naturally occurring in the is defined in web site (miljøstatatus.no) on salmonid egisteret from Miljødirektoratet. ers identified.Report oppdrett 2017" by Institute of of on their website.Report "Smolt - ' by Directorate of Environment efined in regulation "Forskrift om empelse av lakselus", states less per fish from week 21 to week 26.	Compliant	

s expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere.

demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level for salmonid populations in their al impact on those stocks.

salar), trout (Salmo trutta) and nus) are naturally occurring in the	
of sea lice level on wild salmonids Marine Research (Hayforsknings	
nr.no. See eport 2018 Risk	Constitution
IMR report on wild stock sealice	Compliant
psoppsummering" M1-36-2017,. prsk Fiskeoppdrett IMR/vet	
ing environmental effects on wild	
	1

		_
		1
	e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per	
	Appendix VI	1
	Appendix VI.	1
		1

		a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator		
	Indicator : In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish [39]. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2.	 b. Establish the sensitive periods [39] of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before. 	 A. Atlantic salmon (Salmo Arctic char (Salvelinus alp area. B. Sensitive periods considered and defined to 	
3.1.7	Requirement: 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish	c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2.	Surveillance of sea lice leve Institute of Marine Researce	
	salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	d. Provide the CAB with evidence there is a 'feedback loop' between the targets for on-farm lice levels and the results of monitoring of lice levels on wild salmonids (Appendix II-2).	Norway, fish farming repor covered.	
Footnote		[39] Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile out	migration and approximately	
		Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native	species	
	1	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		
		Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.1, "area" is defined as a contiguous body of water wit support the farmed species' life and reproduction (e.g. the Northern Atlantic Coast of the U.S. definition: "The boundaries of an area should be defined, taking into account the zone in whic water movement and other relevant aspects of ecosystem structure and function." The intent put at risk from the non-native salmon. Areas will only rarely coincide with the boundaries of	h the bio-chemical and temp and Canada). Appendix II-1 h key cumulative impacts of is that the area relates to th countries.	
		a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.		
	Indicator : If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially	b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before June 13, 2012.		
3.2.1 produced in the area by the date of publication of the ASC Salmon standard Requirement: Yes [40] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [40]	c. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish that includes details on accuracy of sterility effectiveness.			
	 d. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b or 3.2.1c, provide documented evidence that the production system is closed to the natural environment and for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce [40]; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material [40] that might survive and subsequently reproduce (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of any effluent water exiting the system to the natural environment). 	NA. Atlantic salmon (Salmo		
Footnote	[40] Exceptions shall be made for production systems the	at use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective	e physical barriers that are i	
		Survive and Subsequently re	produce.	

salar), trout (Salmo trutta) and hus) are naturally occurring in the h area for wild salmon migtration week 21 to week 26. C. D. el on wild salmonids is managed by th (Havforsknings instituttet) port 2018 Risk Assessment for t 2018, where sealice issues are	Compliant		
y one month before.			
perature profile required to A elaborates further on this In wild populations may occur, I e spatial extent that is likely to be			
o salar) is native species in Norway.	N/A		
n place and well-maintained to ensu	ure no escapes	of reared specimens or biological material th	hat might

	Indicator : If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research [41] completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.2.2 - Exceptions to Allow Production of Non-Native Species Farms have had five years to demonstrate compliance with this standard from the time of publication of the ASC Salmon June 13, 2017). Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior t the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the i 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining. Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.2, "jurisdiction" is defined the same as "area" in 3.2.1.		
of the species withi 3.2.2 results submitted to	of the species within the farm's jurisdiction and these results submitted to ASC for review [42]	a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI).b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.		
	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All [43]	c. If yes to 3.2.2b, provide evidence of scientific research completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction. Alternatively, the farm may request an exemption to 3.2.2c (see below).	NA. Atlantic salmon (Salmo	
		d. If applicable, submit to the CAB a request for exemption that shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified in instruction box above.		
		e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.		
Footnote		[41] The research must at a minimum include multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed sp	ecies, use credible methodo	
Footnote	[42] If the review demonstrates there is increased risk, certification o	the ASC will consider prohibiting the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisd of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction. The ASC intends to bring this evidence into t	liction under this standard. future revision of the standa	
Footnote	[43] Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in	a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior to farming activities in the introduction took place prior to 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Dive	e area and the following thre rsity (CBD) was ratified); the	
	Indicator: Use of non-native species for sea lice control	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.		
3.2.3	Requirement: None	b. Maintain records (e.g. invoices) to show the species name and origin of all fish used by the farm for purposes of sea lice control.	The farm does not use cle	
	Applicability: All	c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.		
		Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic s	pecies	
	1	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		
		a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.	A. Statement date. 23.03.2	
Indicator: Use of transgenic [44] salmon by the fa 3.3.1 Requirement: None Applicability: All	Indicator: Use of transgenic [44] salmon by the farm Requirement: None	b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	breeding stock, stating tha genetics are applied. Cerm in statement dated 12.02.7	
	Applicability: All	c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.	B.C. Records for the origin: audit. The records confirm transgenic. The smolt supp	
			<u> </u>	

Standard (i.e. full compliance by o farming activities in the area and ntroduction took place prior to			
o salar) is native species in Norway.	N/A		
logies and analysis, and undergo pe	er review.		
n the event that the risk tools demo ard and those results taken forward	onstrate "high" into the revisio	risks, the SAD expects that the ASC will prob on process.	ibit the
ee conditions are met: eradication w species is fully self-sustaining.	vould be impos	sible or have detrimental environmental eff	ects; the
ner fish	N/A		
017, from egg provider AquaGen t only conventional breeding and aq policies on non-GMO available 2018, signed by Quality Manager. s of all stocks were seen at the s that the culture stock is not liers is Cermaq Forsan Smolt.	Compliant		
pressed in the offspring (reference	USDA).		

		Criterion 3.4 Escapes [47]	
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	
Footnote		[45] See Appendix VI for transparency requireme	nts for 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3
	Indicator: Maximum number of acconoos [46] in the	a. Maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.	No escapes registered for t Documented in production with reports. Fisheries dire Fishdir.no) shows no escap verified with the estimate of records for nets, site infras NYTEK/NS9415
	most recent production cycle	b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle.	B, C, D N/A
3.4.1	Requirement: 300 [47] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [47]	c. Maintain the monitoring records described in 3.4.1a for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [47]).	
		d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [47]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the farm could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.	
		e. Submit escape monitoring dataset to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	
Footnote	[46] Farms shall report all escapes; the total	l aggregate number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish. Data on date o	of escape episode(s), numbe
Footnote	[47] A rare exception to this standard may be made for a production cycle for whic	n escape event that is clearly documented as being outside the farm's control. Only one such ex In the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reason	cceptional episode is allower able way to predict the ever
		a. Maintain records of accuracy of the counting technology used by the farm at times of stocking and harvest. Records include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts.	
Indicator: Accuracy [48] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers 3.4.2 Requirement: ≥ 98% Applicability: All	b. If counting takes place off site (e.g. pre-smolt vaccination count), obtain and maintain documents from the supplier showing the accuracy of the counting method used (as above).	A. Counting performed at F for stocking number at sea Fishcounter 777 Smolt and finale check at stocking wit numbers at harvest plant y	
	c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).	regsitered. Statement from accuracy.Statement from A accuracy. B.C.D. Vaccinatio	
	-	number stocked. External p statement of 98-100% accu Smolt and WingTech Fishco Wing Tech of 98-100% accu	
		e. Submit counting technology accuracy to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	
Footnote		[48] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and	through common estimate

3.				
he last three production cycles. and recording system Fishtalk ctorate reports to d.d. (www. es from site. Cross-checked and of unexplained loss, maintenance tructure certificate according to	Compliant			
r of fish escaped and cause of escape episode shall be reported as outlined in Appendix VI. d in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the				
nts that caused the episode. See auc	liting guidance	for additional details.		
W site, vaccination numbers used net cage, manually or Wing Tech WingTech Fishcounter 1200/2000 h well boat. Final accurate where individual fish is handled and wing Tech of 98-100% quaScan CF4000 of 98-100% n numbers in FW used as accurate provider AquaScan CF4000, uracy.Wing Tech Fishcounter 777. punter 1200/2000. Statement from uracy. E. Info submitted to ASC	Compliant			
s of error for any hand-counts.				

		Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss The Estimated Unexplained Loss (EUL) of fish is calculated at the end of each production cycle as follows:						
		EUL = (stocking count) - (harvest count) - (mortalities) - (recorded escapes)						
		Units for input variables are number of fish (i.e. counts) per production cycle. Where possible, stocking count. This formula is adapted from footnote 59 of the ASC Salmon Standard.	, farms should use the pre-s					
	Indicator: Estimated unexplained loss [49] of farmed salmon is made publicly available	a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1).						
3.4.3	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	b. Calculate the estimated unexplained loss as described in the instructions (above) for the most recent full production cycle. For first audit, farm must demonstrate understanding of calculation and the requirement to disclose EUL after harvest of the current cycle.	A. B.Spesific site reports ar available in production and for the production stocked number: 958.872. Harvest 84.470. Recorded escapes					
		c. Make the results from 3.4.3b available publicly. Keep records of when and where results were made public (e.g. date posted to a company website) for all production cycles.	implemented to make EUL available on corporate web sent to ASC when the fish					
		d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.						
		-]					
Footnote	[49] Calculated at the end of the	e production cycle as: Unexplained loss = Stocking count – harvest count – mortalities – other k	nown escapes. Where poss					
		a. Prepare an Escape Prevention Plan and submit it to the CAB before the first audit. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document as long as it addresses all required elements of Indicator 3.4.4.	A.B Risk assessments and s actions to prevent escape (e.g.: Risk assessment for es relevant issues related to p					
	Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and	 b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - net strength testing; - appropriate net mesh size; - act traces billing 	d.t 27.07.2017."Prosedyre for a flåte, og båt - matfisk, ID 3- kontroll, ettersyn og renho The Escape Prevention Plan					
	related employee training, including: net strength testing;	- net traceability; - system robustness;	appropriate net mesh size;					
	appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and	- predator management;	robustness;- predator man					
	reporting of risk events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues,	 record keeping; reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); 	handling errors). Staff trair					
3.4.4	events); and worker training on escape prevention and	- planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and	above areas. Diving inspect related to procedure) dt 1					
	counting technologies		structures NYTEK certified					
	Requirement: Yes	 c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - system robustness; 	langøyhovden is not a close escape prevention perform					
		- record keeping;						
		 reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. 						
		d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.	1					
		e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.	1					
		-	1					

molt vaccination count as the			
nd records documented and I recording system Fishtalk. Data in 2017 (G17 data).Stocking count: 857.365. Mortalities : 0: EUL: 1,8 %. C. System value information easily publicaly opage www.cermaq.com. D. Info	Compliant		
ible, use of the pre-smolt vaccination	on count as the	stocking count is preferred.	
everal procedures describes inspection, maintenance, etc.), scapes, d.t 05.04.18, including potensial causes to escapes, e.g avisning av not og mære" ID 170, for periodiske ettersyn av anlegg, 42, d.t 19.06.16"Prosedyre for Id av not" ID 315, d.t 05.05.18. B. n and accompanying wing areas:- net strength testing;- - net traceability;- system agement;- record keeping;- noles, infrastructure issues, sing performed to cover all of the tion all nets (routine inspections .0.02.18, all nets, KB-dykk. All Norwegian standard NS9415. C. ed system. D. E. Staff training in ned 16.11.2018	Compliant		

PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed						
	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):					

Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds

Farms must show that all feeds used by the farm are produced in compliance with the requirements of Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.4. To do so, farms must obtain documentary evidence that the audited at regular intervals by an independent auditing firm or a conformity assessment body against a recognized standard which substantially incorporate requirements for traceability. Accepta GlobalGAP or other schemes that have been acknowledged by the ASC (see 4.1.1c below). Results from these audits shall demonstrate that feed producers have robust information systems and ir allow the feed producers to be able to bring forward accurate information about their production and supply chains. Declarations from the feed producer that are provided to the farm to demonstrate indicators must be supported by the audits. Farms must also show that all of their feed producers are duly informed of the requirements of the ASC Salmon Standard relating to sourcing of response. 4.1.1b below).

In addition to the above, farms must also show that their feed suppliers comply with the more detailed requirements for traceability and ingredient sourcing that are specified under indicators 4.2 Standard allows farms to use one of two different methods to demonstrate compliance of feed producers:

Method #1: Farms may choose to source feed from feed producers who used only those ingredients allowed under the ASC Salmon Standards during the production of a given batch of feed. For e feed supplier to produce a batch of feed according to farm specifications. Audits of the feed producer will independently verify that manufacturing processes are in compliance with ASC requirem

Method #2: Farms may choose to source feed from feed producers who demonstrate compliance using a "mass-balance" method. In this method, feed producers show that the balance of all ingre used during a given feed production period meets ASC requirements. However, mixing of ingredients into the general silos and production lines is allowed during manufacturing. Audits of the feed verify that manufacturing processes are in compliance with ASC requirements. The mass balance method can be applied, for example, to integrated feed production companies that handle all step (purchasing of raw materials, processing to finished feed, and sales) under the management of a single legal entity.

Note 1: The term "feed producer" is used here to identify the organization that produces the fish feed (i.e. it is the "feed manufacturer"). In most cases, the organization supplying feed to a farm (same organization that produced the feed, but there may be instances where feed suppliers are not directly responsible for feed production. Regardless of whether the farm sources feeds directly indirectly through an intermediary organization, it remains the farm's obligation to show evidence that all feeds used are in compliance with requirements.

4.1.1	Indicator: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [50]. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	 a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records. b. Inform each feed supplier in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to production of salmon feeds and send them a copy of the ASC Salmon Standard. c. For each feed producer used by the farm, confirm that an audit of the producer was recently done by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme. Obtain a copy of the most recent audit report for each feed producer. d. For each feed producer, determine whether the farm will use method #1 or method #2 (see Instructions above) to show compliance of feed producers. Inform the CAB in writing. e. Obtain declaration from feed supplier(s) stating that the company can assure traceability of all feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed to a level of detail required by the ASC Salmon Standard [50]. 	A.C Feed supplier is Ewos a have valid GLOBALG.A.P Cf GGN 4050373825744, Biol current production cycle w suppliers informed of certi requirements in mail date Massbalance is used. E. Sta complete traceability date Biomar on complete tracea			
Footnote	te [50] Traceability shall be at a level of detail that permits the feed producer to demonstrate compliance with the standards in this document (i.e., marine raw ingredients covered und with third-party documentation of the ingredients covered und					

feed producers (see note 1) are able certification schemes include nformation handling processes to strate compliance with these nsibly produced salmon feed (see			
1.1 through 4.4.2. The ASC Salmon			
example, the farm may request its lents.			
edients (both amount and type) d producer will independently ps of feed manufacturing			
i.e. the feed supplier) will be the y from a feed producer or			
nd BioMar, the feed suppliers M certificates. certified (EWOS Aar GGN . Purchase records for the as seen at the audit. B. Feed fications of site and relevant ASC 26.03.2018. D Method #2 tement from Cargill/EWOS on 8 08.01.2018 Statement from bility dated 26.02.2018	Compliant		
iced back to the fishery, soy to the r d.	egion grown, e	etc.). Feed manufacturers will need to supply	the farm

	Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [51]										
Francis		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):									
Footnote		[51] See Appendix VI for transparency require	ments for 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.								
4.2.1		Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.2.1 - Calculation of FFDRm Farms must calculate the Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ration (FFDRm) according to formula presented in Appendix IV-1 using data from the most recent complete production cycle. Farms must also show that they h maintained sufficient information in order to make an accurate calculation of FFDRm as outlined below. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 4.2.1 for the most recent complete product cycle (i.e. if the FFDRm of the most recent crop was > 1.2) if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that:									
	Indicator: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1) Requirement: < 1.2	 a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used including: Quantities used of each formulation (kg); Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation used; Source (fishery) of fishmeal in each formulation used; Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation derived from trimmings; and Supporting documentation and signed declaration from feed supplier. 	Period May 2017- November 2018 for 17G, feed used 3943								
		b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.	ton, fish produced 3391 tons, FCR: 1.16. Total weighted Fish meal in feed 13,9 % (EWOS 25,1 % and Biomar 11,5 %). Fish meal from trimmings EWOS 10 %, Biomar 5,8 % D. Fish meal from forage fisheries in feed 7.3 % (EWOS 15.1 % Biomar 5.7	Compliant							
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).	%). FFDRm 1,16*7,3/24: 0,35. E. Info submitted to ASC								
		d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.									
		e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.									
		Note: Under Indicator 4.2.2, farms can choose to calculate FFDRo (Option #1) or EPA & DHA (both threshold values. Client shall inform the CAB which option they will use.									
		a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.									
	Indicator: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1), or,	b. For FFDRo and EPA+DHA calculations (either option #1 or option #2), exclude fish oil derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.									
4.2.2	Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [52] (calculated according to Appendix IV-2)	c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	Period May 2017- november 2018 for 17G, feed used 3943 tons, fish produced 3391 tons, FCR: 1.16. Total Fish oil in feed 9,3 % (EWOS 11,8 % Biomar 8,7 %) Fish oil from trimmings								
	Requirement: FFDRo < 2.52 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed	d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.	EWOS 3,0 Biomar 2,3 %. D. Fish oil from forage fisheries in feed SA oil 2,9 % (EWOS 6,2 % Biomar 2,2 %) NA oil 4,0 % (EWOS 2,5 % Biomar 4,3 %). FFDRo 2,9*1,16/5 + 4,0*1,16/7 =	Compliant							
	Applicability: All	e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2.	1,33. E. Info submitted to ASC								
		f. Submit FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.									

er 2018 for 17G, feed used 3943 ns, FCR: 1.16. Total weighted Fish 5 25,1 % and Biomar 11,5 %). Fish S 10 %, Biomar 5,8 % D. Fish meal ed 7,3 % (EWOS 15,1 %, Biomar 5,7 35. E. Info submitted to ASC	Compliant	
ve to demonstrate that they meet		
er 2018 for 17G, feed used 3943 ons, FCR: 1.16. Total Fish oil in feed ar 8,7 %) Fish oil from trimmings . Fish oil from forage fisheries in 2 % Biomar 2,2 %) NA oil 4,0 %). FFDRo 2,9*1,16/5 + 4,0*1,16/7 = ASC	Compliant	

Footnote	[52] Calculation excludes DHA and EPA derived from fisheries by-products and trimmings. Trin otnote Fishmeal and fish oil that are produced from trimmings can be excluded from the ca	mmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption o not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumptio calculation as long as the origin of the trimmings is not any species that are classified a (http://www.iucnredlist.org).
----------	---	--

or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does on.

s critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species

11 Findings

11.1 DO NOT DELETE ANY COLUMN

11.2 Columns B/C/D/E (in black) are automatically populated from the species checklist/audit manual

- 11.3 Each NC is raised against a standard indicator or a CAR requirement
- 11.4 Use the "sort" function for presenting the list to your liking (e.g. grading, status, closure deadline, etc.)

11.5 Add new rows as needed
11.6 Adjust the column wide as needed - to

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	Related VR (#)	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB	Deadline for NC close-out	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Actual date of close-out	Date request for delay received	Justificat ion for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
1	2.1.3	Minor	C survey analyse from field work 27.09.2018 by AKVAPLAN NIVA shows results 1 highly abundant taxa that are not pollution index, within the AZE	A.B. See 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.Field work, sorting, specie identification and calculation according to NS-EN ISO/IEC 17025. Guidance on sampling of marine sediments ISO 5667-19. Water quality - Guidelines for quantitive sampling and sample processing of marine soft bottom macro fauna. Evaluation benthos according to NS 9410:2016 and guidance 02:2013 (Anon 2013). Program used is Primer v5. C: 3 Taxa that are not pollution indicator species were identified. D. Akvaplan.niva report 02.11.2018. Sampling performed at a biomass of 3846 tons. Date of sampling 27.09.2018 E. Test results sent to ASC C survey analyse from field work 27.09.2018 by AKVAPLAN NIVA shows results 1 highly abundant taxa that are not pollution index, within the AZE	01/03/2019	Open		Accumulation of organic loading at one area.	Cermaq Norway has high focus on organic loading at it's seasites. We regularily survey the sites through sediment investigations on every generation and report on these to national authorities. The near zone is sampled through B-investigations. The result from the previos B sample at maximum loading was a 1 (very good) and the site will be fallowed for about 6 months so we hope the next generation will show improved benthic results for the ASC samples as well. Vesterålen area where the site is located is an area with naturally high organic loading as well.	01-03-2020	A minor nc raised on 2.1.3 at the initial audit were closed with an action plan. Same problem were found during the SA1 audit and the minor nc was upheld. Justification: As there is only 14 months between the two samplings (done on 03.07.2017 and 27.09.2018) the improvements on the environment which the action plan should initiate cannot be expected to be seen yet. The closure of the nc raised at the SA1 will require another sampling as objective evidence for the final closure of this non-conformity.						
2	4.3.2	Minor	All individual scores and biomass score are not ≥ 6	A. FishSource score is recorded for all species. A275: Statement EWOS, Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed, dated 19.01.2019. og "Dokumentasjon og informasjon om fôr levert iht. ASC", 0.031.2019, includes species, and declares 95 % of fish meal and 91 % of fish oil are shown to be ASC compliant from MSC or Fish Source score approved. B EWOS statement " ASC feed declaration and information " date 19.01.2019 with details of raw material sources in specific feeds have scores according to ASC s requirement for this indicator, calculated with balance principle. BIOMAR statement " Marine Ingredients used by BIOMAR Norway 2017", dated 26.02.2018, 80 % fish meal and 75 % of fish oil fish source score above ≥ 6 . All individual scores and biomass score are not ≥ 6 . c. FishSource scores are available on https://www.fishsource.org and there is no independent third party assessment.	01/03/2019	Open		Both EWOS and Biomar, as well as Cermaq have had the understanding that when one chooses "method 2" for indicator 4.1.1 to 4.4.4. each ingredient does not have to have a biomass score >6, but the balance of compliant ingredients by volume and type needs to be higher than the sales of ASC compliant feed. For Biomar, the ASC compliant feed volume is 96 % for fish meal and 90.3% for Fish oil. For EWOS the ASC compliant feed ingredients are 99.2% for Fish meal and 79.6 % for fish oil. This is much more than the feed suppliers have in ASC sales. See statements from both feed suppliers.	Both EWOS and Biomar continue to work on getting as much of their ingredients from certified fisheries and from trimmings.	01-06-2019	The root cause and corrective/preventive action proposed by client, is accepted based on information and statements from feed suppliers	01-06-2019					



to show the whole text

3	4.3.5	Minor	There is not a link to a public policy from feed manufacturer stating the sourcing policy according to 4.3.5 a	A. EWOS statement " ASC feed declaration and information " date 08. 01.2018 with details of raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASC s requirement for this indicator. Biomar public policy There is not a link to a public policy from feed manufacturer stating the sourcing policy according to 4.3.5 a B. Annual Cermaq Group report 2017 on sustainability policy, requiring feed raw material from sutainable sourcing, (ISEAL scheme fisheries). Code of conduct feed suppliers for Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy, date 18.01.17.C.	01/03/2019 Cl	osed	Link for policy from feed suppliers was included, this was not made clear at audit day	Link for sourcing policy is attached.	01-06-2019	The root cause an corrective/preventive action proposed by client, is accepted based on policy from feed suppliers			
4	4.4.2	Minor	All soy used are Pro-Terra or RTRS certified soya, there is not an approved alternative certification scheme used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC	A. Annual Cermaq Group report 2017 on sustainability policy, requiring feed raw material from sutainable sourcing, (ISEAL scheme fisheries). Code of conduct feed suppliers for Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy, date 18.01.17. B.C. Feed supplier Ewos informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail date 18.06.15. D. EWOS: Statement date date18.01.18 "Traceability, responsible sourcing and origin of soy in EWOS CFM". All soy shall Pro- Terra or RTRS certified soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent	01/03/2019	pen	We are awaiting a statement from ASC on this issue.		01-03-2020	The root cause given by client, is accepted and will be followed up at next SURV audit			





ASC Audit Report - Traceablity

10	Traceability Factor	Description of risk factor if present.	Describe any traceability, segregation, or other systems in place to manage the risk.
10.1	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, produced within the same operation.	There are no risk of mixing non-certified fish from other seafarms with certified fish.	N/A
10.2	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, present during production, harvest, transport, storage, or processing activities.	There are no risk of mixing non-certified fish from other seafarms with certified fish.	N/A
10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.	No possibility as Wellboat services are internal. But should subcontractors be used, there will be full traceability and transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept in electronic system FishTalk.	The site uses certified internal slaughter house. The slaughterhouse is the ASC CoC certified Cermaq Norway F-430, Havneveien 36, 9600 Hammerfest (ASC-C-00687).
10.4	Any other opportunities where certified product could potentially be mixed, substituted, or mislabelled with non-certified product before the point where product	No.	N/A

10.4.a	Total number of sites owned/subcontracted
	by client producing the same species that is
	included in the scope of certification

Number of sites included in the unit of certification

Owned by client	Subcontracted by client
42	
1	0

10.4.b Site(s) within UoC that has product to be excluded from entering the chain of custody

10.5 Detail description of the flow of certified product within the operation and the associated traceability system which allows product to be traced from final sale back to the unit of certification

10.6 Traceablity Determination:

- 10.6.1 The traceability and segregation systems in the operation are sufficient to ensure all products identified and sold as certified by the operation originate from the unit of certification, or
- 10.6.2 The traceability and segregation systems are not sufficient and a separate chain of custody certification is required for the operation before products can be sold as ASC-certified or can be eligible to carry the ASC logo.
- 10.6.3 The point from which chain of custody is required to begin
- 10.6.4 If a sepearate chain of custody certificate is required for the unit of certification

Site name(s)	Reason(s)

The traceability and segregation system is ASC compliant.
N/A
From the point where the fish is harvested at the cages. During transport from the cages to the
slaughterhouse the fish will be covered by the slaughterhouse CoC certification.
No

For Multi-site clients





ASC Audit Report - Closing

12 Evaluation Results

12.1 A report of the results of the audit of the operation against the specific elements in the standard and guidance documents A draft report containing the results of the audit has been developed. The principles where full compliance was found: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. For the rest of the principles, 2, 4, full compliance was not found, although most of these were mainly compliant. VR used during audit: VR nr.39 approved 15.09.2014 by ASC on phosphorus release from smolt producer. Rationale for use of VR 39 during audit is that as for accepted VR 39 the smolt producers effluent is seawater not freshwater. VR nr. 179 approved 24.08.16 by ASC for translation of reports into local language (Norwegian). Reports will be accepted in English. VR nr. 97 approved 20.08.2015 by ASC for calculation of PTI based on biomass.

 12.2 A clear statement on whether or not the audited unit of
 Based on the outcome audit the unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant ASC salmon standard - version

 certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant ASC salmon standard - version
 1.1.

 consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard(s)
 6.1.



123 In cases where BEIA or PSIA is N/A available, it shall be added in full to the audit report. IF these documents are not in English, then a synopsis in English shall be added to the report.

13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	Yes
13.2 The Eligiblity Date (if applicable)	N/A
13.3 Is a separate CoC certificte required for the producer? (yes/no)	No.
13.4 If a certificate has been issued this section shall include:	

13.4.1 The date of issue and date of
expiry of the certificate.

13.4.2 The scope of the certificate

Certificate validity 05.02.2018 - 05.02.2021.
ASC Salmon Standard Version 1.1. Aquaculture species: Salmon (Salmon salar)

13.4.3 Instructions to stakeholders thatInformation on Bureau Veritas complaints procedure is available on
www.bureauveritas.com. Stakeholders are welcome to contact ASC Lead auditor
the CAB decision are to be
subject to the CAB's complaintsSølvi Skare on E-mail: Solvi.skare@dk.bureauveritas.com or Bureau Veritas on E-
mail: asc.farm@dk.bureauveritas.com for further information on complaints.
procedure. This section shall
include information on where to
review the procedure andInformation on Bureau Veritas complaints procedure.
This section shall
include information on where to
subject to the procedure andInformation on Bureau Veritas complaints procedure.
This section shall
subject to the procedure and

January 2020

14 Surveillence

14.1 Next planned Surveillance

where further information on complaints can be found.

14.1.1 Planned date

14.1.2 Planned site

14.2 Next audit type

14.2.1 Surveillence

14.2.2 Surveillance 2

14.2.3 Re-certificatio

14.2.4 Other (specify ty

ice 1	
ice 2	
cation	





Internal Auditors Requirements

Annex B - Table D - Internal auditors qualifications and competencies

Items denoted with (*) are required when the training is made available by the ASC

Req.#		Requirement	Evidence	Met	Unmet				
For all internal auditors									
	Auditor training	* Completed the ASC training for new requirements as specified by the ASC within the deadlines set by ASC							
B45		Undertake additional training on changes to legislation, specific standards, codes or conventions as appropriate							
B60	Work experience	The individual shall have experience relevant to the business being audited.							
B51	Interviewing	Be experienced in different types of interviewing techniques							
B52 Language		Fluent speaker and reader of the language(s) used by managers, administrators and workers or accompanied by an independent interpreter							
For in	ternal audit team	leader							
B42	Audit/inspection Experience	At least two satisfactory witness audits as an acting audit (team) leader, shadowed by and under the supervision of a competent internal auditor							
For au	diting multi-site r	equirements (IMS)							
B44 Audit/inspection training		Successfully completed an Internal Assessor training course based on ISO 19011 principles that have a minimum duration of sixteen (16) hours							
B45	Auditor training	successfully completed either an ISO management system internal auditor course (ISO 9001/14001/22000/27000/OHSAS/etc.) provided by a certification body or a professional auditor training institution * Successfully passed the 'ASC Farm Traceability' online training module							
		Had an audit peer witnessed by a qualified ASC internal auditor no less than once in each two (2) year period							



B54	Management systems and reference documents	Have a general knowledge of management systems standards (such as ISO 9001), applicable procedures or other management systems documents used as audit criteria						
For au	diting environem	ntal requirements						
B59 Technical languag		Have knowledge of the technical language employed in aquaculture and processing of aquaculture products						
For au	For auditing social requirements							
B45	Auditor training	Successfully completed a training course for auditing social requirements provided by a certification body or professional training institution specialised in social auditing						



List of sites of multi-site unit of certification

Name of Certificate Holder	
Certificate Number	
Date of certificate issuance	
Date of certificate expiry	

#	Site name*	Site address*	Site GPS*	Species * (Latin/English name)	Ownership* (owned/ subcontracte d)	Number of pens/cages/ ponds/ tanks/etc.	Production area (ha)	Stocking date(s)	Harvesting dates	Harvested volumes	Date of inclusion*	Date of removal