

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

DNV-GL

PDF 1.2 Date of Submission

Initial Audit notification sent ASC 11.04.19

PDF 1.3 CAB Contact Person

PDF 1.3.1 Name of Contact Person

Thomas Vavik Bekken

PDF 1.3.2 Position in the CAB's
organisation

Lead Auditor

PDF 1.3.3 Mailing address	DNV GL - Business Assurance Norway AS Veritasveien 1 1322 Høvik Norway
PDF 1.3.4 Email address	thomas.vavik.bekken@dnvgl.com
PDF 1.3.5 Phone number	0047 48 10 39 84
PDF 1.3.6 Other	

PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client

PDF 1.4.1 Name of the Client	Lingalaks AS
PDF 1.4.1.a Name of the unit of certification	11665 Jibbersholmane
PDF 1.4.2 Name of Contact Person	Signe Holst-Larsen
PDF 1.4.3 Position in the client's organisation	Quality Coordinator

PDF 1.4.4 Mailing address	Lingalaks AS, Grovabrotet 8, 5600 Norheimssund
PDF 1.4.5 Email address	signe.holst.larsen@lingalaks.no
PDF 1.4.6 Phone number	47 56 55 94 28
PDF 1.4.7 Other	Website: www.lingalaks.no

PDF 1.5 Unit of Certification

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

PDF 1.6 Sites to be audited

Site Name	GPS Coordinates	List all species per site and indicate if they are in the scope of the standard	Ownership status (owned/ subcontracted)	Date of planned audit and type of audit (Initial, SA1, SA2, recertification, etc.)	Status (new, in production/ fallowing /in harvest)
11665 Jibbersholmane	60° 45.157"N; 4° 53.042"E	Atlantic Salmon, Salmo salar. All in scope	Owned	IA - Week 23 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
Abalone				
Bivalve				
Freshwater Trout				
Pangasius				
Salmon	Atlantic Salmon, <i>Salmo salar</i> .	Yes	ASC salmon Standard	Version 1.2
Shrimp				
Talapia				
Seriola/Cobia				
Other				

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	Food Safety Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Hordaland Fylkeskommune	Regional authority	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Bergen Kystverk Vest	Coastal/Maritime authority	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Fiskeridirektoratet	Fisheries authority	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications

Fylkesmannen i Vestland	Regional authority	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Radøy Kommune	Local Municipality	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Bergen og Omland Friluftsråd	Local interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Fiskerlaget Vest	Local interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Skjærgårdsfisk visningssenter AS	Local interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
WWF Verdens Naturfond	National interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Norske Lakseelver	National interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Naturvernforbundet Hordaland	Local interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications
Miljøvernforbundet	National interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions, and telephone if needed	Before audit and during audit process	Written notifications

PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed:	mar.19
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit:	11.04.19 (ASC notification)
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s):	Week 23, 2019
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/Decision:	Pending final certification decision in final report

PDF 1.10 Audit Team

	Column1	Name	ASC Registration Reference
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor	Thomas Vavik Bekken	
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts (<i>specify</i>	N/A	
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor (desktop)	Darius Pamakstys	

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 reproducible 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 reproducible results.

1 Title Page

1.1 Name of Applicant

Lingalaks AS, 11665 Jibbersholmane farm

1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Draft
Certification Report/ Final
certification report/Surveillance
report]

ASC Initial Audit, Draft Report

1.3 CAB name	DNV GL
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Thomas Vavik Bekken, Lead Auditor
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Lead Auditor - Thomas Vavik Bekken, author of report Social auditor - Darius Pamakstys Kim Andre Karlsen - lead auditor, reviewer
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Signe Holst-Larsen, Quality Coordinator
1.7 Date	Report date, 25.06.2019

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

1) MOM-B and MOM-C are surveys of benthic environment at or near farm, according to NS 9410 (Norwegian Standard 9410). 2) NFSA is Norwegian Food Safety Authority. 3) "Nytekt" NS9415 (Norwegian Standard 9415) are technical certifications of Marine fish farms with Requirements for design, dimensioning, production, installation and operation. 4) MTB is Maximum Allowed Biomass. 5) FHP is Fish Health Plan. 6) GG is GLOBALG.A.P. IFA (Integrated Farm Assurance. 7) GGN is GLOBALG.A.P. unique registration number. 8) THOV is acronym for Thomas Vavik Bekken (lead auditor). 9) DP is acronym Darius Pamakstys. 9) NINA is Norwegian institute for Nature Research. 10) IMR is Institute of Marine Research. 11) EQS is a quality and non-conformity handling system. 12) NLA is Norwegian Labour Authority. 13) NEA is Norwegian Environmental Agency. 14) DOF is Directorate of Fisheries

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 being audited</i>)	ASC Salmon audit of 11665 Jibbersholmane, a seasite for ongrowing production of Atlantic Salmon (<i>Salmo Salar</i>)											
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	Production of Atlantic Salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>). Production/ongrowing from smolt to harvest size fish in floating circular cages. Centralised feeding system on floating barge is central in site operation and also housing storage of feed, accomodations, technical and controlroom.											
4.3	Type of unit of certification (<i>select only one type of unit of certification in the list</i>)	Single farm											
4.4	Type of audit (<i>select all the types of audit that apply in the list</i>)	Initial Audit - 2019											
4.4.1	Number of sites included in the unit of certification	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Owned by client</th> <th>Subcontracted by client</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Initial audit - mm/yyyy</td> <td>11665 Jibbersholmane</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Owned by client	Subcontracted by client	Initial audit - mm/yyyy	11665 Jibbersholmane	Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy		Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy		Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy	
Owned by client	Subcontracted by client												
Initial audit - mm/yyyy	11665 Jibbersholmane												
Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy													
Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy													
Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy													
4.5	A summary of the major findings	<p>Refer to report section II Audit template and IV Audit Report - Closing for NCs found during audit.</p> <p>CONFIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION: To enhance transparency the company decided to leave all submitted information open and accessible.</p>											

4.6 The Audit determination

The Audit determination at draft report stage:

Not yet compliant. May be considered compliant and recommended certified only after satisfactory closure of Major non-conformances and satisfactory closure or a corrective action plan for Minor non-conformances is implemented by the client and approved by DNV GL.

- Final certification decision will be taken in final report after completion of stakeholder period.
- Until final certification decision by DNV GL the applicant is NOT yet certified and can not claim ASC Aquaculture certification status.

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1 CAB Name

DNV GL

5.2 CAB Mailing Address

DNV GL Business Assurance Norway AS
Veritasveien 1
1322 Høvik
Norway

5.3 Email Address

OSL.Certification.ASCfarm@dnvgl.com

5.4 Other Contact Information

Phone to DNVGL +47 67 57 99 00

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.

Yes

6.2 A description of the unit of certification (for initial audit) / changes, if any (for surveillance and recertification audits)	11665 Jibbersholman is a single site, conventional floating-cage salmon farm. The production cages are 7 circular floating plastic rings with the dimension 157 m circumference. Central on the farm is a feed barge, with centralised feeding system and submerged camera controls of feeding. All installations are certified after "NS-9415 NYTEK" regulations standard. Smolts supplied by external supplier. Public registers with details on location etc. in https://register.fiskeridir.no/akvareg/
6.3 Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	GlobalG.A.P. IFA
6.4 Other certification(s) obtained by the UoC before this audit	As above.
6.5 Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>current</u> year	2019: 2999
6.6 <u>Actual</u> annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>previous</u> year (mandatory for surveillance and recertification audits)	2017: 3490 MT 2018: 508 MT
6.7 Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification (select one or more in the list)	Net cages at sea
6.8 Number of employees working at the unit of certification (see notes in comment to this cell)	4
6.9 Size, and/or number of ponds, pens (if multi site, per site)	7 cages
7 Scope	
7.1 The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Salmon Standard, version 1.2 March 2019

<p>7.2 The species produced at the applicant farm (in English and Latin names)</p>	<p>Atlantic Salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>)</p>
<p>7.3 A description of the scope of the audit including a description of whether the unit 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.</p>	<p>The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including Jibbersholmane staff, typically a combination of document reviews and staff interviews. Demonstrations of equipment and processes took place, relevant to the scope of the audit, according to the ASC Salmon Standard v1.2 and following guidelines in the ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.2. No sub-sites are operated by the farm and the complete farm is included in the scope of certification. No handling of fish related to harvest is conducted on the farm, ongrowing only. Live fish for harvest is transported to harvest plants by subcontracted live fish carriers (se 7.4 below for details).</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Only approved live-fish carriers (Subcontractor; Sølvrans AS) are used during transshipments of salmon between the site and waiting cages/harvest plant.</p> <p>Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting/ harvesting from other salmon farms/sites.</p> <p>The possibility for mixture of salmon in waiting cages from salmon from other farm/sites is also prevented by biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the harvesting/processing plant used. There are slaughtered fish from only one waiting cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant. Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept both in electronic system Fish Talk and Maritech system for Harvest/Postharvest operations and in hard copies.</p> <p>Post-harvest operations performed at: Hardanger Fiskeforedling AS</p> <p>The harvest plant, Hardanger Fiskeforedling AS is in assessment to be certified against ASC CoC</p> <p>Ref. to www.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found.</p>

7.5 Description of the receiving water body(ies).

The farm is located in Hopslandsosen, the receiving water-body, Radøy municipality. Regional water-body authority is Hordaland Fylkeskommune. Classification of Hoplandsosen as a "protected coastal fiord" with very good environmental status according to EU Water Directive, 31.05.2019 Hordaland Fylkeskommune.

The site is under ABM system managed by FoMAS AS. There is other salmon farming activity in the area, including nearby farms. There are natural wild salmon populations in the area. Overview of salmon watercourses in the area are available in map tools from the Norwegian Environment Agency / Salmon Registry: <http://lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no/lakseregister/public/default.aspx>

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.

Thomas Vavik Bekken, Lead Auditor
Darius Pamakstys, Social Auditor
Kim Andre Karlsen, Technical Reviewer
Onsite audit was finished 06.06.2019
Initial audit draft report sent to technical review 26.06.2019
Technical Review of Initial audit draft report were finished 02.07.2019
Initial audit draft report sent to ASC 08.07.2019
Final Report finished NA
Technical review of Final Report finished NA
Final report sent ASC NA

8.2 Previous Audits (if applicable):

		NC reference number	Standard clause reference	Closing deadline - status - closing date of each NC
8.2.1	Initial audit - mm/yyyy			
	Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy			

Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy
 Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy
 Unannounced audit - mm/ yyyy
 NC close-out audit - mm/ yyyy
 Scope extension audit mm/ yyyy

8.3 Audit plan as implemented including:

8.3.1 Desk Reviews

8.3.2 Onsite audits

8.3.3 Stakeholder interviews and Community meetings

8.3.4 Draft report sent to client

8.3.5 Draft report sent to ASC

8.3.6 Final report sent to Client and ASC

Dates	Locations
31.05.2019	
03.06.2019 - 06.06-2019	HQ Norheimssund and onsite
	No submissions received from notified stakeholders.
08.07.2019	Initial audit 2019 report
08.07.2019	Initial audit 2019 report
NA	Initial audit 2019 report

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

Signe Holst-Larsen, Quality Coordinator
Kristine M Biseth, Quality Manager
Anita Stevnebø, Biological Coordinator
Siri F Ørstavik, Fish Health Manager
Knut Olav Berg, CFO, personal
Åse U Bråthun, Accounting Coordinator, personal
Hans Olav Ånensen, Area Manager
Svein Inge Henriksen, Site Operator, employees representatives
Operational Staff from site present during onsite audit
Gustav Folkestad, CEO Sævareid Fiskeanlegg, smolt manager

The audit was held in the company's head office, focusing on technical and legal matters, mainly, with relevant operational and administrative staff present. The second part of the audit comprised a site visit to Jibbersholmane, covering remaining technical and administrative issues and completed the social responsibility issues. The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including Jibbersholmane staff, typically a combination of document reviews and staff interviews

The interviews pertinent to the Social Responsibility Section of the ASC Salmon Standard were held in conditions allowing for confidentiality of the dialogues and under no constraints of free speech of the interviewees. These interviewees are not named in the report for the same reason.

Demonstrations of equipment and processes took place, relevant to the scope of the audit, according to the ASC Salmon Standard v1.2 and following guidelines in the ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.2

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

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

- 8.6 E5.1.i List of sites exempted from the scope of an initial audit and how they meet conditions in E5.1.i
NA
- 8.6.1 E5.1.ii Justification for auditing site(s) meeting conditions under E5.1.i
NA
- 8.7 E5.1.1.i List of sites removed after the initial audit
NA
- 8.7.1 E5.2.2 Reason for the removal of sites from the certificate.
NA
- 8.8 E5.4 Map of sites included in the unit of certification has been attached
NA
- 8.9 E5.5 Site(s) in following period included in the audit (*only for surveillance and re-certification audits*)
NA

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 ASC Salmon Standard document.

PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS						
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	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 explanatory 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
1.1.1	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws.C12	Electronic copies of laws, regulations and requirements with references to Lovdata with updates and electronic links in LANDAX system. Covered by internal procedures in LANDAX. Strict monitored by relevant authorities on these issues	Compliant		
		b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable.	License from Hordaland Fylkeskommune, d.t 25.11.2014, ref 2014/19397-18 MTB 3620 tons, site 11665 Jibbersholman, signed Bård Sandal, standard requirements Discharge license ref no 2014/0603.T .d.t 20.11.2014 from Fylkesmennene i Hordaland (signed Tom Pedersen), MTB 3620 tons, standard requirements Production plan for 2019-2020, ref 18/15992, approved by NFSD (Mattilsynet) d.t 21.02.2019, ALTINN REF AR304946330, d.t 21.02.2019			
		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).	No inspection from Fylkesmennene regarding discharge licence Seen report from NFSD (Mattilsynet) ref no 2018/255509, dated 20.11.2018 , 1 NC, which is closed, in letter ref.no 2018/255509, dated 29.11.2018, signed by Trine Helland. Seen report from NFD (Fiskeridir) ref no 18/7823, dated 11-13.09.2018. No NC			
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	Seen map from NFD (Fiskeridirektoratet) and "miljøstatus.no", site and national preservation areas are not in conflict with site Jibbersholman Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Krisitian Botnen Lingalaks AS, site not in conflict with any national preservation areas.			

1.1.2	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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.	Authorised auditor statement d.t 26.04.2019 for Lingalaks AS (organisation no 960 900 626), KPMG (HS)	Compliant		
		b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	Links to relevant laws in LANDAX (electronic quality system).			
		c. Register with national or local authorities as an "aquaculture activity".	License from Hordaland Fylkeskommune () 25.11.2014, ref 2014/19397-18 MTB 3620 tons, site 11665 Jibbersholman, signed Bård Sandal, standard requirements Discharge license ref no 2014/0603.T .d.t 20.11.2014 from Fylkesmenn i Hordaland (signed Tom Pedersen), MTB 3620 tons, standard requirements Production plan for 2019-2020, ref 18/15992, approved by NFSD (Mattilsynet) d.t 21.02.2019, ALTINN REF AR304946330, d.t 21.02.2019 Registered in national company register "Enhetsregisteret" 10.05.1991 , Lingalaks AS (organisation nr. 960 900 626)			
1.1.3	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	Online access to lovdata.no with laws and regulations.	Compliant		
		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).	No inspections from NLA (Arbeidstilsynet) or major HSE incidents registered for the site			
1.1.4	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.	License from Hordaland Fylkeskommune () 25.11.2014, ref 2014/19397-18 MTB 3620 tons, site 11665 Jibbersholman, signed Bård Sandal, standard requirements Discharge license ref no 2014/0603.T .d.t 20.11.2014 from Fylkesmenn i Hordaland (signed Tom Pedersen), MTB 3620 tons, standard requirements Production plan for 2019-2020, ref 18/15992, approved by NFSD (Mattilsynet) d.t 21.02.2019, ALTINN REF AR304946330, d.t 21.02.2019 Registered in national company register "Enhetsregisteret" 10.05.1991 , Lingalaks AS (organisation nr. 960 900 626)	Compliant		
		b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	As described in above permits. Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019 MOM-B, 26.07.2018, report no 1639, status 1 - very good, performed by Resipientanalyse AS, reported via ALTINN, ref no AR 278540725, d.t 31.08.2018 MOM-B, report no 1559, dated 14.11.2011, status 2 - good, performed by Resipientanalyse, reported via ALTINN, ref no AR224524977, d.t 15.11.2017			
		c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	MTB reported to government/ Altinn end of month, e.g seen report reference no AR319482040, dated 07.05.2019 Environmental reports and surveys reported to Altinn max 1 month after felt sampling done and results available from contractor. No indications of non compliance.			

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 standards under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix VI for requirements on transparency for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.
----------	---

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 to allow for sampling at different 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 supported by mapping of differences in 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 CAB determines that proposed 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.

2.1.1	<p>Indicator: Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1</p> <p>Requirement: Redox potential > 0 mV or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 μMol/L</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	Note: Under Indicator 2.1.1, farms can choose to measure redox potential (Option #1) or sulphide concentration (Option #2). Farms do not have to 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.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.	Minor	The site specific sediment sampling inspection (MOM C - hybrid - ASC adapted) is not done in peak biomasse (at >75% peak biomasse)	Redox Eh value +108 mV to +168 mV
		b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1c-f, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.	Sediments			
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	Option #1			
		d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I-1 (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations).	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Next MOM C scheduled at next peak biomasse in October/November 2019			

		<p>e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p>	<p>Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Redox stations sampling 2, 3, 4 and 5 from intermediate and remote zone, outside AZE. Redox Eh values ranging from JIB2 = 168, JIB3 = 148, JIB4 = 127, JIB5 = 108 (mV) MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665)</p>			
		<p>f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (µM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p>	<p>Redox potential. National regulations (NS 9410)</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>			
Footnote	[2] Farm sites can choose whether to use redox or sulphide. Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both.					
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.					
2.1.2	<p>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</p> <p>Requirement: AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>Notes: - Under Indicator 2.1.2, farms can choose one of four measurements to show compliance with the faunal index Requirement: AMBI (Option #1); Shannon-Wiener Index (Option #2); BQI (Option #3); or ITI (Option #4). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet all four threshold values. - If a farm is exempt due to hard bottom benthos (see 2.1.1b), then 2.1.2 does not apply and this shall be noted in the audit report.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1).</p>	<p>Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.</p>		
		<p>b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement.</p>	<p>Opt #2 Shannon Wiener used.</p>			
		<p>c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).</p>	<p>Van Veen grab used according to site specific MOM-C (NS9410) Not done at peak biomasse. Next MOM C scheduled at next peak biomasse in October/November 2019</p>			
		<p>d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method.</p>	<p>Opt #2 Shannon Wiener used.</p>	Minor	<p>The site specific sediment sampling inspection (MOM C - hybrid - ASC adapted) is not done in peak biomasse (at >75% peak biomass)</p>	4,16 - 4,62

		<p>e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC dokumentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Shannon Wiener index score outside AZE: stations JIB2 = 4,35, JIB3 = 4,62, JIB4 = 4,16 and JIB5 = 4,44</p> <p>Opt #2 Shannon Wiener used.</p> <p>Opt #2 Shannon Wiener used.</p> <p>MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal). Independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC d.t 31.05.2019</p>			
Footnote	[4] "Good" Ecological Quality Classification: The level of diversity and abundance of invertebrate taxa is slightly outside the range associated with the type-specific conditions. Most of the sensitive taxa of the type-specific communities are present.					
Footnote	[5] http://www.azti.es/en/ambi-azti-marine-biotic-index.html .					
	Indicator: Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment	<p>a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b.</p> <p>b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method.</p>	<p>Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC dokumentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.</p> <p>Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC dokumentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.</p>			

2.1.3	within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1			Minor	The site specific sediment sampling inspection (MOM C - hybrid - ASC adapted) is not done in peak biomasse (at >75% peak biomass)	Macrofaunal taxa value 4
	Requirement: ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species					
	Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane, dt 28.05.2019. Sampling date 01.04.2019. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Highly abundant taxa whitin AZE: stations JIB1, RESULTS: JIB1 = 4 No pollution species where indentified in the station (both whitin or outside AZE) and the abundant of other species is equally high to reference stations. According to national regulations (NS 9410) both station whitin AZE are classified as category 1 (best).			
		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.	MOM-B/C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal). Independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.			
		e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC d.t 31.05.2019			
Footnote	[6] Highly abundant: Greater than 100 organisms per square meter (or equally high to reference site(s) if natural abundance is lower than this level).					
2.1.4	Indicator: Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modeling system Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern.	Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) survey developed and performed by Åkerblå AS	Compliant		
		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].	Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) survey developed and performed by Åkerblå AS			
		c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data.	Site-specific sampling regime (ASC documentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) survey developed and performed by Åkerblå AS			
Footnote	[7] Robust and credible: The SEPA AUTODEPOMOD modeling system is considered to be an example of a credible and robust system. The model must include a multi-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 of operation [8]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[8] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.5.					

2.2.1	<p>Indicator: Weekly average percent saturation [9] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [10] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4</p> <p>Requirement: ≥ 70% [11]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [11]</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.1 - Monitoring Average Weekly Percent Saturation of Dissolved Oxygen</p> <p>Appendix I-4 presents the required methodology that farms must follow for sampling the average weekly percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO). Key points of the method are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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 afternoon (3-6 pm) as appropriate for the location and season;- 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 by fish (e.g. at the downstream edge of a net pen array);- each week, all DO measurements are used in the calculation of a weekly average percent saturation. <p>If monitoring deviates from prescribed sampling methodology, the farm shall provide the auditor with a written justification (e.g. when samples are missed due to bad weather). In limited and well-justified situations, farms may request that the CAB approve reduction of DO monitoring frequency to one sample per day.</p> <p><u>Exception [see footnote 12]</u> If a farm does not meet the minimum 70 percent weekly average saturation requirement, the farm must demonstrate the consistency of percent saturation with a reference site. The reference site shall be at least 500 meters from the edge of the net pen array, in a location that is understood to follow similar patterns in upwelling to the farm site and is not influenced by nutrient inputs from anthropogenic causes including aquaculture, agricultural runoff or nutrient releases from coastal communities. For any such exceptions, the auditor shall fully document in the audit report how the farm has demonstrated consistency with the reference site.</p> <p>Note 1: <i>Percent saturation</i> is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sample compared to the maximum amount that could be present at the same temperature and salinity.</p>				
		a. Monitor and record on-farm percent saturation of DO at a minimum of twice daily using a calibrated oxygen meter or equivalent method. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months.	All daily calculations and weekly calculations show oxygen values above 70%. Saturation. Oxygen measurement autologged with Steinsvik ORBIT probes (two probes in cage 7, depth 7 and 5 meter). Seen report from week 32-2018 to 22-2019, lowest is 85,14%.	Compliant		≥ 70%
		b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.	No missed data			
		c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.	Weekly average calculated from Steinvik camera and oxygen system and registered i FishTalk. All above 70 % in the period week 32-2018 to week 22-2019			
		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).	Weekly average calculated in Steinvik camera and oxygen system and registered i FishTalk. All above 70 % in the week 32-2018 to week 22-2019			
		e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.	Oxygen autologged and checked weekly (described in procedure). Calibration weekly (exposing probes to air). Cleaning when necessary. Instructions from equipment producer available. Seen oxygen logg onsite			
		f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 31.05.2019			
		Footnote	[9] Percent saturation: Percent saturation is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sample compared to the maximum amount that could be present at the same temperature and salinity.			
Footnote	[10] Averaged weekly from two daily measurements (proposed at 6 am and 3 pm).					
Footnote	[11] An exception to this standard shall be made for farms that can demonstrate consistency with a reference site in the same water body.					
2.2.2	<p>Indicator: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/L DO</p> <p>Requirement: 5%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/L DO.	Records confirm all oxygen values above mg/liter DO limit.	Compliant		0 %
		b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 31.05.2019			

2.2.3	<p>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 [13] classified as having “good” or “very good” water quality [14]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes [15]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [15]</p>	<p>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</p> <p>b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.</p> <p>c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.</p>	<p>Map from website ("vannportalen.no") provided by NEA (Miljødirektoratet) 31.05.2019 showing Jibberholmane is not sited in a risk area. Classification of area Hoplandsosen as a "protected coastal fiord" with very good environmental status according to EU Water Directive.</p> <p>Map from website ("vannportalen.no") provided by NED (Miljødirektoratet) 31.05.2019 showing Jibberholmane is not sited in a risk area. Classification of area Hoplandsosen as a "protected coastal fiord" with very good environmental status according to EU Water Directive.</p> <p>Map from website ("vannportalen.no") provided by NED (Miljødirektoratet) 31.05.2019 showing Jibberholmane is not sited in a risk area. Classification of area Hoplandsosen as a "protected coastal fiord" with very good environmental status according to EU Water Directive.</p>	Compliant		
Footnote	[12] Related to nutrients (e.g., N, P, chlorophyll A).					
Footnote	[13] Within the two years prior to the audit.					
Footnote	[14] Classifications of “good” and “very good” are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classification from other water quality monitoring systems in other jurisdictions are acceptable.					
Footnote	[15] Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt from standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.					
2.2.4	<p>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</p> <p>Requirement: Consistency with reference site</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [16]</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.</p> <p>c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.</p>	<p>Se 2.2.3 Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for region/area</p> <p>Se 2.2.3 Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for region/area</p> <p>Se 2.2.3 Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for region/area</p>	Compliant		
Footnote	[16] Farms shall monitor total N, NH4, NO3, total P and Ortho-P in the water column. Results shall be submitted to the ASC database. Methods such as a Hach kit are acceptable.					
2.2.5	<p>Indicator: Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [17]) of the farm on a production cycle basis</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand</p> <p>Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) can be calculated based on cumulative inputs of N and C to the environment over the course of the production cycle.</p> <p>$BOD = ((\text{total N in feed} - \text{total N in fish}) * 4.57) + ((\text{total C in feed} - \text{total C in fish}) * 2.67).$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 this 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 to estimate nutrient reduction.• Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting; Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html. <p>Note 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 audit for the farm, the client is required to demonstrate to the CAB that data is being collected and an understanding of the calculations.</p> <p>Note 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 analyzed by an accredited laboratory, and the farm can show that BOD monitoring results do not deviate significantly from calculated annual BOD load.</p>				

	Applicability: All	a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.	Data complete production cycle 16G: In the period 08-2016 to 05-2018 Total BOD = 5657527,8 BOD was 1,20 kg oxygen per kg fish Calculations from GAPI	Compliant		
		b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 31.05.2019			
Footnote	[17] BOD calculated as: ((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 this equation, “fish” refers to harvested fish. Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting; Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html .					
2.2.6	Indicator: Appropriate controls are in place that maintain good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs, thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Document control systems in good culture and hygiene that includes all appropriate elements.	Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikaliehåndteringsplan" ID 1862, valid to 27.02.20; e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Mørenot/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR. Avfallplan ID 1750, d.t 01.03.2019, procedure for correct waste handling and environmental impact of waste	Compliant		
		b. Apply the systems ensuring that staff are aware, qualified and trained to properly implement them.	Verified during interviews onsite			
		-	Verified during audit			
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
2.3.1	Indicator: Percentage of fines [18] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [20] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) Requirement: < 1% by weight of the feed Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]	Note: The methodology given in Appendix I-2 is used to determine the fines (dust and small fragments) in finished product of fish feed which has a diameter of 3 mm or more.				
		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.	Percentage of fines according to requirements. Seen instruction "Sikting av fôr brudd og støv" ID 2466, d.t 28.05.2019 Fines in feed masured in Q2 - 2019 fines is measured from 0,8% to 0,63%	Compliant		0,72 %
		b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations.	Appropriate testing technology as per ASC			
		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.	Percentage of fines according to requirements. Seen instruction "Sikting av fôr brudd og støv" ID 2466, d.t 28.05.2019 Fines in feed masured in Q2 - 2019 fines is measured from 0,63% to 0,8%			
Footnote	[18] Fines: Dust and fragments in the feed. Particles that separate from feed with a diameter of 5 mm or less when sieved through a 1 mm sieve, or particles that separate from feed with a diameter greater than 5 mm when sieved through a 2.36 mm sieve. To be measured at farm gate (e.g., from feed bags after they are delivered to farm).					

Footnote	[19] To be measured every quarter or every three months. Samples that are measured shall be chosen randomly. Feed may be sampled immediately prior to delivery to farm for sites with no feed storage where it is not possible to sample on farm. Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients and > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt.					
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
2.4.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outlined in Appendix I-3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	Note: If a farm has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may use such documents as evidence to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 2.4.1 as long as all components in Appendix I-3 are explicitly covered.				
		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.	Risk assessment regarding environment and biodiversity performed d.t 27.05.2019. Document "EIA, ERA biomangfold og dyreliv i området", ID 1747, d.t 05.04.2019 Document "Miljø og biomangfoldsplan", ID 1748, d.t 05.04.2019 Document "Liste over rødstearter i Hordaland", ID 2343, d.t 30.04.2019 Procedure "Predatorkontroll", ID 1745, d.t 15.05.2019 MOM-B and MOM-C surveys performed according to requirements in license and national legislation		Minor	Dieseloil to run the power generators is stored in big tanks (fiberglass) in the basement of the barge. Risk of spillage is present and in the same room there are bilge pumps on the floor that will start automatically. Risk of pumping diesel to the environment is present which represent high risk for negative impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystem. The risk for spillage and automatically start of bilge pumps is not identified in the risk assessment and addressed in the action plan
		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.	Risk assessment regarding environment and biodiversity performed d.t 27.05.2019. Document "EIA, ERA biomangfold og dyreliv i området", ID 1747, d.t 05.04.2019 Document "Miljø og biomangfoldsplan", ID 1748, d.t 05.04.2019 Document "Liste over rødstearter i Hordaland", ID 2343, d.t 30.04.2019 Procedure "Predatorkontroll", ID 1745, d.t 15.05.2019 MOM-B and MOM-C surveys performed according to requirements in license and national legislation Plan with actions is addressed in document "Målsetning for lokalitet", H18 site Jibbersholmane, d.t 19.09.2018. Verified implemented with site workers and site manager during inspection and interviews			
		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.	Verified during interviews onsite			

2.4.2	<p>Indicator: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [20] or High Conservation Value Areas [21] (HCVAs)</p> <p>Requirement: None [22]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [22]</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to Requirements that Farms are not sited within Protected Areas or HCVAs</p> <p>The following exceptions shall be made for Indicator 2.4.2:</p> <p>Exception #1: For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management).</p> <p>Exception #2: For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVA.</p> <p>Exception #3: For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected.</p> <p>Definitions</p> <p><u>Protected area:</u> "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values."</p> <p><u>High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA):</u> Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVA are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical conservation values—both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high conservation values are maintained or enhanced</p>				
		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).	Map on "protected planet" and Norwegian Environment Agency showing site is not in a protected area or HCVA	Compliant		
		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.	Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Krisitian Botnen Lingalaks AS, site not in conflict with any national preservation areas (HCVA)			
		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.	Not within HCVA			
		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.	Not within HCVA			
Footnote	[20] Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." Source: Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008), Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 86pp.					
Footnote	[21] High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA): Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVA are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical conservation values—both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high conservation values are maintained or enhanced (http://www.hcvnetwork.org/).					
Footnote	<p>[22] The following exceptions shall be made for Standard 2.4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management).• For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVA.• For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to 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):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			

Footnote	[23] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.6.					
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. -	No ADDs/AHDs in use, nor has been used. Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Krisitian Botnen Lingalaks AS, no use og ADD og AHD Not present at farm	Compliant		0
2.5.2	Indicator: Number of mortalities [25] of endangered or red-listed [26] marine mammals or birds on the farm Requirement: 0 (zero) Applicability: All	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations. b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents. c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death. d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1) -	Birdnets located above the net cages are only predator control devices used. No marine mammals involved. No bird entanglement incidents in bird net. Records verified on site Red list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area from "Norsk Rødliste for arter-2015 version 1.2" - from Artsdatabanken No mortalities of Red listed species	Compliant		0
Footnote	[25] Mortalities: Includes animals intentionally killed through lethal action as well as accidental deaths through entanglement or other means.					
Footnote	[26] Species listed as endangered or critically endangered by the IUCN or on a national endangered species list.					
2.5.3	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 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 Requirement: Yes [28] Applicability: All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [28]	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. 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. 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].	No lethal actions taken at farm No lethal actions taken at farm No lethal actions taken at farm	Compliant		
Footnote	[27] Lethal action: Action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds.					
Footnote	[28] Exception to these conditions may be made for a rare situation where human safety is endangered. Should this be required, post-incident approval from 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.

2.5.4	Indicator: Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [30] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [29] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.3), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.	List on http://lingalaks.no/sertifiseringer/ showing no lethal incidents has occurred last 6 months (will be published within 30 days if actual).	Minor	Records reviewed onsite during inspection show that there has been 2 incidents with birds in the nets last 6 months. These incidents has not been made easily publicly available on their website	
		a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.3), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.	List on http://lingalaks.no/sertifiseringer/ showing no lethal incidents has occurred last 6 months (will be published within 30 days if actual).			
		b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.4a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).	List on http://lingalaks.no/sertifiseringer/ showing no lethal incidents has occurred last 6 months (will be published within 30 days if actual).			
		Footnote				
2.5.5	Indicator: Maximum number of lethal incidents [30] on the farm over the prior two years Requirement: < 9 lethal incidents [31], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals Applicability: All	a. Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.3a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required.	2 lethal incidents with birds, seen records in "LANDAX " non-conformance system from 12-2018 to 05-2019	Compliant		2
		b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.	2 lethal incidents with birds, seen records in "LANDAX " non-conformance system from 12-2018 to 05-2019			
		c. 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). Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019			
Footnote		[30] Lethal incident: Includes all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids.				
Footnote		[31] Standard 2.5.6 applicable to incidents related to non-endangered and non-red-listed species. This standard complements, and does not contradict, 2.5.3.				
2.5.6	Indicator: In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that an assessment of the risk of lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences	a. Keep records showing that the farm undertakes an assessment of risk following each lethal incident and how those risk assessments are used to identify concrete steps the farm takes to reduce the risk of future incidents.		Minor	Records onsite is showing 2 incidents with birds in net the last 6 months. These 2 incidents are not registered in theirs non-conformances	

2.5.6	<p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.6a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents.			system and no cause analysis including actions to minimize risk for future incidences in done
PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS					
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [34, 35]					
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):		
Footnote	[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 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7.				
<p>Instruction to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1</p> <p>According to footnote [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 requirements under Criterion 3.1. More specifically, farms are only eligible for exemption from Criterion 3.1 if it can be shown that either of the following holds:</p> <p>1) the farm does not release any water to the natural environment; or</p> <p>2) any effluent released by the farm to the natural environment has been effectively treated to kill pathogens (e.g. UV and/or chemical treatment of water with testing demonstrating efficacy).</p> <p>Auditors shall fully document the rationale for any such exemptions in the audit report.</p>					
3.1.1	<p>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.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	<p>a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme.</p> <p>b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- coordination of stocking;- fallowing;- therapeutic treatments; and- information sharing. <p>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.</p> <p>d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.</p>	<p>Agreement regarding ABM ("Nordhordaland Fiskehelsenettverk") in Hordaland signed 23.05.2019, applicable for 2019 by all companies in the area (100% participation), including Lingalaks. Jibbersholmane is in the sub zone no 15 "Radøy-Nord". Fishguard AS and FoMAS administrate the work with ABM. Members of the group reports to Fishgurad AS and Fishguard AS monitors situation in the area (lice, disease, stocking, fallowing, treatments, etc. in the area). FoMAS AS reports to the members, or members do it to each other</p> <p>The ABM ("Lusenettverk") plan for release and fallowing period 01.06.2020 - 30.06.2020 shows Jibbersholmane shall have a fallow period in June 2020</p> <p>Last record form meeting 07.05.2019, signed Ragnhild Malkenes</p> <p>Production plan for 2019-2020, ref 18/15992, approved by NFSD (Mattilsynet) d.t 21.02.2019, ALTINN REF AR304946330, d.t 21.02.2019</p> <p>Information of ABM above submitted to CAB and compliance verified.</p> <p>Agreement regarding ABM ("Nordhordaland Fiskehelsenettverk") in Hordaland signed 23.05.2019, applicable for 2019 by all companies in the area (100% participation), including Lingalaks. Jibbersholmane is in the sub zone no 15 "Radøy-Nord". Fishguard AS aministrate the work with ABM. Members of the group reports to Fishgurad AS and Fishguard AS monitors situation in the area (lice, disease, stocking, fallowing, treatments, etc. in the area). Fishguard AS reports to the members.</p> <p>The ABM ("Lusenettverk") plan for release and fallowing period 01.06.2020 - 30.06.2020 shows Jibbersholmane shall have a fallow period in June 2020</p> <p>Last record form meeting 07.05.2019, signed Ragnhild Malkenes</p> <p>Production plan for 2019-2020, ref 18/15992, approved by NFSD (Mattilsynet) d.t 21.02.2019, ALTINN REF AR304946330, d.t 21.02.2019</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	Compliant	

3.1.2	<p>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</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	<p>Note: Indicator 3.1.2 requires that farms demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks. If the farm does not receive any requests to collaborate on such research projects, the farm may demonstrate compliance by showing evidence of commitment through other proactive means such as published policy statements or directed outreach to relevant organizations.</p>		Compliant		
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Company involved in several research projects, e.g.: -Project, "kameratelling i Granvinsvassdraget", surveillance of wild stock i local rivers, non-financial, together with "Rådgivende Biologer" -OURO, mandatory for all producers -Salmon Tracking project, reaserch on wild stock in rivers, together with others producers in production area 3 and 4 -Blue Planet, analyses of nutrition in fjordsystem, together woth Norse Reaserch</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Some of the projects described in 3.1.2 includes non-financial support.</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluated by technical team. Denied projects not known by staff in audit.</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Seen email from Knut Olav Berg, CEO, d.t 06.06.2019</p>			
Footnote	[34] Commitment: At a minimum, a farm and/or its operating company must demonstrate this commitment through providing farm-level data to researchers, granting researchers access to sites, or other similar non-financial support for research activities.					
3.1.3	<p>Indicator: Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II-2</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	<p>a. Keep records to show that a maximum sea lice load has been set for: - the entire ABM; and - the individual farm.</p>	<p>There are legal limits for maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and the individual farm. Maximum 0,5 mature female sea lice all year, except in sensitive period (week 16 to week 21) were the action limit is 0,2 mature female lice and moving lice based on the legal authorities regulations for lice control Procedure "Lusetelling og krav til behandling og samordning" ID 1714, d.t 01.04.2019 shows regularity of lice count, how to count and maximum sea lice load. Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard AS and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmane - no week above limits on the current production cycle Records confirm compliance with limits for sealice from 2016 and up to date 2019.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>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 salmon where applicable (See 3.1.6).</p>	<p>Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Results available at webpages "lusedata.no" and "barentswatch.no" with lice levels, treatment etc. published in this public website.They have information and registrations from several years up to today.</p>			

		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.	Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Results available at webpages "lusedata.no" and "barentswatch.no" with lice levels, treatment etc. published in this public website. They have information and registrations from several years up to today.			
		d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019			
3.1.4	<p>Indicator: Frequent [35] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [36] within seven days of testing</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.</p> <p>f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year.</p>	<p>There are legal limits for maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and the individual farm. Maximum 0,5 mature female sea lice all year, except in sensitive period (week 16 to week 21) where the action limit is 0,2 mature female lice and moving lice based on the legal authorities regulations for lice control Procedure "Lusetelling og krav til behandling og samordning" ID 1714, d.t 01.04.2019 shows regularity of lice count, how to count and maximum sea lice load. Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard AS and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmane - no week above limits on the current production cycle Records confirm compliance with limits for sealice from 2016 and up to date 2019.</p> <p>Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard AS and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmane - no week above limits on the current production cycle</p> <p>Procedure "Prosedyre for lusekontroll" shows regularity of lice count, how to count and maximum sea lice load.</p> <p>Result of sea lice count made public in "Lusenettverket" and website BarentsWatch.no, company website (http://lingalaks.no/asc/jibbersholmane/)</p> <p>Result of sea lice count made public in "Lusenettverket", website BarentsWatch.no, company website (http://lingalaks.no/asc/jibbersholmane/)</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	Compliant		
Footnote	[35] Testing must be weekly during and immediately prior to sensitive periods for wild salmonids, such as outmigration of wild juvenile salmon. Testing must be at least monthly during the rest of the year, unless water temperature is so cold that it would jeopardize farmed fish health to test for lice (below 4 degrees C). Within closed production systems, alternative methods for monitoring sea lice, such as video monitoring, may be used.					
Footnote	[36] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available."					

3.1.5	<p>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</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmonid Health and Migration</p> <p>In writing this indicator, the SAD Steering Committee concluded that relevant data sets on wild salmonid health and migration are publicly available in the vast majority of, if not all, jurisdictions with wild salmonids. The information is likely to come from government sources or from research institutions. Therefore farms are not responsible for conducting this research themselves. However farms must demonstrate that they are aware of this basic information in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those wild stocks.</p> <p>This Indicator requires collection and understanding of general data for the major watersheds within approximately 50 km of the farm. A farm does not need to demonstrate that there is data for every small river or tributary or subpopulation. Information should relate to the wild fish stock level, which implies that the population is more or less isolated from other stocks of the same species and hence self-sustaining. A "conservation unit" under the Canadian Wild Salmon Policy is an example of an appropriate fish stock-level definition. However, it must be recognized that each jurisdiction may have slight differences in how a wild salmonid stock is defined in the region.</p> <p>For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere [39]. Potentially affected species in these areas are salmonids (i.e. including all trout species). Where a species is not natural to a region (e.g. Atlantic or Pacific Salmon in Chile) the areas are not considered as "areas with wild salmonids" even if salmon have escaped from farms and established themselves as a reproducing species in "the wild".</p> <p>Farms do not need to conduct research on migration routes, timing and the health of wild stocks under this standard if general information is already available. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level for salmonid populations in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those stocks. Such "evidence" would consist of, for example, peer review studies; publicly available government monitoring and reporting.</p>				
		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.	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) and trout (<i>Salmo trutta</i>) is naturally occurring in the area.	Compliant		
		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.	Overview with relevant links and report, inclusive fiskinginnorge.no/lakseelver, lakseelver.no/nb/news, lakseelver.no/nb/fakta, miljodirektoratet.no, vitenskapsrådet.no, etc last report from 2018 The report "Status for norske laksebestander 2011" by Vitenskaplig råd for lakseforvaltning shows records from wild salmon surveys since 1983. Vosso is the main river for salmon in the area, but no migration routes is identified relevant for site Jibbersholman			
		c. From data in 3.1.5b, identify any sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. periods of outmigration of juveniles) within 50 km of the farm.	Sensitiv periode is changes to week 16 to week 21			
		-	Good understanding of issue.			
Footnote	[37] For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere.					
Footnote	[38] Farms do not need to conduct research on migration routes, timing and the health of wild stocks under this standard if general information is already available. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level for salmonid populations in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those stocks.					
3.1.6	<p>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 available. See requirements in Appendix III-1.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in</p>	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) and trout (<i>Salmo trutta</i>) is naturally occurring in the area.	Compliant		
		b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.	Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law. Governmental monitoring and reporting			
		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.	Havforskningsinstituttet report 2018 Risk Assessment for Norway, fish farming report 2018, where sealice issues are covered.IMR report on wild stock sealice situation "Smolt - kunnskapsoppsummering" M1-36-2017, and "Risikovurdering av Norsk Fiskeoppdrett IMR/vet Institute report on measuring environmental effects on wild salmon".			

	[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.	Reports public available at www.imr.no and www.miljodirektoratet.no			
		e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI.	Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law. Public reports regarding this issue is easily publicly available.			
3.1.7	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. Requirement: 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply. 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. c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2. 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).	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) and trout (<i>Salmo trutta</i>) is naturally occurring in the area. Sensitive periods in area for wild salmon migration considered and defined to week 16 to week 21 Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmen - the site was in fallow periode in 2018 Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law, monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids administrated by IMR. Direct feedback loop hence impossible to obtain.	Compliant		0,01-0,08
Footnote	[39] Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.					
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
3.2.1	Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially 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]	Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.1, "area" is defined as a contiguous body of water with the bio-chemical and temperature profile required to support the farmed species' life and reproduction (e.g. the Northern Atlantic Coast of the U.S. and Canada). Appendix II-1A elaborates further on this definition: "The boundaries of an area should be defined, taking into account the zone in which key cumulative impacts on wild populations may occur, water movement and other relevant aspects of ecosystem structure and function." The intent is that the area relates to the spatial extent that is likely to be put at risk from the non-native salmon. Areas will only rarely coincide with the boundaries of countries. a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply. b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before June 13, 2012. 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).	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area. Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area. Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area. Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area.	N/A	Salmonides, e.g. <i>S. salar</i> , <i>S. trutta</i> , naturally occurring in the area.	

		-	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area.			
Footnote	[40] Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical barriers that are in place and well-maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.					
3.2.2	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 of the species within the farm's jurisdiction and these results submitted to ASC for review [42] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All [43]	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 Standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017). 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 area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 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.		N/A Salmo salar native to region.		
		a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI).	Submitted to ASC in email dt.18.07.2016			
		b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area.			
		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).	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area.			
		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.	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area.			
		e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) is native in the area.			
Footnote	[41] The research must at a minimum include multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species, use credible methodologies and analysis, and undergo peer review.					
Footnote	[42] If the review demonstrates there is increased risk, the ASC will consider prohibiting the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction under this standard. In the event that the risk tools demonstrate "high" risks, the SAD expects that the ASC will prohibit the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction. The ASC intends to bring this evidence into future revision of the standard and those results taken forward into the revision process.					
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 area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining.					
3.2.3	Indicator: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.	Cleaning fish; Lumpfish (<i>Rognkjeks</i>) and wrasses (<i>Grønnngylte</i> , <i>Bergylte</i> and <i>Bergnebb</i>) are all native to region.	Compliant		
		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.	Cleaning fish; Lumpfish (<i>Rognkjeks</i>) and wrasses (<i>Grønnngylte</i> , <i>Bergylte</i> and <i>Bergnebb</i>) are all native to region. Documentation available, e.g.: -Transport logg from Scallops Fighter, d.t 12.02.2019, 44 815 Lumpfish, from Svelgen to site Jibbersholmane -Veterinarian statement from AKVAvet Gulen, valid to 18.02.2019, regarding cleaner fish from Steinvik Rensefisk AS Procedure "Rensefisk" ID 1723, d.t 25.02.2019, inclusive routines for cleaner fish			
		c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.	Cleaning fish; Lumpfish (<i>Rognkjeks</i>) and wrasses (<i>Grønnngylte</i> , <i>Bergylte</i> and <i>Bergnebb</i>) are all native to region.			
Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			

3.3.1	Indicator: Use of transgenic [44] salmon by the farm Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.	Declaration from AquaGen (ova provider), d.t 15.01.2019, no GMO salmon, signed Fride Lindseth	Compliant		
		b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	Smolt supplier on the 18G is internal provider Sævareid Fiskeanlegg AS, ova supplier AquaGen and Salmobreed			
		c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.	Declaration from AquaGen (ova provider), d.t 15.01.2019, no GMO salmon, signed Fride Lindseth			
Footnote	[44] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get					
Criterion 3.4 Escapes [47]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[45] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.					
3.4.1	Indicator: Maximum number of escapees [46] in the most recent production cycle Requirement: 300 [47] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [47]	a. Maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.	No escapes registered. Documented in production and recording system Fishtalk. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (DOF), updated 30.04.2019 (www.fiskeridir.no).Cross-checked and verified with the estimate of unexplained loss.	Compliant		0
		b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle.	No escapes registered. Documented in production and recording system Fishtalk. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (DOF), updated 30.04.2019 (www.fiskeridir.no).Cross-checked and verified with the estimate of unexplained loss.			
		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]).	No escapes registered. Documented in production and recording system Fishtalk. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (DOF), updated 30.04.2019 Documents are and will be available for at least 10 years.			
		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.	No escapes registered. Documented in production and recording system Fishtalk. Environmental company/site reports for 2017 states 0 escapes. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (DOF) .			
		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).	Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019			
Footnote	[46] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregate number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish. Data on date of escape episode(s), number of fish escaped and cause of escape episode shall be reported as outlined in Appendix VI.					
Footnote	[47] A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. See auditing guidance for additional details.					

3.4.2	<p>Indicator: Accuracy [48] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers</p> <p>Requirement: ≥ 98%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Stock count provided by FW site. They use vaccination numbers as basis. Vaccination counting by camera technology from "Maskon". Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 05.06.2016. In case of counting during production at sea (e.g. grading, delicing) wellboat performs this. Seen specification for Aquascan registration unit CSF series (used in wellboat company Sølvtrens AS) with accuracy 98 - 100%. Seen statement from Sølvtrens regarding Aquascan with accuracy 98 %. Wellboats also use harvest number for calibration. Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered.</p>	Compliant		≥ 98%
	<p>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).</p>	<p>Stock count provided by FW site. They use vaccination numbers as basis. Vaccination counting by camera technology from "Maskon". Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 05.06.2016. In case of counting during production at sea (e.g. grading, delicing) wellboat performs this. Seen specification for Aquascan registration unit CSE1600 (used in wellboat Sølvtrens AS) with accuracy 98 - 100%. Seen statement from Sølvtrens regarding Aquascan with accuracy 98 %. Wellboats also use harvest number for calibration. Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered.</p>				
	<p>c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).</p>	<p>Farm does not use counting equipment.</p>				
	<p>-</p>	<p>Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 05.06.2016. Seen specification for Aquascan registration unit CSE1600 (used in wellboats from Sølvtrens AS) with accuracy 98 - 100%.</p>				
	<p>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).</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>				
Footnote	[48] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.					
3.4.3	<p>Indicator: Estimated unexplained loss [49] of farmed salmon is made publicly available</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss</p> <p>The Estimated Unexplained Loss (EUL) of fish is calculated at the end of each production cycle as follows:</p> <p>EUL = (stocking count) - (harvest count) - (mortalities) - (recorded escapes)</p> <p>Units for input variables are number of fish (i.e. counts) per production cycle. Where possible, farms should use the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count. This formula is adapted from footnote 59 of the ASC Salmon Standard.</p>		Compliant		0,44 %
	<p>a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1).</p>	<p>Specific site reports and records documented and available in production system FishTalk</p>				
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Most recent production cycle is 2016 generation: EUL = 0,44%</p>				
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Published on companys website</p>				
	<p>d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>				

		-				
Footnote	[49] Calculated at the end of the production cycle as: Unexplained loss = Stocking count – harvest count – mortalities – other known escapes. Where possible, use of the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count is preferred.					
3.4.4	<p>Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and reporting of risk events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors, reporting and follow up of escape events); and worker training on escape prevention and counting technologies</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Procedure to prevent escape "Tiltaksplan mot rømming" ID 1746, d.t 20.03.2019 and a contingency plan regarding escape, ID 1778, d.t 28.05.2019. Risk assesement for escapes, d.t 151, d.t 21.02.2019</p> <p>Lingaskolen will be performed in June 2019 where escape prevention is a major training subject</p> <p>Nets individually tagged and registered in NetReg with expiry date of certificates/service card. Seen overview in NetReg with no nets over the expiry date. Strenght tests and certificates available for all nets used at site, seen examples.</p> <p>External training courses in escape prevention for staff, seen training record for all employees, escapes prevent training, e.g Kenneth Marøy, d.t 07.06.2016, by SjømatNorge and for Hans Olav Ånesen, d.t 21.06.2018</p> <p>Good awarness demonstrated interview</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- net strength testing;- appropriate net mesh size;- net traceability;- system robustness;- predator management;- 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.	<p>The Escape Prevention Plan and accompanying documents covers the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- net strength testing;- appropriate net mesh size;- net traceability;- system robustness;- predator management;- record keeping;- reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors);- planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas;- planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. <p>All nets are inspected after they are put to sea and moorings are inspected when changed, e.g. seen report from netinspection i cage 4, d.t 06.03.2019, ROV inspection, by Ringasund AS, no NC. Inspection report in cage 7, d.t 06.03.2019, ROV inspection by Ringasund AS, no NC.</p> <p>Monthly inspection by ROV and after incidents/bad weather, e.g. registration report for monthly control i net/cage no 7, d.t 09.04.2019, by Samba Marine AS, no AF-0000242, divers PJ, TH, AD, all valid health certificates (includes nets, moorings, pens, farm) - all CP ok, signed Phillip Jeppson</p> <p>Additional control when nets are washed. Diving licence and health certificate ok</p> <p>All structures NYTEK certified Norwegian standard NS9415 (Site certificate nr AS212, 11655 Jibbersholman, dated 02.09.2016 by Aquastructure (inspection organisation INSP 004) valid to 02.09.2021, approved for over 1 million fish., signed Tore Åmås)</p>			
		<p>c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- system robustness;- predator management;- 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.	<p>Open system</p>			

		<p>d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.</p>	<p>Monthly inspection by ROV and after incidents/bad weather, e.g. registration report for monthly control i net/cage no 7, d.t 09.04.2019, by Samba Marine AS, no AF-0000242, divers PJ, TH, AD, all valid health certificates (includes nets, moorings, pens, farm) - all CP ok, signed Phillip Jeppson</p> <p>Cage M7: net MND-10152, Mørenot AQ in the cage and in the register net-reg by Mørenot. Service card with strenght test for net MND-10152, Mørenot, valid to 16.07.2020</p> <p>All structures NYTEK certified Norwegian standard NS9415 (Site certificate nr AS212, 11655 Jibbersholman, dated 02 09.2016 by Aquastructure (inspection organisation INSP 004) valid to 02.09.2021, approved for over 1 million fish., signed Tore Åmås)</p>			
		<p>e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.</p>	<p>Seen training record for all employees, escapes prevent training, dated 21.06.2018</p>			
		-	<p>Implementation confirmed e.g net strenght and net certificate for nets documented in "net-reg" by Mørenot and internal net register.</p> <p>Awareness verified on site visit/interviews</p>			
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):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds</p> <p>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 feed producers (see note 1) are audited at regular intervals by an independent auditing firm or a conformity assessment body against a recognized standard which substantially incorporate requirements for traceability. Acceptable certification schemes include 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 information handling processes to 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 compliance with these 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 responsibly produced salmon feed (see 4.1.1b below).</p> <p>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 4.1.1 through 4.4.2. The ASC Salmon Standard allows farms to use one of two different methods to demonstrate compliance of feed producers:</p> <p>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 example, the farm may request its 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 requirements.</p> <p>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 ingredients (both amount and type) 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 producer will independently 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 steps of feed manufacturing (purchasing of raw materials, processing to finished feed, and sales) under the management of a single legal entity.</p> <p>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 (i.e. the feed supplier) will be the 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 from a feed producer or indirectly through an intermediary organization, it remains the farm's obligation to show evidence that all feeds used are in compliance with requirements.</p>						

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.	Feed supplier: Skretting (www.skretting.com), Biomar (www.biomar.no) and EWOS/Cargill (www.cargill.com) Records of purchase: From 01.01.2018 to 27.05.2019 Recent cycle (18G): 1 739 935 kg Skretting: 962 981 kg Biomar: 750 953 kg EWOS/Cargill: 26 000 kg (<1%) E.g Biomar order no. 144893, 130 500 kg, SG 1000 S 50mg Q, dated 20.05.2019, verified input in FishTalk, used on Jibbersholmane E.g Skretting order no. 0013645677, 94 500 kg, PROTEQ 1200-50A 9, dated 23.04.2019, verified input in FishTalk, used on Jibbersholmane	Compliant		
		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.	Information letter to CF supplier sent 16.04.2019 to Skretting and to Biomar dated 30.04.2019			
		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.	Skretting: Audited by DNV GL GG CFM d.t 14.05.19, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.20 Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, d.t 21.08.18, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2019			
		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.	Method #2 Massbalance			
		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].	Statement from Skretting, "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture" compound ASC feed, ASC Salmon Feed Requirements, Version, 1.7 January 2018 Statement from Biomar, "Traceability of feed" including origin of raw materials, feed, process history amnd locations of feed, dated 14.01.2019, signed by Ellinor Helland			
		-	Statement and certificate for feed supplier verified.			
Footnote	[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 must be traced back to the fishery, soy to the region grown, etc.). Feed manufacturers will need to supply the farm with third-party documentation of the ingredients covered under this standard.					
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [51]						
	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[51] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.					
4.2.1	Indicator: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 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 have 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 production cycle (i.e. if the FFDRm of the most recent crop was > 1.2) if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that: - the client understands how to accurately calculate FFDRm; - the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate FFDRm (i.e. all feed specs for > 6 months) for the current production cycle; and - the client can show how feed used for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. FFDRm < 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.	Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsupplier Skretting and Biomar			

	Requirement: < 1.2 Applicability: All	b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.	Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 2018" relevant for Q1 2019 (42,7 % of fishmeal originated from trimmings) Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 (25,2 % of fishmeal originated from trimmings), d.t 05.02.2019	Compliant		FFDRm 0,49 FFDRm 0,94
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).	Recent cycle (18G): eFCR= 1,17			
		d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.	Recent cycle (18G): Skretting: FFDRm = 0,49 Biomar: FFDRm = 0,94			
		e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in mail 31.05.2019			
4.2.2	Indicator: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV-1), or, Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [52] (calculated according to Appendix IV-2) Requirement: FFDRo < 2.52 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed Applicability: All	Note: Under Indicator 4.2.2, farms can choose to calculate FFDRo (Option #1) or EPA & DHA (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values. Client shall inform the CAB which option they will use.		Compliant		FFDRo 1,37 FFDRo 1,28
		a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.	Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsupplier Skretting and Biomar			
		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.	Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" (57,7 % of fishoil originated from trimmings). Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 (32,5 % of fishoil originated from trimmings), d.t 05.02.2019			
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	Option #1			
		d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.	Last complete cycle (18G): FFDRo= 1,17 Recent cycle (18G): Skretting: FFDRo = 1,37 Biomar: FFDRo = 1,28			
		e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2.	Option #1			
		f. Submit FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in mail 31.05.2019			
Footnote	[52] Calculation excludes DHA and EPA derived from fisheries by-products and trimmings. Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption. Fishmeal and fish oil that are produced from trimmings can be excluded from the calculation as long as the origin of the trimmings is not any species that are classified as critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org).					
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials						
	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			

4.3.1	<p>Indicator: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries [53] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [54] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries</p> <p>Requirement: Not required</p> <p>Applicability: N/A</p>	-			
Footnote	[53] This standard and standard 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.				
Footnote	[54] Meets ISEAL guidelines as demonstrated through full membership in the ISEAL Alliance, or equivalent as determined by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.				
4.3.2	<p>Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score [55] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived</p> <p>Requirement: All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 6</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.2 - FishSource Score of Fish Used in Feed</p> <p>To determine FishSource scores of the fish species used as feed ingredients, do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-go to http://www.fishsource.org/- type the species into the search function box and choose the accurate fishery-confirm that the search identifies the correct fishery then scroll down or click on the link from the menu on the left reads "Scores" <p>For first audits, farms must have scoring records that cover all feeds purchased during the previous 6-month period.</p> <p>Note: Indicator 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.</p>	<p>Fish source score verified and found above limits. All individual scores >6, BM scores > 8 (6) according to Fish source score.</p> <p>Skretting: Fish species used in Method #2 Massbalance: Herring,Blue Whiting, Sandeel, Norway Pout, Baltic sprat Biomar: Herring,Blue Whiting, Sandeel, Norway Pout, Antarctic crill, Sprat, Capelin, Silver smelt, Atlantic Mackerel Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for sourced marine ingredients 2018, d.t 05.02.2019</p>	Compliant	≥6
	a. Record FishSource score for each species from which fishmeal or fish oil was derived and used as a feed ingredient (all species listed in 4.2.1a).				
	b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 6.	Correspondence verified. Individual score >6 and Biomass score >6.			
	c. If the species is not on the website it means that a FishSource assessment is not available. Client can then take one or both of the following actions: 1. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as a priority for assessment. 2. Contract a qualified independent third party to conduct the assessment using the FishSource methodology and provide the assessment and details on the third party qualifications to the CAB for review.	No independent assessment			
	-	All have scores			
Footnote	[55] Or equivalent score using the same methodology. See Appendix IV-3 for explanation of FishSource scoring.				

4.3.3	<p>Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.3 - Third-Party Verification of Traceability</p> <p>Indicator 4.3.3 requires that farms show that their feed producers can demonstrate chain of custody and traceability as verified through third-party audits. Farms may submit reports from audits of feed producers (see 4.1.1c) as evidence that traceability systems are in compliance. Alternatively, farms may show that their feed producers comply with traceability requirements of Indicator 4.3.3 by submitting evidence that suppliers, and the batches of fishmeal and oil, are certified to the International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organization's Global Standard for Responsible Supply or to the Marine Stewardship Council Chain of Custody Standard.</p> <p>For the first audit, a minimum of 6 months of data on feed is required and evidence shall relate to species used in said dataset.</p>	<p>a. Obtain from the feed supplier documentary evidence that the origin of all fishmeal and fish oil used in the feed is traceable via a third-party verified chain of custody or traceability program.</p>	<p>Skretting: Audited by DNV GLGG CFM d.t 14.05.19, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.20</p> <p>Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, d.t 21.08.18, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2019</p>	Compliant		
<p>b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).</p>	<p>Skretting: Audited by DNV GL GG CFM d.t 14.05.19, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.20</p> <p>Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, d.t 21.08.18, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2019</p>						
4.3.4	<p>Indicator: Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products [56] or trimmings from IUU [57] catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [58], whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed</p> <p>Requirement: None [59]</p> <p>Applicability: All except as noted in [59]</p>	<p>a. Compile and maintain, consistent with 4.2.1a and 4.2.2a, a list of the fishery of origin for all fishmeal and fish oil originating from by-products and trimmings.</p>	<p>Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statments from feedsuppliers with details of fisheries and raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASCs requirement for this indicator.</p>	Compliant			
<p>b. Obtain a declaration from the feed supplier stating that no fishmeal or fish oil originating from IUU catch was used to produce the feed.</p>	<p>Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" (57,7 % of fishoil originated from trimmings).</p> <p>Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 (32,5 % of fishoil originated from trimmings), d.t 05.02.2019</p>						
<p>c. Obtain from the feed supplier declaration that the meal or oil did not originate from a species categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [58] and explaining how they are able to demonstrate this (i.e. through other certification scheme or through their independent audit).</p>	<p>Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" (57,7 % of fishoil originated from trimmings).</p> <p>Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 (32,5 % of fishoil originated from trimmings), d.t 05.02.2019</p>						
<p>d. If meal or oil originated from a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, obtain documentary evidence to support the exception as outlined in [59].</p>	<p>Not from vulnerable fisheries</p>						
4.3.5	<p>Indicator: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Request a link to a public policy from the feed manufacturer stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers purchases of fishmeal and fish oil to fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries and committing to continuous improvement of source fisheries.</p>	<p>Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" (57,7 % of fishoil originated from trimmings).</p> <p>Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 (32,5 % of fishoil originated from trimmings), d.t 05.02.2019</p>	Compliant			
<p>b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in indicator 4.3.1.</p>	<p>Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Krisitian Botnen Lingalaks AS, including intention to purchase feed containing raw material from certified fisheries</p>						

		c. Compile a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients in all feed.	Origin of fish meal and oil origin on feedbatches used, per site, presented. Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsupplier Skretting and Biomar			
Footnote	[56] Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption.					
Footnote	[57] IUU: Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported.					
Footnote	[58] The International Union for the Conservation of Nature reference can be found at http://www.iucnredlist.org/ .					
Footnote	[59] For species listed as “vulnerable” by IUCN, an exception is made if a regional population of the species has been assessed to be not vulnerable in a National Red List process that is managed explicitly in the same science-based way as IUCN. In cases where a National Red List doesn't exist or isn't managed in accordance with IUCN guidelines, an exception is allowed when an assessment is conducted using IUCN's methodology and demonstrates that the population is not vulnerable.					
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
4.4.1	Indicator: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums [60] and local laws [61] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a)	Regular commercial contact info and websites for Skretting and Biomar	Compliant		
		b. Obtain from each feed manufacturer a copy of the manufacturer's responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients showing how the company complies with recognized crop moratoriums and local laws.	Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" (57,7 % of fishoil originated from trimmings). Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 (32,5 % of fishoil originated from trimmings), d.t 05.02.2019			
		c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.	Skretting: Audited by DNV GL GG CFM d.t 14.05.19, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.20 Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, d.t 21.08.18, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2019			
Footnote	[60] Moratorium: A period of time in which there is a suspension of a specific activity until future events warrant a removal of the suspension or issues regarding the activity have been resolved. In this context, moratoriums may refer to suspension of the growth of defined agricultural crops in defined geographical regions.					
Footnote	[61] Specifically, the policy shall include that vegetable ingredients, or products derived from vegetable ingredients, must not come from areas of the Amazon Biome that were deforested after July 24, 2006, as geographically defined by the Brazilian Soy Moratorium. Should the Brazilian Soy Moratorium be lifted, this specific requirement shall be reconsidered.					
4.4.2	Indicator: Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [62] Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent.	Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Krisitian Botnen Lingalaks AS, including company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent.	Compliant		100 %
		b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent)	Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Krisitian Botnen Lingalaks AS, including company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent.			
		c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b).	Information letter to CF supplier sent 16.04.2019 to Skretting and to Biomar dated 30.04.2019			
		d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed.	Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible faming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" including origin of soya Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 including origin of soya, d.t 05.02.2019			

		e. Provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [62]	Skretting ASC Salmon Feed Requirements, Version 1.7, January 2018. Seen e.g Biomar: PROTERRA certified ID BR48428, delivery date 01.03.2018, eg. Volume 2008855 kg, client number 869-7/870-7			
Footnote	[62] Any alternate certification scheme would have to be approved as equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.					
4.4.3	Indicator: Evidence of disclosure to the buyer [63] of the salmon of inclusion of transgenic [64] plant raw material, or raw materials derived from transgenic plants, in the feed Requirement: Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [65] Applicability: All	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of soya and other plant raw materials in feed and whether it is transgenic. b. Disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure. For first audits, farm records of disclosures must cover > 6 months. c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Skretting statement "compliance with ASC responsible farming" - feed requirements January 18, relevant for Q1 2019" including origin of soya and no GMO Biomar statement "ASC statement and feed documentation, version of 13 March 2018, relevant for 2018 including origin of soya and no GMO, d.t 15.01.2019, by Ellinor Helland Statments from feedsuppliers on non use of GMO/transgenic in feed for 2019 Submitted to ASC in email 31.05.2019	Compliant		0 %
Footnote	[63] The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product. This standard requires disclosure by the feed company to the farm and by the farm to the buyer of their salmon.					
Footnote	[64] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get that trait expressed in the offspring.					
Footnote	[65] See Appendix VI for transparency requirement for 4.4.3.					
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
		a. Prepare a policy stating the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the farm's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation.	Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikaliehåndteringsplan" ID 1862, valid to 27.02.20; e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Mørenot/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR. Document licence from Ragn Sells avd Sunnhordaland, no 2017.0653.T, d.t 28.08.2018, signed Nina Vadøy, Fylkesmannen i Hordaland. Avfallplan ID 1750, d.t 01.03.2019, procedure for correct waste handling and potential environmental impact from waste Seen statement dated 28.05.2019 by CEO Kristian Botnen including no dumping of no-biological waste and proper/responsible waste handling			
	Indicator: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [66] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and	b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean.	Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikaliehåndteringsplan" ID 1862, valid to 27.02.20; e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Mørenot/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR. Seen statement dated 28.05.2019 by CEO Kristian Botnen including no dumping of no-biological waste and proper/responsible waste handling			

4.5.1	recycling) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.	<p>Avfallplan ID 1750, d.t 01.03.2019, procedure for correct waste handling and potential environmental impact from waste</p> <p>Seen record Invoice for ensilage "K2 Ensillasje", 20.05.2019, 14300 liters, pH 3,6, RP 18618. Seen certificate approval for Scanbio from NFSD (Mattilsynet), no 1002277, dt 28.02.2019, signed Jan Arild Røkke</p> <p>Seen record invoice no 1269886, d.t 19.03.2019, 0,45 tonn rest waste, to NGIR. Seen certificate of approval for NGIR, no 2017.0253.T, by Fylkesmannen i Hordland, d.t 19.05.2017, signed Hallvard Hageberg</p> <p>All special and dangerous waste , e.g rest oil and filters, is collected, stored properly and delivered to approved waste company (BIR/NGIR). Declarations is available at www.deklarerer.no - verified during audit</p>	Compliant		
		d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.	Waste companies is recycling whats possible to recyle			
Footnote	[66] Proper and responsible disposal will vary based on facilities available in the region and remoteness of farm sites. Disposal of non-biological waste shall be done in a manner consistent with best practice in the area. Dumping of non-biological waste into the ocean does not represent "proper and responsible" disposal.					
4.5.2	Indicator: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. (see also 4.5.1c)	<p>Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikaliehåndteringsplan" ID 1862, valid to 27.02.20; e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Mørenot/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR.</p> <p>Avfallplan ID 1750, d.t 01.03.2019, procedure for correct waste handling and potential environmental impact from waste</p>	Compliant		
		b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)	Waste companies is recycling whats possible to recyle			
		c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken..	No infractions identified.			

		d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.	Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikaliehåndteringsplan" ID 1862, valid to 27.02.20; e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Mørenot/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR. Seen invoice no 86394, d.t 30.06.2018, from Egersund Net, 3 332 kg, old net, NOFIR 13086 Seen environmental diploma, 2017, for Lingalaks AS, from NOFIR, 124979 kg old nets, inclusive material amount and environmental benefits			
Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [67]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[67] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.					
4.6.1	Indicator: Presence of an energy use assessment verifying the energy consumption on the farm and representing the whole life cycle at sea, as outlined in Appendix V- 1 Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/t fish produced/production cycle Applicability: All	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.1 - Energy Use Assessment Indicator 4.6.1 requires that farms must have an assessment to verify energy consumption. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational energy use for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. Boundaries for operational energy use should correspond to the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions (see Appendix V-1). Energy use corresponding to Scope 3 emissions (i.e. the energy used to fabricate materials that are purchased by the farm) is not required. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate energy use assessments across the board in the company. For the purposes of calculating energy consumption, the duration of the production cycle is the entire life cycle "at sea" - it does not include freshwater smolt production stages. Farms that have integrated smolt rearing should break out the grow-out stage portion of energy consumption if possible. Quantities of energy (fuel and electricity) are converted to kilojoules. Verification is done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details).				
		a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.	Records and calculations ok	Minor	The energy use assessment is not done for a whole life cycle at sea	
		b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last production cycle.	Last recent production cycle 2016G in calender year 2017: 5 044 066 560 KJ			
		c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (t) produced during the last production cycle.	1107 MT biomass produced during recent production cyclus (16G) in calender year 2017			
		d. Using results from 4.6.1b and 4.6.1c, calculate energy consumption on the farm as required, reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle.	Last complete production cycle (2016G): Only for calender year 2017: 4556519,02 KJ/MT			
		e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019			
		f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.	Scope 1 Diesel, fuel oil, crude oil, petrol, propane Scope 2 Electricity. Assessed and compared between sites and production forms.			
		Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.2 - Annual GHG Assessment Indicator 4.6.2 requires that farms must have an annual Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment. Detailed instructions are presented in Appendix V-1 and references therein. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational boundaries for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate GHG accounting practices across the board in the company. Verification may be done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details). Note: For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO ₂); methane (CH ₄); nitrous oxide (N ₂ O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆).				
		a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm.	Farm records of GHG assessment.			

4.6.2	<p>Indicator: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [68]) emissions [69] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.</p> <p>c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors.</p> <p>d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO₂ gases to CO₂ equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.</p> <p>e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.</p> <p>f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.</p>	<p>Record and calculation 01.01.2017 - 31.12.2017 for site Jibbersholmane: Scope 1 (company facilities and vehicles): 335,9 CO₂e/tonn Scope 2 (purchased energy): 0 CO₂e/kg</p> <p>Farm records of GHG assessment. Scope 1 diesel from diesel/gasoline workboat, truck, generator and scope 2 is purchased electricity and purchased service boat diesel consumption.</p> <p>All calculated to CO₂e</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p> <p>Calculaitons and assessment provided. Factores used in calculations according to IPCC-2006 and Eurost</p>	Minor	The GHG assessment is done for 2017
Footnote	[68] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO ₂); methane (CH ₄); nitrous oxide (N ₂ O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆).				
Footnote	[69] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.				
4.6.3	<p>Indicator: Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [70] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.3 - GHG Emissions of Feed</p> <p>Indicator 4.6.3 requires that farms document the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) associated with any feeds used during salmon production. Farms will need to obtain this information from their feed supplier(s) and thereafter maintain a continuous record of Feed GHG emissions throughout all production cycles. This requirement applies across the entire previous production cycle. Therefore farms should inform their feed supplier(s) and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the farm provides its feed suppliers with detailed information about the requirements including a copy of the methodology outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2;- the farm explain what analyses must be done by feed suppliers; and- the farm explains to feed suppliers what documentary evidence will be required by the farm to demonstrate compliance. <p>Note1: Farms may calculate GHG emissions of feed using the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) rather than using feed composition on a lot-by-lot basis.</p> <p>Note2: Feed supplier's calculations must include Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 GHG emissions as specified in Appendix V, subsection 2.</p>	<p>a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed).</p> <p>b. Multiply the GHG emissions per unit feed by the total amount of feed from each supplier used in the most recent completed production cycle.</p> <p>c. If client has more than one feed supplier, calculate the total sum of emissions from feed by summing the GHG emissions of feed from each supplier.</p> <p>d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Skretting: 1,79 kg CO₂ / kg feed Biomar: 1,86 kg CO₂ / kg feed</p> <p>Feed usage 18G production cycle: Skretting: 962 981,7 kg Biomar: 750 953 kg</p> <p>18G production cycle: Skretting factor 1.79 kg CO₂ / kg feed 1723737,24 kg CO₂e Biomar factor 1,86 kg CO₂ / kg feed 750 953 kg CO₂e</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	Compliant
Footnote	[70] GHG emissions from feed can be given based on the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) and not as documentation linked to each single product used during the production cycle. Feed manufacturer is responsible for calculating GHG emissions per unit feed. Farm site then shall use that information to calculate GHG emissions for the volume of feed they used in the prior production cycle.				
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [71,72]					
	Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):		

Footnote	[71] Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.					
Footnote	[72] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.7.1, 4.7.3 and 4.7.4.					
4.7.1	<p>Indicator: For farms that use copper-treated nets [73], evidence that nets are not cleaned [74] or treated in situ in the marine environment</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [71]</p>	<p>a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping.</p> <p>b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets.</p> <p>c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets.</p> <p>d. If copper-based treatments are used, maintain documentary evidence (see 4.7.1b) that farm policy and practice does not allow for heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ.</p> <p>e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>No cobber-based treatment (antifoulant) is used. Seen procedure "Spyling", ID 1756, d.t 25.03.2019. inclusive how to clean nets when they are in production. Nets are cleaned with "spylerigg" to maintain good fish welfare, low risk for escapes and to optimize lize situation</p> <p>Aquanet Protect (coating - no copper), Steen-Hansen, 03.03.2017, EU DIR 2017/830, EF 1907/2006 (REACH), 1272/2008/EF (CLP), 790/2009/EF</p> <p>Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Kistian Botnen, no use of copper based antifoulant is used on nets.</p> <p>Statement d.t 28.05.2019, signed by CEO Kistian Botnen, no use of copper based antifoulant is used on nets.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	Compliant		
Footnote	[73] Under the SAD, "copper-treated net" is defined as a net that has been treated with any copper-containing substance (such as a copper-based antifoulant) during the previous 18 months, or has not undergone thorough cleaning at a land-based facility since the last treatment. Farms that use nets that have, at some point prior in their lifespan, been treated with copper may still consider nets as untreated so long as sufficient time and cleaning has elapsed as in this definition. This will allow farms to move away from use of copper without immediately having to purchase all new nets.					
Footnote	[74] Light cleaning of nets is allowed. Intent of the standard is that, for example, the high-pressure underwater washers could not be used on copper treated nets under this standard because of the risk of copper flaking off during this type of heavy or more thorough cleaning.					
4.7.2	<p>Indicator: For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment [75]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [71]</p>	<p>a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land.</p> <p>b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place.</p>	<p>Mørenot station Radøy cleans nets for Jibbersholman on land. Process water collected in tanks and recycled in process before delivered to waste handling facility. Process is approved by authorities. No use of cobber based antifoulant is used</p> <p>Mørenot station Radøy cleans nets for Jibbersholman on land. Process water collected in tanks and recycled in process before delivered to waste handling facility. Process is approved by authorities. No use of cobber based antifoulant is used</p>	Compliant		

		c. If yes to 4.7.2b, obtain evidence that effluent treatment used at the cleaning site is an appropriate technology to capture of copper in effluents.	Mørenot station Radøy cleans nets for Jibbersholman on land. Process water collected in tanks and recycled in process before delivered to waste handling facility. Process is approved by authorities. No use of cobber based antifoulant is used			
Footnote	[75] Treatment must have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper if the farm uses copper-treated nets.					
4.7.3	<p>Indicator: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix I-1</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [71]</p>	<p>Note: If the benthos throughout and immediately outside the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from Indicator 4.7.3 (see 2.1.1c).</p> <p>a. Declare to the CAB whether the farm uses copper nets or copper-treated nets. (See also 4.7.1c). If "no", Indicator 4.7.3 does not apply.</p> <p>b. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, measure and record copper in sediment samples from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE.</p> <p>c. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, maintain records of testing methods, equipment, and laboratories used to test copper level in sediments from 4.7.3b.</p>	<p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p>	N/A	No use of copper-based treatment on the nets	
4.7.4	<p>Indicator: Evidence that copper levels [76] are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, or, in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [71] and excluding those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB whether: 1) farm is exempt from Indicator 4.7.4 (as per 4.7.3a), or 2) Farm has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment.</p> <p>b. Provide evidence from measurements taken in 4.7.3b that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight.</p> <p>c. If copper levels in 4.7.4b are ≥ 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, provide evidence the farm tested copper levels in sediments from reference sites as described in Appendix I-1 (also see Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2).</p> <p>d. Analyze results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body.</p> <p>e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Confirmed use of no copper-based treatmet on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	N/A	No use of copper-based treatment on the nets	
Footnote	[76] According to testing required under 4.7.3. The standards related to testing of copper are only applicable to farms that use copper-based nets or copper-treated nets.					
4.7.5	<p>Indicator: Evidence that the type of biocides used in net antifouling are approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [71]</p>	<p>a. Identify all biocides used by the farm in net antifouling.</p> <p>b. Compile documentary evidence to show that each chemical used in 4.7.5a is approved according to legislation in one or more of the following jurisdictions: the European Union, the United States, or Australia.</p>	<p>Aquanet Protect (coating - no copper), Steen-Hansen, 03.03.2017, EU DIR 2017/830, EF 1907/2006 (REACH), 1272/2008/EF (CLP), 790/2009/EF</p> <p>Chemical used in 4.7.5a is approved according to legislation following jurisdictions of the European Union and Norway.</p>	Compliant		
PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [77]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			

Footnote	[77] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.6.					
5.1.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases, parasites and environmental conditions relevant for good fish health, including implementing corrective action when required</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a fish health management plan that incorporates components related to identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document.</p> <p>b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [78].</p>	<p>Fish health management plan "Veterinær Helseplan Lingalaks" valid for site Jibbersholman, d.t 29.05.2019, signed Siri Ørstavik. Includes measurements for identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites.</p> <p>Approved and signed by veterinarian dt. 29.05.2019, Siri Ørstavik, approval HPR no 7337914</p>	Compliant		
5.1.2	<p>Indicator: Site visits by a designated veterinarian [78] at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager [79] at least once a month</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Maintain records of visits by the designated veterinarian [78] and fish health managers [82]. If schedule cannot be met, a risk assessment must be provided.</p> <p>b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed as the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [78] and fish health manager(s) [79].</p> <p>c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.</p>	<p>Minimum 12 visits annually. FH manager is site manager hence hands -on on daily issues. System for weekly scheduled meetings covering e.g FH issues. Verified in veterinarian log, last report dated 15.04.19, signed Bjarte Langhelle (HPR no 10004858), FoMAS</p> <p>Farms designated veterinarian is Siri Ørstavik and fish health manager is several persons from FoMAS, seen list of apporved person d.t 11.05.2019</p> <p>S.Ø. at Lingalaks AS is authorized veterinarian. HPR nr. 7337914 B.L. at FoMAS AS, authorized fish health biolog, HPR nr. 10004858</p>	Compliant		
Footnote	[78] A designated veterinarian is the professional responsible for health management on the farm who has the legal authority to diagnose disease and prescribe medication. In some countries such as Norway, a fish health biologist or other professional has equivalent professional qualifications and is equivalent to a veterinarian for purposes of these standards. This definition applies to all references to a veterinarian throughout the standards document.					
Footnote	[79] A fish health manager is someone with professional expertise in managing fish health, who may work for a farming company or for a veterinarian, but who does not necessarily have the authority to prescribe medicine.					
	<p>Indicator: Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner</p>	<p>a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner.</p>	<p>Daily removal of dead fish (registration in FishTalk system) and processed to ensilage, seen report in FishTalk, mortality report for 18G from 01.08.2018 to 04.06.2019, total accumulated 6.66%, main reason treatment, losers, normal, etc</p> <p>All mortality is made to ensilage and delivered to Scanbio Biokraft Marine AS, agreement together with Salmon Group, signed dt 16.01.2019</p> <p>Seen prosedyre "Dødfiskhåndtering" ID 1708, d.t 25.02.2019 in LANDAX system.</p>			

5.1.3	<p>Requirement: 100% [80]</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities.</p>	<p>System established for handling and documentation according to requirements in national legislation handled by NFSA. Seen record Invoice for ensilage "K2 Ensillasje", 20.05.2019, 14300 liters, pH 3,6, RP 18618. Seen certificate approval for Scanbio from NFSD (Mattilsynet), no 1002277, dt 28.02.2019, signed Jan Arild Røkke</p>	Compliant		100 %
		<p>c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.</p>	<p>No exceptional mortalities without post-mortem analysis</p>			
Footnote	[80] The SAD recognizes that not all mortality events will result in dead fish present for collection and removal. However, such situations are considered the exception rather than the norm.					
5.1.4	<p>Indicator: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis</p> <p>Requirement: 100% [81]</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Note: Farms are required to maintain mortality records from the current and two previous production cycles. For first audit, records for the current and prior production cycle are required. It is recommended that farms maintain a compiled set of records to demonstrate compliance with 5.1.3 - 5.1.6.</p> <p>a. Maintain detailed records for all mortalities and post-mortem analyses including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - date of mortality and date of post-mortem analysis; - total number of mortalities and number receiving post-mortem analysis; - name of the person or lab conducting the post-mortem analyses; - qualifications of the individual (e.g. veterinarian [78], fish health manager [79]); - cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and - classification as 'unexplained' when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6). <p>b. For each mortality event, ensure that post-mortem analyses are done on a statistically relevant number of fish and keep a record of the results.</p> <p>c. If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive and disease is suspected or results are inconclusive over a 1-2 week period, ensure that fish are sent to an off-site laboratory for diagnosis and keep a record of the results (5.1.4a).</p> <p>d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications.</p> <p>e. Provide additional evidence to show how farm records in 5.1.4a-d cover all mortalities from the current and previous two production cycles (as needed).</p> <p>f. Submit data on numbers and causes of mortalities to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	<p>On site analysis on all mortalities every day. If classification is inconclusive on site, mortalities sent to accredited lab (Veterinary insitiute) for analysis. Routines defined in fish health plan and LANDAX procedures.</p> <p>All mortalities categorized:</p> <p>16G: total 14,38% mortality, losers 12,03, physical damage 1,68%, treatment 0,35%</p> <p>18G: total 4,84% mortality, normal 1,24%, losers 1,05%, treatment 1,56%</p> <p>All mortalities are diagnosed and post-mortem analyses are done on a statistically relevant number of fish (ref unspecified numbers above). Lab analyses routinely.</p> <p>When evaluated mortality registered and if on-site diagnosis is inconclusive or verification is needed it is routine to send fish to laboratory for diagnostic e.g. samples sent to Veterinary Institutt</p> <p>E.g. pathology report from FishVet Group, report no FVG-467VUFF7-RP, d.t 23.04.2019,, test done d.t 05.04.2019, 20 fish, SAV/PD, no positive</p> <p>Record are available and documented in Fishtalk, all mortalities are categorised.</p> <p>Record are available and documented in Fishtalk production system where mortalities are recorded and categorised according to FHP and mortality guide.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	Compliant		100 %
Footnote	[81] If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive, this standard requires off-site laboratory diagnosis. A qualified professional must conduct all diagnosis. One hundred percent of mortality events shall receive a post-mortem analysis, not necessarily every fish. A statistically relevant number of fish from the mortality event shall be analyzed.					

5.1.5	<p>Indicator: Maximum viral disease-related mortality [82] on farm during the most recent production cycle</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 10%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease.</p>	<p>100% of Mortality categorised for 16G from Fishtalk: 16G: total 14,38% mortality, losers 12,03, physical damage 1,68%, treatment 0,35%</p> <p>Last complete production cyclus 16G: Total mortality 14,38 % Virus 0% + Unspecified 0,41 % = Virus + Unspecified = 0,41%. Unexplained mortality 2,42% of total</p>	Compliant		0,41 %
<p>b. Combine the results from 5.1.5a with the total number of unspecified and unexplained mortalities from the most recent complete production cycle. Divide this by the total number of fish produced in the production cycle (x100) to calculate percent maximum viral disease-related mortality.</p>	<p>100% of Mortality categorised for 16G from Fishtalk: 16G: total 14,38% mortality, losers 12,03, physical damage 1,68%, treatment 0,35%</p> <p>Last complete production cyclus 16G: Total mortality 14,38 % Virus 0% + Unspecified 0,41 % = Virus + Unspecified = 0,41%. Unexplained mortality 2,42% of total</p>					
<p>c. Submit data on total mortality and viral disease-related mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>					
Footnote	[82] Viral disease-related mortality count shall include unspecified and unexplained mortality as it could be related to viral disease.					
5.1.6	<p>Indicator: Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6%</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 40% of total mortalities</p> <p>Applicability: All farms with > 6% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle.</p>	<p>a. Use records in 5.1.4a to calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for the most recent full production cycle. If rate was ≤ 6%, then the requirement of 5.1.6 does not apply. If total mortality rate was > 6%, proceed to 5.1.6b.</p>	<p>100% of Mortality categorised for 16G from Fishtalk: 16G: total 14,38% mortality, losers 12,03, physical damage 1,68%, treatment 0,35%</p> <p>Last complete production cyclus 16G: Total mortality 14,38 % Virus 0% + Unspecified 0,41 % = Virus + Unspecified = 0,41%. Unexplained mortality 2,42% of total</p>	Compliant		2,42 %
<p>b. Calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for each of the two production cycles immediately prior to the current cycle. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.</p>	<p>100% of Mortality categorised for 16G from Fishtalk: 16G: total 14,38% mortality, losers 12,03, physical damage 1,68%, treatment 0,35%</p> <p>Last complete production cyclus 16G (full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle): Total mortality 14,38 % Virus 0% + Unspecified 0,41 % = Virus + Unspecified = 0,41%. Unexplained mortality 2,42% of total</p>					
<p>c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>					
5.1.7	<p>Indicator: A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Note: Farms have the option to integrate their farm-specific mortality reduction program into the farm's fish health management plan (5.1.1).</p>				
		<p>a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.</p>	<p>Seen document "Målsetning for lokalitet" site Jibbersholmane, cyclus H18, d.t 19.09.2018, inclusive program and quality objectives for mortality reduction and actions for optimizing fish welfare. Approved by veterinary Siri Ørstavik</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. Use the data in 5.1.7a and advice from the veterinarian and/or fish health manager to develop a mortalities-reduction program that defines annual targets for reductions in total mortality and unexplained mortality.</p>	<p>Seen document "Målsetning for lokalitet" site Jibbersholmane, cyclus H18, d.t 19.09.2018, inclusive program and quality objectives for mortality reduction and actions for optimizing fish welfare. Approved by veterinary Siri Ørstavik</p>			

		c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.	Verified during interviews onsite			
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [83]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[83] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.2.1, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.10.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs for Criterion 5.2 - Records Related to Therapeutic Treatments						
Indicator 5.2.1 requires that farms maintain detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use. Those records maintained for compliance with 5.2.1, if all consolidated into a single place, can be used to demonstrate performance against subsequent Indicators (5.2.1 through 5.2.10) under Criterion 5.2.						
5.2.1	<p>Indicator: On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals [84] and therapeutants used during the most recent production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing, and all disease and pathogens detected on the site</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment;- product name and chemical name;- reason for use (specific disease)- date(s) of treatment;- amount (g) of product used;- dosage;- t of fish treated;- the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and- the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	Antibiotics not used. Allowed usage in VHP "Helseplan for matfiskanlegg". All treatments registered in FishTalk. One therapeutant treatment done - SLICE for lice treatment, rescription no 186427, d.t 03.12.2018, vet Solveig Nygård, vet HPR 6024092, Slice vet 7 mg/kg, 19 tonn, 500 dgr, MSD, supplier Skretting	Compliant		
		<p>b. If not already available, assemble records of chemical and therapeutant use to address all points in 5.2.1a for the previous two production cycles. For first audits, available records must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.</p>	<p>Seen overview for 2016 gen, use of Releaze for lice treatment in period 14-29.12.2016, in cage3,5 6</p> <p>Seen overview for 2016 gen, use of SLICE for lice treatment in period 11-18-09-2016, in cage 3,5 6</p> <p>Seen overview for 2016 gen, use of SLICE for lice treatment in period 11-18-09-2016, in cage 1, 2, 4, 7, SLICE in periode 25.04 - 02.05.2017</p>			
		<p>c. Submit information on therapeutant use (data from 5.2.1a) to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019			
Footnote	[84] Chemicals used for the treatment of fish.					
5.2.2	<p>Indicator: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [85] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [86]</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a list of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [86].</p>	<p>All therapeutants which can be used is listed in VHP "Veterinær Helseplan Lingalaks", appendix 5 "Oversikt over legemidler og andre medikamenter benyttet på fisk". Therapeutants listed with withdrawal period and MRL.</p> <p>All product sold to Norwegian exporters/traders.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles.</p>	<p>NFSA (Mattilsynet) mandatory testing by NIFES on site and/or at harvest line. Results published in yearly NIFES report from OK programme. Seen overview of samples from Jibbersholmane and Toska N, e.g. seen report ref no 2019/081311, d.t 16.04.2019, from NSFA (Mattilsynet), test for MRL values, the letter confirming the test conduct</p>			
		-	<p>Compliance verified and in accordance with requirements and also in accordance with reports and usage recorded in production system Fishtalk.</p>			

Footnote	[85] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance. A substance banned in any of the primary salmon-producing or importing countries, as defined here, cannot be used in any salmon farm certified under the SAD, regardless of country of production or destination of the product. The SAD recommends that ASC maintain a list of a banned therapeutants.					
Footnote	[86] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.					
5.2.3	<p>Indicator: Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Obtain prescription for all therapeutant use in advance of application from the farm veterinarian (or equivalent, see [78] for definition of veterinarian).</p> <p>b. Maintain copies of all prescriptions and records of veterinarian responsible for all medication events. Records can be kept in conjunction with those for 5.2.1 and should be kept for the current and two prior production cycles.</p>	<p>Allowed usage defined in Fish Health Plan. Antibiotics not used. Treatments done are anaesthetics all under responsible veterinarian prescriptions. Registered in Fishtalk/fish CV including dates for usage, quantity and dosage, withdrawal periods defined and registered in Fishtalk.</p> <p>One therapeutant treatment done - SLICE for lice treatment, rescription no 186427, d.t 03.12.2018, vet Solveig Nygård, vet HPR 6024092, Slice vet 7 mg(kg, 19 tonn, 500 dgr, MSD, supplier Skretting</p> <p>100% of treatment events are prescribed by a veterinarian Original prescription in site folder and stored by Fishhealth responsible and regisitered in Fishtalk with withholding periods defined in prescription and in Fishtalk.</p>	Compliant		100 %
5.2.4	<p>Indicator: Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a).</p> <p>b. Compile and maintain documentation on legally-required withholding periods for all treatments used on-farm. Withholding period is the time interval after the withdrawal of a drug from the treatment of the salmon before the salmon can be harvested for use as food.</p> <p>c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.</p>	<p>In Fishtalk, automatically notified/blocked according to degreedays withholdingtime stated in prescription. According to FHMP/VHP on withholding periods defined in Fishtalk and specific preprescription.</p> <p>Documented in Fishtalk, automatically notified/blocked according to degreedays withholdingperiod stated in prescription.</p> <p>FishTalk CV, cage 2, d.t 12.12..2018, e.g. SLICE emamektin, quarantine end 12.12.2018, quarantine end 04.03.2019, 500 DGR</p>	Compliant		
5.2.5	<p>Indicator: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII</p> <p>Requirement: PTI score \leq 13</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Using farm data for therapeutants usage (5..2.1a) and the formula presented in Appendix VII, calculate the cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score for the most recent production cycle. Calculation should be made and updated on an ongoing basis throughout the cycle by farm manager, fish health manager, and/or veterinarian.</p> <p>b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score.</p> <p>c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Calculations verified. PTI score calculated according to ASC and Reference is made to VR 97, on PTI calculation method confirmed by ASC See www.asc-aqua.org for VR details firmed by ASC dt.20.08.15</p> <p>PTI score (2016G): 10,86 PTI score (2018G): 0,51</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 31.05.2019</p>	Compliant		10,86
5.2.6	<p>Indicator: For farms with a cumulative PTI \geq 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [87] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms with a cumulative PTI \geq 6 in the most recent production cycle</p>	<p>a. Review PTI scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTI \geq 6 in the most recent production cycle. If yes, proceed to 5.2.6b; if no, Indicator 5.2.6 does not apply.</p> <p>b. Using results from 5.2.5 and the weight of fish treated (kg), calculate parasiticide load in the most recent production cycle [90].</p> <p>c. Calculate parasiticide load in the two previous production cycles as above (5.2.6b) and compute the average. Calculate the percent difference in parasiticide load between current cycle and average of two previous cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.</p> <p>d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI).</p>	<p>PTI score (2016G): 10,86 PTI score (2018G): 0,51</p> <p>Calculations verified. Present cycle (2018G): parasiticide load 1 841 776 (78,7% reduction) Previous cycle (2016G): parasiticide load 8 660 539,20</p> <p>Calculations verified. Present cycle (2018G): parasiticide load 1 841 776 (78,7% reduction) Previous cycle (2016G): parasiticide load 8 660 539,20</p> <p>Submitted to ASC in email dt.31.05.19</p>	Compliant		

Footnote	[87] Parasiticide load = Sum (kg of fish treated x PTI). Reduction in load required regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined parasiticide load of the consolidated sites.					
5.2.7	Indicator: Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments [88] Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.	Compliant		0
		b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3)	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
		c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.9).	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
Footnote	[88] The designated veterinarian must certify that a pathogen or disease is present before prescribing medication.					
5.2.8	Indicator: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO [89]) Requirement: None [90] Applicability: All	Note 1: Farms have the option to certify only a portion of the fish or farm site when WHO-listed [89] antibiotics have been used at the production facility (see 5.2.8d). To pursue this option, farms must request an exemption from the CAB in advance of the audit and provide sufficient records giving details on which pens were treated and traceability of those treated fish. Note 2: It is recommended that the farm veterinarian review the WHO list [see 89] in detail and be aware that the list is meant to show examples of members of each class of drugs, and is not inclusive of all drugs.		Compliant		0
		a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [89].	Valid WHO list 5th edition 2016 demonstrated			
		b. If the farm has <u>not</u> used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
		c. If the farm <u>has</u> used antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
		d. If yes to 5.2.8c, request an exemption from the CAB to certify only a portion of the farm. Prior to the audit, provide the CAB with records sufficient to establish details of treatment, which pens were treated, and how the farm will ensure full traceability and separation of treated fish through and post-harvest.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
Footnote	[89] The fifth edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: http://www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/antimicrobials-fifth/en/ .					
Footnote	[90] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.					
5.2.9	Indicator: Number of treatments [91] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle Requirement: ≤ 3 Applicability: All	Note: for the purposes of Indicator 5.2.9, "treatment" means a single course of medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days and be applied in one or more pens (or cages).		Compliant		0
		a. Maintain records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 5.2.1a). For first audits, farm records must cover the current and immediately prior production cycles in a verifiable statement.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
Footnote	[91] A treatment is a single course medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days.					
		Note: Indicator 5.2.10 requires that farms must demonstrate a reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites.				
	Indicator: If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that	a. Use results from 5.2.9b to show whether more than one antibiotic treatment was used in the most recent production cycle. If not, then the requirement of 5.2.10 does not apply. If yes, then proceed to 5.2.10b.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			

5.2.10	<p>In the most recent production cycle, demonstrate that the antibiotic load [92] is at least 15% less than of the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p>Requirement: Yes [93]</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	b. Calculate antibiotic load (antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotic used in kg) for most recent production cycle and for the two previous production cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.	N/A	No antibiotics used	0
		c. Provide the auditor with calculations showing that the antibiotic load of the most recent production cycle is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles.	No antibiotics used the recent cycles.			
		d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 08.11.2017			
Footnote	[92] Antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotics used (kg).					
Footnote	[93] Reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites.					
5.2.11	<p>Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers [94] of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Prepare a procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [94] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutants used in production (see 4.4.3b).	Seen procedure "Sporbarhet" ID 1763, d.t 01.04.2019, inclusive traceability and routines for registratiron of all therapeutant treatments	Compliant		
		b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.	All treatments registered in FishTalk. CV contains history of treatments. E.g seen CV for cage no 007, fish group name 1603006, last feeding day 02.01.2018, last treatment dated 01.05.2018, quarantine 20.06.2018, Salar Bruk AS, origin AquaGen			
Footnote	[94] Buyer: The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product.					
Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
5.3.1	<p>Indicator: Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.3.1 - Identifying the 'Expected Effect' of Medicinal Treatment</p> <p>Indicator 5.3.1 requires that farms identify treatments that have not produced the expected effect. The SAD Steering Committee recognizes that the “expected effect” will vary with health condition and type of medicinal treatment. Therefore farms and auditors will need to review the pre- and post-treatment condition of fish in order to understand and evaluate the impact of treatment.</p> <p><u>Example: sea lice treatment with emamectin benzoate</u></p> <p>The SAD SC recommends that a typical baseline for effectiveness of emamectin benzoate is a minimum of 90 percent reduction in abundance of lice on the farmed fish. To determine whether treatment has produced the expected effect, farm and auditor must review pre- and post-treatment lice counts. If the calculated percent reduction in lice is < 90% then the treatment did not produce the expected effect and a bio-assay should be performed to determine whether sea lice have developed resistance.</p> <p>Note: If field-based bio-assays for determining resistance are ineffective or unavailable, the farm shall have samples analyzed by an independent laboratory to determine resistance formation. The auditor shall record in the audit report why field-based bio-assays were deemed ineffective and shall include results from the laboratory analyses of resistance formation.</p>				
		a. In addition to recording all therapeutic treatments (5.2.1a), keep a record of all cases where the farm uses two successive medicinal treatments.	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	
		b. Whenever the farm uses two successive treatments, keep records showing how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.			
		c. For any result of 5.3.1b that did not produce the expected effect, ensure that a bio-assay analysis of resistance is conducted.	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.			

		d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.			
5.3.2	Indicator: When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Review results of bio-assay tests (5.3.1d) for evidence that resistance has formed. If yes, proceed to 5.3.2b. If no, then Indicator 5.3.2 is not applicable. b. When bio-assay tests show evidence that resistance has formed, keep records showing that the farm took one of two actions: - used an alternative treatment (if permitted in the area of operation); or - immediately harvested all fish on site.	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect. No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	
<i>Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [95]</i>						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[95] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.4.2 and 5.4.4.					
5.4.1	Indicator: Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class [96] Requirement: 100% [97] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [97]	a. Keep records of the start and end dates of periods when the site is fully fallow after harvest. b. Provide evidence of stocking dates (purchase receipts, delivery records) to show that there were no gaps > 6 months for smolt inputs for the current production cycle. -	In Fish Talk and stocking/harvest reports: Fallowing periode between 16G and 18G: 26.01.18 to 09.08.18 In Fish Talk and stocking/harvest reports. First stocking date 18G: 09.08.18 Last stocking date 18G: 13.10.18 Ova CVs, Smolt CVs, smolts health cerificates, all information available in Fishtalk.	Compliant		100 %
Footnote	[96] Gaps of up to six months between inputs of smolts derived from the same stripping are acceptable as long as there remains a period of time when the site is fully fallow after harvest.					
Footnote	[97] Exception is allowed for: 1) farm sites that have closed, contained production units where there is complete separation of water between units and no sharing of filtration systems or other systems that could spread disease, or, 2) farm sites that have ≥95% water recirculation, a pre-entry disease screening protocol, dedicated quarantine capability and biosecurity measures for waste to ensure there is no discharge of live biological material to the natural environment (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of effluent) .					
5.4.2	Indicator: Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, [98] the farm has: 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance [99] on the farm and within the ABM 3. Promptly [100] made findings publicly available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, show evidence that the farm promptly evaluated each to determine whether it was a statistically significant increase over background mortality rate on a monthly basis [98]. The accepted level of significance (for example, $p < 0.05$) should be agreed between farm and CAB. b. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, record whether the farm did or did not suspect (yes or no) an unidentified transmissible agent. c. Proceed to 5.4.2d if, during the most recent production cycle, either: - results from 5.4.2a showed a statistically significant increase in unexplained mortalities; or - the answer to 5.4.2b was 'yes'. Otherwise, Indicator 5.4.2 is not applicable. d. If required, ensure that the farm takes and records the following steps: 1) Report the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority; 2) Increase monitoring and surveillance [99] on the farm and within the ABM; and 3) Promptly (within one month) make findings publicly available. e. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring. Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring. System available for prompt publication in website www.lingalaks.no Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring. System available for prompt publication in website www.lingalaks.no Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring. System available for prompt publication in website www.lingalaks.no Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring. System available for prompt publication in website www.lingalaks.no	Compliant		
Footnote	[98] Increased mortality: A statistically significant increase over background rate on a monthly basis.					

Footnote	[99] Primary aim of monitoring and surveillance is to investigate whether a new or adapted disease is present in the area.					
Footnote	[100] Within one month.					
5.4.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence of compliance [101] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [102]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.4.3 - Compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code</p> <p>Indicator 5.4.3 requires that farms show evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (see http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171). Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code. For purposes of the ASC Salmon Standard, this means that the farm must have written procedures stating how the farm will initiate an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm ['exotic' = not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen)]. An aggressive response will involve, at a minimum, the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- depopulation of the infected site;- implementation of quarantine zones (see note below) in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen; and- additional actions as required under Indicator 5.4.4. <p>To demonstrate compliance with Indicator 5.4.3, clients have the option to describe how farm practices are consistent with the intentions of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code by developing relevant policies and procedures and integrating them into the farm's fish health management plan.</p> <p>Note: The Steering Committee recognizes that establishment of quarantine zones will likely incorporate mandatory depopulation of sites close to the infected site and affect some, though not necessarily all, of the ABM.</p>				
		a. Maintain a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code on site or ensure staff have access to the most current version.	Seen document LANDAX, d.t 16.05.2019 link to relevant internet page OIE	Compliant		
		b. Develop policies and procedures as needed to ensure that farm practices remain consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (5.4.3a) and with actions required under indicator 5.4.4.	Awareness of OIE aquatic Animal Health Code. Fish health management plan "Veterinær Helseplan Lingalaks" valid for site Jibbersholman, d.t 29.05.2019, signed Siri Ørstavik.			
		-	Confirmed during interviews			
Footnote	[101] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Quarantine zones will likely incorporate mandatory depopulation of sites close to the infected site and affect some, though not necessarily all, of the ABM. Exotic signifies not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen).					
Footnote	[102] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171 .					
5.4.4	<p>Indicator: If an OIE-notifiable disease [103] is confirmed on the farm, evidence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [104]3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease4. the farm promptly [105] made findings publicly available <p>Requirement: Yes</p>	a. Ensure that farm policies and procedures in 5.4.3a describe the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4 in response to an OIE-notifiable disease on the farm.	Awareness of OIE aquatic Animal Health Code. Fish health management plan "Veterinær Helseplan Lingalaks" valid for site Jibbersholman, d.t 29.05.2019, signed Siri Ørstavik. Farm notify FoMAS and FishGuard AS if suspected disease, and FoMAS AS (administrator ABM) notify members of ABM and governments if OIE-notifiable diseases occurs.	N/A	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.	
		b. Inform the CAB if an OIE-notifiable disease has been confirmed on the farm during the current production cycle or the two previous production cycles. If yes, proceed to 5.4.4c. If no, then 5.4.4c and 5.4.4d do not apply.	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
		c. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm (see 5.4.4b), then retain documentary evidence to show that the farm:	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
		1) immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected;				
		2) immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [104]				
		3) enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease; and				
		4) promptly (within one month) made findings publicly available.				

	Applicability: All	d. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
		-	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
Footnote	[103] At the time of publication of the final draft standards, OIE-notifiable diseases relevant to salmon aquaculture were: Epizootic haematopoietic necrosis, Infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN), Infectious salmon anemia (ISA), Viral hemorrhagic septicemia (VHS) and Gyrodactylus (Gyrodactylus salaris).					
Footnote	[104] This is in addition to any notifications to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.					
Footnote	[105] Within one month.					
Social requirements in the standards shall be audited by an individual who is a lead auditor in conformity with SAAS Procedure 200 section 3.1.						
PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [106]						
		Compliance Criteria				
Footnote	[106] Bargain collectively: A voluntary negotiation between employers and organizations of workers in order to establish the terms and conditions of employment by means of collective (written) agreements.					
6.1.1	Indicator: Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Workers have the freedom to join any trade union, free of any form of interference from employers or competing organizations set up or backed by the employer. Farms shall prepare documentation to demonstrate to the auditor that domestic regulation fully meets these criteria. b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits "acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control or employers or employers' organizations." c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises. d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The right of Freedom of association is ensured. The agreement with trade unions available. Tariff agreement in place for 2018-2019. Declaration of good social practise 2019-04-01. (ID 1849). Trade union worker representative was elected during trade union meeting of employees. Frederik Mo and Svein Inge Henriksen both for all Lingalaks sites. Three safety representatives Moten Laupsa Borge (main 2017-09-08), Jarle Hella (local for Radoey 2018-09-12) and Robet Mikkelsen (deputy 2017-09-08). TU representative has meetings with workers each Quarter during the meetings of all employees. The communication open by phone, email, social networks. Safety representative meets employees annually during safety rounds. The representative has possibility to visit farms. Management is encouraging to be organised. TU and worker safety representatives were interviewed and confirmed information presented above.	Compliant		
6.1.2	Indicator: Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association. b. Employer communicates that workers are free to form organizations to advocate for and protect work rights (e.g. farm policies on Freedom of Association; see 6.12.1).	The job contracts have link to working rules and local tariff agreement, where is the statement of right for freedom of association. Declaration of good social practice 2019-04-01. (ID 1849) was communicated to employees by quality manager.	Compliant		

		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms communication. All workers confirmed free possibilities to be organised.			
6.1.3	Indicator: Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Local trade union, or where none exists a reputable civil-society organization, confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees’ freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.	During audit no outstanding cases identified.	Compliant		
		b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.	Collective bargaining is implemented during consultations and agreement with Trade unions.			
		c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).	The sector Tariff agreement is in place for 2018-2020. Local collective bargaining agreement with TU is for 2018-2019.			
Criterion 6.2 Child labor						
		Compliance Criteria				
6.2.1	Indicator: Number of incidences of child [107] labor [108] Requirement: None Applicability: All except as noted in [107]	a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions: - in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years (see footnote 108); or - in countries where the legal minimum age is set higher than 15 years, in which case the legal minimum age of the country is followed. If the farm operates in a country where the legal minimum ages is not 15, then the employer shall maintain documentation attesting to this fact.	Requirements of standard apply.	Compliant		0
		b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).	The youngest worker at site is 19.			
		c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.	The records are in place			
Footnote	[107] Child: Any person under 15 years of age. A higher age would apply if the minimum age law of an area stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling. Minimum age may be 14 if the country allows it under the developing country exceptions in ILO convention 138.					
Footnote	[108] Child Labor: Any work by a child younger than the age specified in the definition of a child.					
6.2.2	Indicator: Percentage of young workers [109] that are protected [110] Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.	Training procedure (ID 1696) for employees has dedicated chapters for young workers training. The procedure of Young workers is defined, but it has limited specific information about job limitations.	Minor		NC 1:The job descriptions were not clearly defined on site for young workers. NC 2: Young worker was involved in one case of overtime and working in weekends what make continuous on-duty period more than 7 days.
		b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.	Identification process is in place. No young workers employed at the time of the audit.			
		c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.	The time sheets in Tidsbank program, interview with workers and ste manager.			
		d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.	Typical scheme is 8 hours per day on work days and or weekends.			
		e. Young workers are not exposed to hazards [111] and do not perform hazardous work [112]. Work on floating cages in poor weather conditions shall be considered hazardous.	The dedicated risk analysis covering Young workers' work at sites to be organised in case of employment.			
		f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.	Site was inspected, but no young workers employed.			
Footnote	[109] Young Worker: Any worker between the age of a child, as defined above, and under the age of 18.					
Footnote	[110] Protected: Workers between 15 and 18 years of age will not be exposed to hazardous health and safety conditions; working hours shall not interfere with their education and the combined daily transportation time and school time, and work time shall not exceed 10 hours.					
Footnote	[111] Hazard: The inherent potential to cause injury or damage to a person’s health (e.g., unequipped to handle heavy machinery safely, and unprotected exposure to harmful chemicals).					
Footnote	[112] Hazardous work: Work that, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of workers (e.g., heavy lifting disproportionate to a person’s body size, operating heavy machinery, exposure to toxic chemicals).					
Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor						

			Compliance Criteria				
6.3.1	Indicator: Number of incidences of forced, [113] bonded [114] or compulsory labor Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no ‘pay to work’ schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs).	Contracts are understood. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted. The education programs are credited by company.	Compliant		0	
		b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.	After shift workers are free to leave.				
		c. Employer does not withhold employee’s original identity documents.	No cases identified.				
		d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers’ salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.	No cases identified.				
		e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.	No cases identified.				
		f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Payroll records are maintained.				
Footnote	[113] Forced (Compulsory) labor: All work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty for which a person has not offered himself/herself voluntarily or for which such work or service is demanded as a repayment of debt. “Penalty” can imply monetary sanctions, physical punishment, or the loss of rights and privileges or restriction of movement (e.g., withholding of identity documents).						
Footnote	[114] Bonded labor: When a person is forced by the employer or creditor to work to repay a financial debt to the crediting agency.						
Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [118]							
			Compliance Criteria				
Footnote	[115] Discrimination: Any distinction, exclusion or preference that has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment. Not every distinction, exclusion or preference constitutes discrimination. For instance, a merit- or performance-based pay increase or bonus is not by itself discriminatory. Positive discrimination in favor of people from certain underrepresented groups may be legal in some countries.						
6.4.1	Indicator: Evidence of comprehensive [116] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer has written anti-discrimination policy in place, stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.	Anti-discrimination policy is in Declaration of good social practise 2019-04-01. (ID 1849).	Minor		NC 1: The whistle blowing procedure do not provide specific contacts whom to contact in case of need to raise the complaint. NC 2: Some employees have not received non-discrimination training.	
		b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.	Procedure of Whistle blowing procedure is developed and is in place. No details of contacts are provided and communicated to employees.				
		c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.	The equal access to job opportunities are provided. The equal pay principle is followed. Remuneration and working time policy and Tariff agreement state payment condition equal for all employees to get same salary for the same job and taking into consideration experience. Information about vacancies and training opportunities are sent via e-mail to all employees.				
		d. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective.	The trainings for site manager training information is missing in LANDAX system. Management interview and LANDAX system records indicates that not all site employees are trained on anti-discrimination.				
Footnote	[116] Employers shall have written anti-discrimination policies stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.						
		a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.	The record system is created. No discrimination related complaints reported.				

6.4.2	Indicator: Number of incidences of discrimination Requirement: None Applicability: All	b. Be advised that worker testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.	Interview of workers confirmed that rights of employees are respected and no discrimination cases indicated.	Compliant		0
<i>Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety</i>						
		Compliance Criteria				
6.5.1	Indicator: Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [117] and policies on a yearly basis Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Employer has documented practices, procedures (including emergency response procedures) and policies to protect employees from workplace hazards and to minimize risk of accident or injury. The information shall be available to employees. b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	Documentation (number of documented procedures) is developed and is available in places and LANDAX system. The contingency plans are developed. Employees know emergency respond procedures. During site visit some deviations were observed: At the land base: chemicals are stored in open door (because of door damage) room, soft acid is stored without spill collection stand. On the boat: lifebuoy wheel obstructed by ropes and container of chemicals. On the feed barge: damaged ladder is not removed to avoid use, the eye-wash liquid near dead fish treatment tank is stored in small container on the outside wall, it creates risk of not being able to use it in low outside temperatures (indicated allowed temperatures on the bottle is from 5oC to 35oC.). Employees are trained and annual refreshment trainings are organised. Training records are maintained. Weekly meetings are used to remind specific H&S risks related to coming jobs. Safety drill was organised on 2018-11-01 on land base and feed barge. Drill reports are available. For future drills the list of situations to be used could be related to identified H&S risks. Interviews and missing records indicating absence of drills on boat.	Minor	NC 1: Farm visit identified incomplete maintenance and low awareness of employees towards emergency preparedness. NC 2: There are no evidences of periodical drills conducted on boat.	
Footnote	[117] Health and safety training shall include emergency response procedures and practices.					
6.5.2	Indicator: Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals). b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards. c. Employees receive annual training in the proper use of PPE (see 6.5.1c). For workers who participated in the initial training(s) previously an annual refreshment training may suffice, unless new PPE has been put to use. d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The list of hazards is defined in log of H&S risks. PPE is provided according risk assessment results and the needs of employees. The periodical training of PPE is conducted. Interview confirms good PPE management.	Compliant		
		a. Employer makes regular assessments of hazards and risks in the workplace. Risk assessments are reviewed and updated at least annually (see also 6.5.1a).	Site manager with employees make assessments of hazards and risks weekly and prior to hazardous jobs. General review of risk assessment was conducted in Q1 2019. The general risks are identified in main office and amended with local risks if needed. Safety representative make safety rounds at farm annually. Last check on 2019-05-29.			

6.5.3	<p>Indicator: Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).</p> <p>c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.</p>	<p>Employees are familiar with hazards. Employees are provided refreshment trainings about procedures and risks prior to hazardous works like fish delivery, delicing etc.</p> <p>H&S procedures are adapted after relevant accidents or revised once a year.</p>	Compliant		
6.5.4	<p>Indicator: Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.</p> <p>b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations.</p> <p>c. Employer implements corrective action plans in response to any accidents that occur. Plans are documented and they include an analysis of root cause, actions to address root cause, actions to remediate, and actions to prevent future accidents of similar nature.</p> <p>d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.</p>	<p>H&S accidents recorded in LANDAX.</p> <p>LANDAX system is used for records for all H&S violations and near accidents and their investigation. The reporting rate of potential hazards is very low.</p> <p>H&S violations are investigated and results are recorded in Landax. The information on use of root cause analysis results is not maintained.</p> <p>The analysis of H&S accidents is understood by workers and improvements are implemented.</p>	Minor	The corrective actions plans and related records for H&S violations in LANDAX do not contain results of Root cause analysis.	
6.5.5	<p>Indicator: Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance (accident or injury) for 100% of worker costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains documentation to confirm that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries (if not covered under national law). Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers. Written contract of employer responsibility to cover accident costs is acceptable evidence in place of insurance.</p>	<p>Insurance provided. Extended insurance provided to all permanent employees of the company. Temporary employees are covered by state health insurance system.</p>	Compliant		
6.5.6	<p>Indicator: Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Note: If the farm outsources its diving operations to an independent company, the farm shall ensure that auditors have access to specified information sufficient to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 6.5.6. It is the farm's responsibility to obtain copies of relevant documentation (e.g. certificates) from the dive company.</p> <p>a. Employer keeps records of farm diving operations and a list of all personnel involved. In case an external service provider was hired, a statement that provider conformed to all relevant criteria must be made available to the auditor by this provider.</p> <p>b. Employer maintains evidence of diver certification (e.g. copies of certificates) for each person involved in diving operations. Divers shall be certified through an accredited national or international organization for diver certification.</p>	<p>The records of diving activities maintained. Diving company Samba Marine AS is used. The statement is available.</p> <p>Information of certificates of divers are checked by site manager at divers boat prior of diving.</p>	Compliant		100 %
Criterion 6.6 Wages						
Compliance Criteria						
		<p>a. Employer keeps documents to show the legal minimum wage in the country of operation. If there is no legal minimum wage in the country, the employer keeps documents to show the industry-standard minimum wage.</p>	<p>Documents are available at the company. The wage is based on Tariff agreement.</p>			

6.6.1	Indicator: The percentage of workers whose basic wage [118] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [119] Requirement: 0 (None) Applicability: All	b. Employer's records (e.g. payroll) confirm that worker's wages for a standard work week (≤ 48 hours) always meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. If there is no legal minimum wage, the employer's records must show how the current wage meets or exceeds industry standard. If wages are based on piece-rate or pay-per-production, the employer's records must show how workers can reasonably attain (within regular working hours) wages that meet or exceed the legal minimum wage.	Wages are exceeding legal minimum wage.	Compliant		0 %
		c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The information is available per employee. Documentary evidence is in place.			
Footnote	[118] Basic wage: The wages paid for a standard working week (no more than 48 hours).					
Footnote	[119] If there is no legal minimum wage in a country, basic wages must meet the industry-standard minimum wage.					
6.6.2	Indicator: Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [120] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and the use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages. Includes review of any national basic needs wage recommendations from credible sources such as national universities or government.	Cost of living is evaluated based on government set social support cost of living figures and average housing cost for the area.	Compliant		
		b. Employer has calculated the basic needs wage for farm workers and has compared it to the basic (i.e. current) wage for their farm workers.	The calculations and comparison are done. The company wages are above BNW.			
		c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	Wages exceed basic needs wage.			
Footnote	[120] Basic needs wage: A wage that covers the basic needs of an individual or family, including housing, food and transport. This concept differs from a minimum wage, which is set by law and may or may not cover the basic needs of workers.					
6.6.3	Indicator: Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [121] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.	The job contracts have the link to local agreement. The wages counting is well understood by workers. Workers are only paid benefits for special conditions like work at weekends, overtime and night work, stay out of home etc. The bonuses related to work efficiency are not well defined and interview of employees indicated lack of articulation/communication and low understanding about calculation method of bonuses.	Minor	The bonuses are not clearly articulated for workers.	
		b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.	The method of setting wages is well understood by workers.			
		c. Employer renders wages and benefits in a way that is convenient for the worker (e.g. cash, check, or electronic payment methods). Workers do not have to travel to collect benefits nor do they receive promissory notes, coupons or merchandise in lieu of payment.	Wages are transferred to personal bank accounts			
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview has confirmed information about wages.			
Footnote	[121] Payments shall be rendered to workers in a convenient manner.					
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting						
		Compliance Criteria				
6.7.1	Indicator: Percentage of workers who have contracts [122] Requirement: 100%	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.	Contracts available, records maintained.	Compliant		100 %
		b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.	No evidences			

	Applicability: All	c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms legal employment by contracts.			
Footnote	[122] Labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes are not acceptable. This includes revolving/consecutive labor contracts to deny benefit accrual or equitable remuneration. False Apprenticeship Scheme: The practice of hiring workers under apprenticeship terms without stipulating terms of the apprenticeship or wages under contract. It is a “false” apprenticeship if its purpose is to underpay people, avoid legal obligations or employ underage workers. Labor-only contracting arrangement: The practice of hiring workers without establishing a formal employment relationship for the purpose of avoiding payment of regular wages or the provision of legally required benefits, such as health and safety protections.					
6.7.2	Indicator: Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible practices and policies. b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors. c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.	Procedure for Supply and evaluation of subcontractors ID 1701 (2019-02-25) is applied. Criteria for suppliers and subcontractors are defined and is based on GRASP checklists. The list of critical suppliers developed. All critical suppliers and contractors are required to fill and sign self-declaration/assessment document. The better definition needed of follow-up activities to be applied in case of risks revealed from self assessment documents. Most of the suppliers have GRASP audits and supplier evaluation, but there are suppliers not covered by GGAP scheme. The records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2 are available in form of self evaluation questionnaire and second party audits	Compliant		
Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution						
Compliance Criteria						
6.8.1	Indicator: Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner. b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access. c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. complaint or grievance filings, minutes from review meetings) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Procedure of Whistle blowing poster is used in line with procedure for dealing with conflicts, harassment mobbing ID 1850 2019-02-25. Complaint and reclamations handling procedure ID 1699, 2019-02-25. Employees are familiar with Whistle blower procedure. No cases identified.	Compliant		
6.8.2	Indicator: Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [123] within a 90-day timeframe Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised. b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed. c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe.	No grievances reported No grievances reported No conflicts were identified. The Conflict handling procedure has defined timeframe of 90 days handling.	Compliant		100 %
Footnote	[123] Addressed: Acknowledged and received, moving through the company's process for grievances, corrective action taken when necessary.					
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices						
Compliance criteria						
6.9.1	Indicator: Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity. b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [124], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors. c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.	The disciplinary verbal and written warnings to be used in case of misbehaviour during the work. It is defined in working rules. No cases reported. Interview has confirmed no cases of improper disciplinary behaviour.	Compliant		0
Footnote	[124] Mental Abuse: Characterized by the intentional use of power, including verbal abuse, isolation, sexual or racial harassment, intimidation or threat of physical force.					

6.9.2	Indicator: Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [125] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [125]. b. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. worker evaluation reports) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that the disciplinary action policy is fair and effective.	Disciplinary policy is defined in working rules. Interview has confirmed fair policy.	Compliant		
Footnote	[125] If disciplinary action is required, progressive verbal and written warnings shall be engaged. The aim shall always be to improve the worker; dismissal shall be the last resort. Policies for bonuses, incentives, access to training and promotions are clearly stated and understood, and not used arbitrarily. Fines or basic wage deductions shall not be acceptable disciplinary practices.					
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime						
		Compliance criteria				
6.10.1	Indicator: Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [126] Requirement: None Applicability: All	Note: Working hours, night work and rest periods for workers in agriculture should be in accordance with national laws and regulations or collective agreements (e.g. The Safety and Health in Agriculture Convention, 2001). Additional information can be found on the website of the International Labour Organization (www.ilo.org). a. Employer has documentation showing the legal requirements for working hours and overtime in the region where the farm operates. If local legislation allows workers to exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime) then requirements of the international standards apply. b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law. c. If an employer requires employees to work shifts at the farm (e.g. 10 days on and six days off), the employer compensates workers with an equivalent time off in the calendar month and there is evidence that employees have agreed to this schedule (e.g. in the hiring contract). d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	Workers are working 5 days week with 1 weekend per month. The time scheme 1:1 is used. (7 days x 10 hours and 7 days-off) is used for service team. It is approved by ASC. The Allowed overtime is defined in agreement between trade unions and company. Records are in place. According collective bargaining agreement working time/overtime limits are: 13h(total)/24h; 20h/7days; 50h/4w; 300h/52w. As well 8 h off-time in 24h if both sides agree. It was noted cases when worker has worked, including overtime, 12 days in a row. The check of records of time sheets has identified the deviations from agreed limits. Workers are working 5 days week with 1 weekend per month. 7 by7 shift is used by service employees. Interview has confirmed information above.	Minor	The working load and time control is not well balanced as there are cases of exceeding total working hours worked per 24h and overtime limit per 7 days.	0
Footnote	[126] In cases where local legislation on working hours and overtime exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime), the international standards will apply.					
6.10.2	Indicator: Overtime is limited, voluntary [127], paid at a premium rate [128] and restricted to exceptional circumstances Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except as noted in [130]	a. Payment records (e.g. payslips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours. b. Overtime is limited and occurs in exceptional circumstances as evidenced by farm records (e.g. production records, time sheets, and other records of working hours). c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that all overtime is voluntary except where there is a collective bargaining agreement which specifically allows for compulsory overtime.	Overtime for workers is paid at premium rate as could be seen in payslips. The timesheets are in place. Overtime is voluntary and in low amounts.	Compliant		
Footnote	[127] Compulsory overtime is permitted if previously agreed to under a collective bargaining agreement.					
Footnote	[128] Premium rate: A rate of pay higher than the regular work week rate. Must comply with national laws/regulations and/or industry standards.					
Criterion 6.11 Education and training						
		Compliance criteria				

6.11.1	Indicator: Evidence that the company regularly performs training of staff in fish husbandry, general farm and fish escape management and health and safety procedures Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers. Company provides incentives (e.g. subsidies for tuition or textbooks, time off prior to exams, flexibility in work schedule) that encourage workers to participate in educational initiatives. Note that such offers may be contingent on workers committing to stay with the company for a pre-arranged time. b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees). c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	Company encourages the workers to participate in additional trainings. Training records and certificates maintained in LANDAX system. The matrix of trainings is not completely updated. Interview confirms that company supports education initiatives.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility						
		Compliance criteria				
6.12.1	Indicator: Demonstration of company-level [129] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11. b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located. c. The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covers all company operations relating to salmonid production in the region (i.e. all smolt production facilities, grow-out facilities and processing plants). d. The site that is applying for certification provides auditors with access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above).	Company level policies are available and are in line with requirements of the standard. Policies are approved. The policies cover all company operations. The access is provided.	Compliant		
Footnote	[129] Applies to the headquarters of the company in a region or country where the site applying for certification is located. The policy shall relate to all of the company's operations in the region or country, including grow-out, smolt production and processing facilities.					
Social requirements in the standards shall be audited by an individual who is a lead auditor in conformity with SAAS Procedure 200 section 3.1.						
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN		Criterion 7.1 Community engagement				
		Compliance Criteria				
7.1.1	Indicator: Evidence of regular and meaningful [130] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually). b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations. c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda. d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3).	The open day meeting was organised on 2019-05-25 for stake holders and community representatives. The day was used for consultation with interested parties. Consultations agenda has included main points required by the standard. The participants from local community were invited for consultation and were asked to contribute to agenda. No the potential health risks from therapeutic treatments were discussed during consultations meeting.	Minor	No information about therapeutic substances and potential risks were communicated during consultation with community and stake holders.	

		e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.	The invitation, presentation and minutes of meeting are available. 13 participants from stakeholders were attended.						
		f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.	The extensive communication is completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.						
Footnote	[130] Regular and meaningful: Meetings shall be held at least bi-annually with elected representatives of affected communities. The agenda for the meetings should in part be set by the community representatives. Participatory Social Impact Assessment methods may be one option to consider here.								
7.1.2	Indicator: Presence and evidence of an effective [131] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations. b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder describing corrective actions). c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders). d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.	Complaint and reclamations handling procedure ID 1699, 2019-02-25 is used for complaints from stakeholder, community members, and organizations. No complaints related to SA area received. Complaints will be handled in LANDAX system. No complaints related to SA area received. The effectiveness of mechanism is tested by working as with other type of complaints. The extensive communication is completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.	Compliant					
Footnote	[131] Effective: In order to demonstrate that the mechanism is effective, evidence of resolutions of complaints can be given.								
7.1.3	Indicator: Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice [132] at the farm during times of therapeutic treatments and has, as part of consultation with communities under 7.1.1, communicated about potential health risks from treatments Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (use of anaesthetic baths is not regarded a therapeutant) b. Notices (above) are posted where they will be visible to affected stakeholders (e.g. posted on waterways for fishermen who pass by the farm). c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1) d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.	The notification signs are not available. Limited therapeutic treatment was applied with feed of salmon in the beginning of generation. No the potential health risks from treatments were discussed during consultations meetings. See 7.1.1. The extensive communication is completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.				Minor	The notification posting system during therapeutic treatment is not ready.	
Footnote	[132] Signage shall be visible to mariners and, for example, to fishermen passing by the farm.								
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories									
Compliance Criteria									
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 7.2 - Traditional Territories of Indigenous Groups The ASC Salmon Standard requires that farms must be respectful of the traditional territories of indigenous groups. The Indicators listed under Criterion 7.2 were designed to fulfill this purpose in a manner consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In many locales, the territorial boundaries of indigenous groups have a defined legal status according to local or national law. In such cases, it is straightforward to know whether a farm is operating in close proximity to indigenous people. However, when boundaries of indigenous territories are undefined or unknown, there is no simple way to establish whether the farm is operating in close proximity to indigenous groups. Here ASC provides the following guidance. The intent behind the ASC Salmon Standard is that the farm will identify all neighboring groups who are potentially negatively impacted by the farm's activities. The actual physical distance between the farm and an indigenous group is less important than understanding whether the farm is having a detrimental impact upon its neighbors. Effective community consultations are one of the best ways to identify such impacts to neighbor groups. Through a transparent process of consultation, indigenous groups who are put under "stress" by the farm will identify themselves and voice their concerns about the nature of the farm's impacts. Continued consultations between farm and neighbors should create a forum where any key issue can be discussed and resolved.									
		a. Documentary evidence establishes that the farm does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [133]). If not then the requirements of 7.2.1 do not apply.	No indigenous present in the area. All interested parties were communicated during the licence application processing to start the sites. The principle 7.2. is not applied.						

7.2.1	Indicator: Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [133]	b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.	No indigenous present in the area. The principle 7.2. is not applied.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups available in the vicinity of the farm.	
		c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR - farm confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence.	No indigenous present in the area. The principle 7.2. is not applied.			
		d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.	The extensive communication is completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.			
7.2.2	Indicator: Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities Requirement: Yes [133] Applicability: All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [133]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm.	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.2. do not apply.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	
		b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.2. do not apply.			
Footnote	[133] All standards related to indigenous rights only apply where relevant, based on proximity of indigenous territories.					
7.2.3	Indicator: Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [134] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [133]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm.	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.3. do not apply.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	
		b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) reached a protocol agreement with the indigenous community and this fact is documented; or 2) continued engagement in an active process [134] to reach a protocol agreement with the indigenous community.	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.3. do not apply.			
		c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.3. do not apply.			
Footnote	[134] To demonstrate an active process, a farm must show ongoing efforts to communicate with indigenous communities, an understanding of key community concerns and responsiveness to key community concerns through adaptive farm management and other actions.					
Criterion 7.3 Access to resources						
		Compliance Criteria				
7.3.1	Indicator: Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [135] without community approval Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Resources that are vital [135] to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under Indicator 7.3.2).	The resources that are vital for community are known by the site. It was communicated during the application to get the licence to start the site.	Compliant		0
		b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.	The community approval for resources was done during operation application processing to start the sites.			
		c. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has not restricted access to vital resources without prior community approval.	The extensive communication is completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.			
Footnote	[135] Vital community resources can include freshwater, land or other natural resources that communities rely on for their livelihood. If a farm site were to block, for example, a community's sole access point to a needed freshwater resource, this would be unacceptable under the Dialogue standard.					

7.3.2	Indicator: Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources	a. There is a documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources. Can be completed as part of community consultations under 7.1.1.	It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.	Compliant		
	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.	The extensive communication is completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.			
INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION						
A farm seeking certification must have documentation from all of its smolt suppliers to demonstrate compliance with the following standards. The requirements are, in general, a subset of the standards in Principles 1 through 7, focusing on the impacts that are most relevant for smolt facilities. In addition, specific standards are applied to open systems (net pens), and to closed and semi-closed systems (recirculation and flow-through). [136]						
Footnote	[136] The SAD SC proposes this approach to addressing environmental and social performance during the smolt phase of production. In the medium term, the SC anticipates a system to audit smolt production facilities on site. In the meantime, farms will need to work with their smolt suppliers to generate the necessary documentation to demonstrate compliance with the standards. The documentation will be reviewed as part of the audit at the grow-out facility.					
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT		External supplier, Sævareid				
Standards related to Principle 1						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.1	Indicator: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Identify all of the farm's smolt suppliers. For each supplier, identify the type of smolt production system used (e.g. open, semi or closed systems) and submit this information to ASC (Appendix VI).	Semi-closed system (flow through), resirk for deler av anlegget, 8 mill, 22 ansatte, uteavdeling, gjennomstrømming, 10 kar i resirk, 3 klekkeri, Submitted to ASC sent 31.05.2019	Compliant		
		b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.	License from NVE, ref no 200708140-9, d.t 25.11.2010 for Sævareidvassdraget, 20 million smolt per year (165 tonn feed and 191 tonn biomass per year) Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Hordaland (Kjell Kvingedal), ref no 2015.0026.T 24.02.2015, Sævareid 20 million smolt per year (4300 tonn feed and 148 organic suspension per year), requires resipient surveys each 5 year.			
		c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	Report "Undersøkelse av sjøbunnen utenfor avløpet til Sævareid Fiskeanlegg", no 2418, assessment (MOM B), Sævareid, dated 07.12.2016, result grad 1, done by Rådgivende Biologer AS, signed Ingrid Wathne and Bjarte Tveranger Seen report from NVE (Norsk Vassdrags og Energi), ref. no 2012/03666-25, d.t 22.02.16, with 5 NC. Seen letter form NVE, ref no 201203666-28, d.t 01.05.2016, confirming closing the NC Seen report from FM (Fylkesmannen), ref. no 2013.0861.FMHO, d.t 17.10.13, with 2 NC. Seen letter form FM, ref no 2013.13676 542.1, d.t 14.02.2014, confirming closing the NC			
		-	Report "Undersøkelse av sjøbunnen utenfor avløpet til Sævareid Fiskeanlegg", no 2418, assessment (MOM B), Sævareid, dated 07.12.2016, result grad 1, done by Rådgivende Biologer AS, signed Ingrid Wathne and Bjarte Tveranger			
	Indicator: Compliance with labor laws and regulations	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labor laws and regulations.	Links to relevant laws, regulations and requirements in EQS (electronic quality system).			

8.2	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	b. Keep records of supplier inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation; see 1.1.3a)	Seen report from NLA (Arbeidstilsynet), ref. no 2016/31885, d.t 23.08.16, with 1 NC. Seen letter form NLA, ref no 2016/31885, d.t 04.10.2019 - All NC's closed	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 2						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.3	Indicator: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains the same components as the assessment for grow-out facilities under 2.4.1 Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	<p>Note: If the smolt facility has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may obtain and use such documents as evidence to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 8.3 as long as all components are covered.</p> <p>a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a documented assessment of the smolt site's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3.</p> <p>b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration confirming they have developed and are implementing a plan to address potential impacts identified in the assessment.</p>	<p>Seen risk assessment for biodiversity and environment ID 1190, d.t 05.05.2019, included potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems.</p> <p>Seen action plan including environmental issues, ID 1118 d.t 07.05.19, approved by G. Folkestad Seen declaration form Sævareid Fiskeanlegg, d.t 06.06.2019, signed Gustav Fokestad</p>	Compliant		
8.4	Indicator: Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1) Requirement: 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period Applicability: All Smolt Producers	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.4 - Calculating Total Phosphorus Released per Ton of Fish Produced</p> <p>Farms must confirm that each of their smolt suppliers complies with the requirement of indicator 8.4. This specifies the maximum amount of phosphorus that a smolt production facility can release into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period. The requirement is set at 4 kg/mt. The calculation of total phosphorus released is made using a "mass balance" approach. Detailed instructions and formulas are given in Appendix VIII-1.</p> <p>If applicable, farms may take account of any physical removals of phosphorus in the form of sludge provided there is evidence to show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the smolt supplier has records showing the total quantity of sludge removed from site over the relevant time period; - the supplier determined phosphorus concentration (% P) in removed sludge by sampling and analyzing representative batches; and - the sludge was properly disposed off site and in accordance with the farm's biosolid management plan. 		Compliant		8,89 kg P / mt
		a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months.	01.01. - 31.12.2018 calculation: 1 414 400 kg feed used (listed per feed item in kg, P % and P total). Total 1 414 400 kg feed and total 1,37% by feed kg P.			
		b. For all feeds used by the smolt suppliers (result from 8.4a), keep records showing phosphorus content as determined by chemical analysis or based on feed supplier declaration (Appendix VIII-1).	01.01. - 31.12.2018 calculation: 1 414 400 kg feed used (listed per feed item in kg, P % and P total). Total 1 414 400 kg feed and total 1,37% by feed kg P.			
		c. Using the equation from Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a and b, calculate the total amount of phosphorus added as feed during the last 12 months of smolt production.	01.01. - 31.12.2018 calculation: 1 414 400 kg feed used (listed per feed item in kg, P % and P total). Total 1 414 400 kg feed and total 1,37% by feed kg P.			
		d. Obtain from smolt suppliers records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months.	01.01. - 31.12.2018: Produced biomass 1 480 401 kg			

		<p>e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1.</p>	<p>01.01. - 31.12.2018: Environmental report for Sævareid Fiskeanlegg AS confirming phosphorus per ton produced 8,89 kg (discharge to sea, see VR 48).</p>			
		<p>f. If applicable, obtain records from smolt suppliers showing the total amount of P removed as sludge (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months.</p>	<p>Sævareid: 44 019 kg tørrstoff</p>			
		<p>g. Using the formula in Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a-f (above), calculate total phosphorus released per ton of smolt produced and verify that the smolt supplier is in compliance with requirements.</p>	<p>01.01. - 31.12.2018: Environmental report for Sævareid Fiskeanlegg AS confirming phosphorus per ton produced 8,89 kg (discharge to sea, see VR 39).</p>			
Standards related to Principle 3						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.5	<p>Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication of the ASC Salmon Standard</p> <p>Requirement: Yes [137]</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [137]</p>	<p>a. Obtain written evidence showing whether the smolt supplier produces a non-native species or not. If not, then Indicator 8.5 does not apply.</p>	<p>Salmo salar is native to region.</p>	N/A	Salmo salar is native to region.	
		<p>b. Provide the farm with documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the ASC Salmon Standard. (See definition of area under 3.2.1).</p>	<p>Salmo salar is native to region.</p>			
		<p>c. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish.</p>	<p>Salmo salar is native to region.</p>			
		<p>d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b or 8.5c, provide documented evidence 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; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.</p>	<p>Salmo salar is native to region.</p>			
		<p>e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.</p>	<p>Salmo salar is native to region.</p>			
Footnote	[137] Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical barriers that are in place and well-maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.					
		<p>a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers maintained monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.</p>	<p>No escaped according to internal statement. Internal Risk Assessment with instruction for registration and reporting. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overview updated per 30.04.2019 (www.fiskdir.no)</p>			
	<p>Indicator: Maximum number of escapees [138] in the most recent production cycle</p>	<p>b. Using smolt supplier records from 8.6a, determine the total number of fish that escaped. Verify that there were fewer than 300 escapees from the smolt production facility in the most recent production cycle.</p>	<p>No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overview per 30.04.2019 (www.fiskdir.no)</p>			

8.6	Requirement: 300 fish [139] Applicability: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [139]	c. Inform smolt suppliers in writing that monitoring records described in 8.6a must be maintained for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which the farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [139]). d. If an escape episode occurs at the smolt production facility (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [139]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the smolt producer could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.	Internal smolt supplier. All records in Fish Talk Internal Risk Assessment/contingency plan with instruction for registration and reporting. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overview (www.fiskdir.no)	Compliant		0
Footnote	[138] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregated number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish.					
Footnote	[139] A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside of the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. Extreme weather (e.g., 100-year storms) or accidents caused by farms located near high-traffic waterways are not intended to be covered under this exception.					
8.7	Indicator: Accuracy [140] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish Requirement: ≥98% Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records showing the accuracy of the counting technology used by smolt suppliers. Records must include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts. B. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	They use vaccination numbers as basis. Vaccination counting by camera technology from "Maskon". Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 11.03.2016. They use vaccination numbers as basis. Vaccination counting by camera technology from "Maskon". Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 11.03.2016.	Compliant		≥98%
Footnote	[140] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand counts.					
Standards related to Principle 4						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.8	Indicator: Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain a policy which states the supplier's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the supplier's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation.	Waste plan "Avfallsplan for Sævareid Fiskeanlegg", ID 1154, d.t 28.05.2018, e.g: Ensilage to Scanbio Oil and chemicals to BIR, seen e.g record no 7661, 10.06.2017 Styrofoam boxes from egg delivery to BIR Rest waste to community service, seen e.g record from Standvik Transport og Maskin AS, np 10389, 27.02.2019, 1,82 tonn container rest waste.	Compliant		
8.9	Indicator: Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection 1 for guidance and required components of the records and assessment) Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle Applicability: All Smolt Producers	Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.1. a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year. b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last year. c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year. d. Confirm that the smolt supplier used results from 8.9b and 8.9c to calculate energy consumption on the supplier's facility as required and that the units are reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle.	Records OK in excel documents. Calculation for 2018: 91 634 472 kWh (1091623046 kj) Calculation for 2018: Produced biomass 1 480,4 tons 737,38285 kj per ton biomass produced.	Compliant		

		e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a e.	Records OK in excel. Continuous evaluation.			
8.10	Indicator: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [141]) emissions [142] at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment (See Appendix V, subsection 1) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.2.				
		a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility.	Records OK	Compliant		
		b. Confirm that, on at least an annual basis, the smolt supplier calculates all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	Calculation for 2018: scope 1: 80696,3256 tonn CO2e scope 2: 0 tonn CO2e scope 3: 0 tonn CO2e Total 80696,3256 tonn CO2e			
		c. For GHG calculations, confirm that the smolt supplier selects the emission factors which are best suited to the supplier's operation. Confirm that the supplier documents the source of the emissions factors.	Emission factor energy: 0,117 tonn CO2 per kWh.			
		d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO2 gases to CO2 equivalents, confirm that the smolt suppliers specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	CO2 used			
		e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually.	Calculations and assessment provided. Calculations and assessment provided by CO2 focus. Data from IEA 2013, SSB 2013, EIA 2011, IPCC 2006.			
Footnote	[141] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO ₂); methane (CH ₄); nitrous oxide (N2O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆).					
Footnote	[142] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.					
Standards related to Principle 5						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.11	Indicator: Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites.	Fish health management plan ID 1518 "Veterinær Helseplan for AS Sævareid Fiskeanegg" valid for Sævareid, signed Gustav Folkestad - HPR 1016725, dated 27.05.2019. Includes measurements for identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites.	Compliant		
		b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.	Fish health management plan ID 1518 "Veterinær Helseplan for AS Sævareid Fiskeanegg" valid for Sævareid, signed Gustav Folkestad - veterinary apporval number HPR 1016725, dated 27.05.2019. Includes measurements for identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites. External veterinaay services done by FoMAS AS, last visit d.t, d.t 20.05.2019, Bjarte Langhelle, HSF015, ID 70411			

8.12	<p>Indicator: Percentage of fish that are vaccinated for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists [143]</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Maintain a list of diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region, developed by farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.</p> <p>b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.</p> <p>c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received.</p> <p>d. Demonstrate, using the lists from 8.12a-c above, that all salmon on the farm received vaccination against all selected diseases known to present a significant risk in the regions for which an effective vaccine exists.</p>	<p>Diseases and vaccines listed in VHP. All fish is vaccinated (legal requirement).</p> <p>Diseases and vaccines listed in VHP. All fish is vaccinated (legal requirement).</p> <p>Vaccines registered in AquaFarmer - verified in production CV</p> <p>All fish is vaccinated (legal requirement). AquaFarmer CV has information regarding vaccine type, date and fish group.</p>	Compliant		100 %				
Footnote	[143] The farm's designated veterinarian is responsible for undertaking and providing written documentation of the analysis of the diseases that pose a risk in the region and the vaccines that are effective. The veterinarian shall determine which vaccinations to use and demonstrate to the auditor that this decision is consistent with the analysis.									
8.13	<p>Indicator: Percentage of smolt groups [144] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.13-- Testing of Smolt for Select Diseases</p> <p>The farm is responsible for developing and maintaining a list of diseases of regional concern for which each smolt group should be tested. The list of diseases shall include diseases that originate in freshwater and are proven or suspected to occur in seawater (and for which seawater fish-to-fish transmission is a concern).</p> <p>The designated veterinarian <u>to the smolt supplier</u> is required to evaluate, based on scientific criteria and publicly available information, which diseases should be tested for. This analysis shall include an evaluation of whether clinical disease or a pathogen carrier state in fresh water is deemed to have a negative impact on the grow-out phase, thereby disqualifying a smolt group from being transferred. The analysis must be available to the CAB upon request.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Note: A "smolt group" is defined as a population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry, and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents for each group.</p> <p>a. Obtain from the smolt supplier a list of diseases of regional concern for which smolt should be tested. List shall be supported by scientific analysis as described in the Instruction above.</p> <p>b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration and records confirming that each smolt group received by the farm has been tested for the diseases in the list (8.13a).</p>					<p>Sampling and visits stated in VHP plan, and performed according to VHP.</p> <p>Seen report from PATOGEN, report no PG039899 d.t 28.05.2018, screening for ILA, PRV, BKD</p>	Compliant		100 %
Footnote	[144] A smolt group is any population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents for each group. Only diseases that are proven, or suspected, as occurring in seawater (and for which seawater fish-to-fish transmission is a concern) but originating in freshwater should be on the list of diseases tested. The designated veterinarian to the smolt farm is required to evaluate, based on scientific criteria and publicly available information, which diseases should be tested for. This analysis shall include an evaluation of whether clinical disease or a pathogen carrier state in fresh water is deemed to have a negative impact on the grow-out phase, thereby disqualifying a smolt group from being transferred. A written analysis must be available to the certifier on demand.									

8.14	<p>Indicator: Detailed information, provided by the designated veterinarian, of all chemicals and therapeutants used during the smolt production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing and all disease and pathogens detected on the site</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use for the fish sold to the farm that is signed by their veterinarian and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant. 	<p>Information provided by AquaFarmer CV, VHP and prescriptions from veterinarian. AquaFarmer contains information (date, name, withdrawal, supplier, fish group, amount, etc.) of treatments and vaccines used.</p>	Compliant		
8.15	<p>Indicator: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [145] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [146]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [146].</p> <p>b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.</p> <p>c. Compare therapeutant records from smolt supplier (8.14) to the list (8.15a) and confirm that no therapeutants appearing on the list (8.15a) were used on the smolt purchased by the farm.</p>	<p>VHP appendix ID 1517, d.t 05.06.2019, with all therapeutic treatments. Oxolinic acid is listed in the appendix, but it is clerally stated not to be used for ASC fish</p> <p>Seen notification to smolt supplier d.t 24.05.2019</p> <p>Listed substances not used</p>	Compliant		0
Footnote	[145] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance.					
Footnote	[146] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.					
8.16	<p>Indicator: Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 3</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a).</p> <p>b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.</p>	<p>No antibiotics used. Seen AquaFarmer CV with treatments.</p> <p>No antibiotics used. Seen AquaFarmer CV with treatments.</p>	Compliant		
8.17	<p>Indicator: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [147]</p> <p>Requirement: None [148]</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [147].</p> <p>b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.</p> <p>c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm.</p>	<p>Sent to smolt supplier d.t 24.05.2019</p> <p>Seen notification to smolt supplier d.t 24.05.2019</p> <p>No antibiotics used. Seen AquaFarmer CV with treatments.</p>	Compliant		0
Footnote	[147] The 3rd edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/CIA_3.pdf .					
Footnote	[148] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.					
	Note: see instructions for Indicator 5.4.3 regarding evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.					

8.18	Indicator: Evidence of compliance [149] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [150]	a. Provide the smolt supplier with a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (or inform the supplier how to access it from the internet).	Awareness of OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. Seen reference in Fish health management plan ID 1518 "Veterinær Helseplan for AS Sævareid Fiskeanegg" refers to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Compliant		
	Requirement: Yes	b. Inform the supplier that an ASC certified farm can only source smolt from a facility with policies and procedures that ensure that its smolt production practices are compliant with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Seen notification to smolt supplier d.t 24.05.2019			
	Applicability: All Smolt Producers	c. Obtain a declaration from the supplier stating their intent to comply with the OIE code and copies of the smolt suppliers policies and procedures that are relevant to demonstrate compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Awareness of OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. Seen reference in Fish health management plan ID 1518 "Veterinær Helseplan for AS Sævareid Fiskeanegg" refers to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.			
Footnote	[149] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Exotic signifies not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen).					
Footnote	[150] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171 .					
Standards related to Principle 6						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.19	Indicator: Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11	a. Obtain copies of smolt supplier's company-level policies and procedures and a declaration of compliance with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	Company level documents of smolt supplier are available. The declaration of compliance with labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11 is available.	Compliant		
	Requirement: Yes	b. Review the documentation and declaration from 8.19a to verify that smolt supplier's policies and procedures are in compliance with the requirements of labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	The documents mentioned in 8.19 a) were revised. Smolt supplier's policies and procedures are in compliance with the requirements of labour standards.			
Standards related to Principle 7						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.20	Indicator: Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.20 - Consultation and Engagement with Community Representatives Farms must comply with Indicator 7.1.1 which requires that farms engage in regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations. Under Indicator 8.20, farms must show how each of their smolt suppliers complies with an equivalent requirement. Farms are obligated to maintain evidence that is sufficient to show their suppliers remain in full compliance. Evidence shall be documentary (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) and will substantiate the following: - the smolt supplier engaged in "regular" consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually); - the supplier's consultations were effective (e.g. using participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or similar methods); and - the supplier's consultations included participation by elected representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.				
	Requirement: Yes	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community.	The meeting was organised on in local community. Because of extension of the company the communication with community and stakeholders started on 2018-11-16. The hearing process is in progress.	Compliant		
	Applicability: All Smolt Producers	b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements.	Invitation and PP presentation and minutes of meeting are available and demonstrate well organised consultation.			
8.21	Indicator: Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.	All complaints are managed by EQS system. And communicated to stakeholders.	Compliant		
	Requirement: Yes					
	Applicability: All Smolt Producers					

8.22	Indicator: Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people (see Indicator 7.2.1). If not then the requirements of 8.22 do not apply.	Smolt supplier company does not operate in specific indigenous area. No traditional and Indigenous groups are involved, because there is no such groups in the area. The requirements of 8.22 do not apply.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved, because there are no such groups in the area.	
		b. Obtain documentation to demonstrate that, as required by law in the jurisdiction: smolt supplier consulted with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR smolt supplier confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence.	The requirements of 8.22 do not apply.			
8.23	Indicator: Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier.	Based on 8.22 a) the requirements of 8.2.3. do not apply.	N/A	Based on 8.22 a) the requirements of 8.2. do not apply.	
		b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.	Based on 8.22 a) the requirements of 8.2.3. do not apply.			
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT In addition to the requirements above, if the smolt is produced in an open system, evidence shall be provided that the following are met:						
Instruction to Clients for Indicators 8.24 through 8.31 - Requirements for Smolt Produced in Open Systems Client shall provide documentary evidence to the CAB about the production system(s) from which they source smolt. If smolt used by the farm are produced, for part or all of the growth phase from alevin to smolt, in open (net-pen) systems, indicators 8.24 - 8.31 are applicable.						
	Indicator: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids Requirement: None Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids.	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
		b. Request smolt suppliers to identify all water bodies in which they operate net pens for producing smolt and from which facilities they sell to the client.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
8.25	Indicator: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Take steps to ensure that the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens.	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
8.26	Indicator: Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body has been established by a reliable entity [151] within the past five years [152] and total biomass in the water body is within the limits established by that study (see Appendix VIII-5 for minimum requirements)	a. For the water body(s) where the supplier produces smolt for the client (see 8.24b), obtain a copy of the most recent assessment of assimilative capacity.	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
		b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5.	No net-pens, tanks only.			

	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a). e. If the study in 8.26a is more than two years old and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since completion, request evidence that an updated assessment study has been done.	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.			
Footnote	[151] E.g., Government body or academic institution.					
Footnote	[152] If the study is older than two years, and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since the completion of the study, a more recent assessment is required.					
8.27	Indicator: Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) Requirement: ≤ 20 µg/l [153] Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	<p style="text-align: center;">Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.27 and 8.28 - Monitoring TP and DO in Receiving Water for Open Smolt Systems</p> <p>Farms must confirm that any smolt supplier using an open (net-pen) system is also engaged in monitoring of water quality of receiving waters. Requirements for the supplier's water quality monitoring program are presented in detail in Appendix VIII-6 and only re-stated briefly here. Monitoring shall sample total phosphorus (TP) and dissolved oxygen (DO). TP is measured in water samples taken from a representative composite sample through the water column to a depth of the bottom of the cages. Samples are submitted to an accredited laboratory for analysis of TP to a method detection limit of < 0.002 mg/L. DO measurements will be taken at 50 centimeters from the bottom sediment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The required sampling regime is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- all stations are identified with GPS coordinates on a map of the farm and/or available satellite imagery;- stations are at the limit of the farm management zone on each side of the farm, roughly 50 meters from the edge of enclosures;<ul style="list-style-type: none">- the spatial arrangement of stations is shown in the table in Appendix VIII-6;- sampling is done at least quarterly (1X per 3 months) during periods without ice, including peak biomass; and- samples are also collected at two reference stations located ~ 1-2 km upcurrent and downcurrent from the farm. <p style="text-align: center;">Note: Some flexibility on the exact location and method of sampling is allowed to avoid smolt suppliers needing to duplicate similar sampling for their local regulatory regime.</p>				
		a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements of Appendix VIII-6.	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		e. Confirm that the average value for TP over the last 12 months did not exceed 20 ug/l at any of the sampling stations nor at the reference station.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
Footnote	[153] This concentration is equivalent to the upper limit of the Mesotrophic Trophic Status classification as described in Appendix VIII-7.					
8.28	Indicator: Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimeters above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) Requirement: ≥ 50% Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	<p style="text-align: center;">Note: see instructions for Indicator 8.27.</p>				
		a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a).	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.	No net-pens, tanks only.			
		a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable).	No net-pens, tanks only.			

8.29	Indicator: Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	b. If the trophic status of the waterbody has not been classified (see 8.29a), obtain evidence from the supplier to show how the supplier determined trophic status based on the concentration of TP. c. As applicable, review results from 8.29b to verify that the supplier accurately assigned a trophic status to the water body in accordance with the table in Appendix VIII-7 and the observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months. d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported for all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change.	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
8.30	Indicator: Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) Requirement: 25% Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable. b. Compare the baseline TP concentration (result from 8.30a) to the average observed TP concentration over the past 12 months (result from 8.27e). c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration.	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
8.31	Indicator: Allowance for use of aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water body Requirement: None Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water bodies where the supplier operates.	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A		
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS Additionally, if the smolt is produced in a closed or semi-closed system (flow through or recirculation) that discharges into freshwater, evidence shall be provided that the following are met [157]:						
Instructions to Client for Indicators 8.32-8.35 - Requirement for smolts produced in open systems Client shall provide documentary evidence to the CAB about the production system(s) from which they source smolt. -If smolt used by the farm are not produced, for part or all of the growth phase from alevin to smolt, in open (net-pen) systems, indicators 8.32 - 8.35 are applicable. -If the production system is closed or semi-closed and does not discharge into freshwater, Indicators 8.32 - 8.35 are not applicable to smolt producers as per [154]. For such an exemption, farms must provide documentary evidence to the CAB. Auditors shall fully document their rationale for awarding exemptions in the audit report.						
Footnote	[154] Production systems that don't discharge into fresh water are exempt from these standards.					
8.32	Indicator: Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) Requirement: Yes [155]	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing that water quality monitoring was conducted at least quarterly (i.e. once every 3 months) over the last 12 months. b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness. c. Submit the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix to ASC as per Appendix VIII-2 and Appendix VI at least once per year.	No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater	N/A		
Footnote	[155] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.32.					
	Indicator: Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b).	No discharge to freshwater			

8.33	(methodology in Appendix VIII-2) Requirement: 60% [156,157] Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation.	No discharge to freshwater	N/A		
	c. If a single DO reading (as reported in 8.33a) fell below 60%, obtain evidence that the smolt supplier performed daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for at least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2).	No discharge to freshwater				
Footnote	[156] A single oxygen reading below 60 percent would require daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for at least a week demonstrating a minimum 60 percent saturation at all times.					
Footnote	[157] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.33.					
8.34	Indicator: Macro-invertebrate surveys downstream from the farm's effluent discharge demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys.	No discharge to freshwater	N/A		
		b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).	No discharge to freshwater			
		c. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm the survey results show that benthic health is similar to or better than upstream of the supplier's discharge.	No discharge to freshwater			
8.35	Indicator: Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.	No discharge to freshwater	N/A		
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly.	No discharge to freshwater			
		c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months.	No discharge to freshwater			
		d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2.	No discharge to freshwater			

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.)

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
IA-19-1	2.1.1 d 2.1.2.c 2.1.3.a	Minor	The site specific sediment sampling inspection (MOM C - hybrid - ASC adapted) is not done in peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass)	Verified in report from Åkerblå AS, report no MCR-M-19044-Jibbersholmane d.t. 28.05.2019, including results from samplings dated 01.04.2019, which was in the middle part (approx 50 %) of the production cycle	06.06.2019	Accepted/open		MOM C was not taken on peak biomass last production cycle.	MOM C will be taken at >75% peak biomass. Reference to ID 338 in action plan	06.09.2019	Accepted - 17.06.19 THOV: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions accepted - MOM C taken on peak biomass will be followed in Surveillance Audit 1	
IA-19-2	2.4.1.a,b	Minor	Dieseloil to run the power generators is stored in big tanks (fiberglass) in the basement of the barge. Risk of spillage is present and in the same room there are bilge pumps on the floor that will start automatically. Risk of pumping diesel to the environment is present which represent high risk for negative impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystem. The risk for spillage and automatically start of bilge pumps is not identified in the risk assessment and adressed in the action plan	Seen storage tanks and bilge pumps in the same room during inspection on the barge. Bilge pump was tested and verified automatically to start with a floating sensor	06.06.2019	Open		Was not aware of this.	New bilge pump is ordered and will be mounted. Reference to ID 339 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 17.06.19 THOV: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-3	2.5.4	Minor	Records reviewed onsite during inspection show that there has been 2 incidents with birds in the nets last 6 months. These incidents has not been made easily publicly available on their website	Seen website http://lingalaks.no/sertifiseringer/ including information about lethal incidents but no information about 2 incidents with birds is published	06.06.2019	Open		Website was not ready for editing at the time of audit.	Will be published on website. Reference to ID 340 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 17.06.19 THOV: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-4	2.5.6	Minor	Records onsite is showing 2 incidents with birds in net the last 6 months. These 2 incidents are not registered in their non-conformances system and no cause analysis including actions to minimize risk for future incidences in done	Not seen registration of bird incidents in the non-conformance sysem LANDAX including causes analysis	06.06.2019	Open		Task not done by responsible person.	Will be registred in Landax. Reference to ID 340 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 17.06.19 THOV: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-5	4.6.1	Minor	The energy use assessment is not done for a whole life cycle at sea	Not seen energy use assessment for a whole production cycle (last complete cyclus is H2016)	06.06.2019	Open		Used wrong period for calculations	Will be calculated. Reference to ID 341 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 17.06.19 THOV: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-6	4.6.2	Minor	The GHG assessment is done for 2017	Not seen GHG assessment for calender year 2018	06.06.2019	Open		Used wrong period for calculations	Will be calculated. Reference to ID 341 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 17.06.19 THOV: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-7	6.2.2	Minor	NC 1: The job descriptions were not clearly defined on site for young workers. NC 2: Young worker was involved in one case of overtime and working in weekends what make continuous on-duty period more than 7 days.	Evidence for NC 1: The procedure of Young workers is defined, but it has limited specific information about job limitations. Evidence for NC 2: The time sheets in Tidsbank program, interview with workers and ste manager.	06.06.2019	Open		Missing sufficient documentation.	Job descriptions will be defined. Overtime for young workers will be monitored. Reference to ID 343 and 344 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	

IA-19-8	6.4.1	Minor	NC 1: The whistle blowing procedure do not provide specific contacts whom to contact in case of need to raise the complaint. NC 2: Some employees have not received non-discrimination training.	Evidence for NC 1: Procedure of Whistle blowing procedure is developed and is in place. No details of contacts are provided and communicated to employees. Evidence for NC 2: The trainings for site manager training information is missing in LANDAX system. Management interview and LANDAX system records indicates that not all site employees are trained on anti-discrimination.	06.06.2019	Open		Was not aware of this requirement.	Contact info will be includes in procedure. None discrimination training will be executed. Reference to ID 345 and 346 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-9	6.5.1	Major	NC 1: Farm visit identified incomplete maintenance and low awareness of employees towards emergency preparedness. NC 2: There are no evidences of periodical drills conducted on boat.	Evidence for NC 1: During site visit some deviations were observed: At the land base: chemicals are stored in open door (because of door damage) room, soft acid is stored without spill collection stand. On the boat: lifebuoy wheel obstructed by ropes and container of chemicals. On the feed barge: damaged ladder is not removed to avoid use, the eye-wash liquid near dead fish treatment tank is stored in small container on the outside wall, it creates risk of not being able to use it in low outside temperatures (indicated allowed temperatures on the bottle is from 5oC to 35oC.). Evidence for NC 2: Interviews and missing records indicating absence of drills on boat.	06.06.2019	Open		HSE is always in focus and improvements are ongoing.	All NCs will be fixed. Reference to ID 347, 348, 349 and 350 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-10	6.5.4	Minor	The corrective actions plans and related records for H&S violations in LANDAX do not contain results of Root cause analysis.	H&S violations are investigated and results are recorded in Landax. The information on use of root cause analysis results is not maintained.	06.06.2019	Open		Was not aware of this requirement.	Will be implemented in Landax system. Reference to ID 351 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-11	6.6.3	Minor	The bonuses are not clearly articulated for workers.	The bonuses related to work efficiency are not well defined and interview of employees indicated lack of articulation/communication and low understanding about calculation method of bonuses.	06.06.2019	Open		Was not aware of this requirement.	Bonus-system will be described and distributed to all employees. Reference to ID 352 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-12	6.10.1	Minor	The working load and time control is not well balanced as there are cases of exceeding total working hours worked per 24h and overtime limit per 7 days.	The check of records of time sheets has identified the deviations from agreed limits.	06.06.2019	Accepted/ open		Due to unforeseen circumstances this can occur once in a while.	The working load and time control will be monitored. Reference to ID 353 in action plan	06.09.2019	Accepted - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - will be followed in Surveillance Audit 1	
IA-19-13	7.1.1	Minor	No information about therapeutic substances and potential risks were communicated during consultation with community and stake holders.	No the potential health risks from therapeutic treatments were discussed during consultations meeting.	06.06.2019	Open		Forgotten during preparations for stakeholders meeting.	Will be followed up on next stakeholder meeting. Reference to ID 354 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	
IA-19-14	7.1.3	Minor	The notification posting system during therapeutic treatment is not ready.	The notification signs are not available.	06.06.2019	Open		Was not aware of this requirement.	Sign will be ordered and taken in use. Reference to ID 356 in action plan	06.09.2019	Open - 24.06.19 DP: Corrective and preventive actions presented in action plan accepted - the NC is expected closed before Final Report	

ASC Audit Report - Traceability

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.	NA	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.
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.	NA	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit. Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). Transport from one seasite to the slaughterhouse at the time, only.

<p>10.3 The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Only approved wellboats is used during transhipments of salmon between the site and waiting cages/harvest plant.</p> <p>Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting/ harvesting from other salmon farms/sites. The possibility for mixture of salmon in waiting cages from salmon from other farm/sites is also prevented by biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the harvesting/processing plant used.</p> <p>There are slaughtered fish from only one waiting cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant</p> <p>Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage).</p> <p>All information is kept both in electronic system FishTalk and Maritech Innova in hard copies.</p>
<p>10.4 Any other opportunities where certified product could potentially be mixed, substituted, or mislabelled with non-certified product before the point where product enters the chain of custody.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No other possibility for mixing products.</p>

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

Owned by client	Subcontracted by client
NA	NA

Number of sites included in the unit of certification

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

Site name(s)	Reason(s)
NA	NA
<p>The company has a robust and well implemented quality system, which covers the whole organization from smolt to finished slaughtered fish. The company is certified according to GLOBALG.A.P in the whole production chain.</p> <p>All stages of fish live cycle within the scope of this certification standard are traceable. Documents describe a satisfactory control with incoming products, from own freshwater sites, and corresponding documentation of production site, suppliers lists and reception control, both in harvesting and processing. Digital information is handled in Fish Talk for all freshwater stages and on-growing phase in seawater. Subsequent harvest, processing and sales are handled in Innova/Maritech system. It comprises sufficient information of traceability from Broodstock and ova, via smolts to harvestable fish, purchases, invoices and suppliers registers.</p> <p>Post-harvest operations performed at: Hardanger Fiskeforedling AS</p> <p>The harvest plant, Hardanger Fiskeforedling AS is in assessment to be certified against ASC CoC Ref. to www.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found.</p>	

10.6 **Traceability 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

Yes

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.

NA see 10.6.1

10.6.3 The point from which chain of custody is required to begin

Products are authorised to enter an ASC Chain of Custody certification at the point where the fish is moved from the wellboat/live fish carrier and delivered direct to the harvest/processing plant. From this point the ASC Salmon Standard certificate stops and the ASC CoC certificate takes over.

Post-harvest operations performed at: Hardanger Fiskeforedling AS

The harvest plant, Hardanger Fiskeforedling AS is in assessment to be certified against ASC CoC

Ref. to www.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found.

As the scope of this ASC Salmon Standard audit is the complete farm, all salmon at the site is included in the scope of this audit, and the fact that the harvest plant has an ASC CoC certification, the risk associated to substitution and mixing of certified with not certified products is very limited or not existing at the site and before the point when the ASC CoC as specified is needed and takes over in the ASC Salmon/ASC CoC certification process.

10.6.4 If a separate chain of custody certificate is required for the unit of certification

No, not for the unit of certification (Jibbersholmane farm)

A separate ASC CoC certification is needed, as specified earlier in the report, for activities e.g Harvest, processing and trading of certified products performed after the ASC Salmon Standard certificate scope stops.

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	<p>The evaluation of the company's compliance to the requirements in the ASC Salmon Standard and all references and findings is described in detail in the report section II Audit template and section IV Audit Report Closing.</p> <p>The principles where full compliance was found is listed below: Principle 1; "Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations". Principle 3; "Protect the health and integrity of wild populations". Principle 5; "Manage disease and parasites in an environmentally responsible manner". Principle 8; "Standards for supplier of smolt".</p> <p>For the rest of the principles listed below: Principle 2; "Conserve natural habitat local biodiversity and ecosystem function". Principle 4; "Use resources in an environmentally efficient and responsible manner". Principle 6; "Develop and operate farms in a social responsible manner". Principle 7; "Be a good neighbour and conscientious citizen".</p> <p>full compliance was not found, although most of these were mainly compliant. The audit hence resulted in a limited number of Major and Minor category Non-Conformities.</p> <p>Reference is made to ASC Farm certification and Accreditation Requirement 17.4.2 and 17.4.3. As the fish were not at harvest size during the audit, harvest was not overseen by the auditor. The audit was timed without including harvest activities to allow the farm to benefit from certification during the initially audited production cycle. The QMS system used related to harvest and procedures and methodology used for harvesting salmon at the site/company was assessed. Harvest is planned to be observed and assessed during relevant surveillance audit of the site/company</p> <p>VRs 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, and not freshwater. - VR nr.97 approved 20.08.2015 by ASC for indicator 5.2.5 for PTI Calculations when Slice is used for treatment against sea lice. Rationale for use of VR 97 during audit is that as for accepted VR 97 the site is using slice on small fish and calculate as in VR 97 according to MTB (Maximum Allowed Biomass) for the sea site. - VR nr.179 approved 24.08.2016 by ASC for audit reports in local language. Rationale for use of VR 179 during this audit is that Scandinavian countries are rated as "very high" in English Proficiency Index. - VR nr.225 approved 23.04.2018 by ASC for indicator 7.1.1, reducing stakeholders / community meetings in-person from bi-annually to once every year</p> <p>VR list and updated documentation for VR can be found on the ASC website: http://variance-requests.asc-aqua.org/</p>
12.2 A clear statement on whether or not the audited unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard(s)	<p>It is expected that site Jibbersholmane has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the ASC Salmon Standard for the future. At this draft report stage the unit of certification has 13 Minor NCs and 1 Major NCs. The closing of Major NCs and closing or relevant corrective actions plan for Minor NCs has to be approved before certification is granted. Final certification decision will be taken in final report after completion of stakeholder period. The site may be considered compliant and recommended certified only after satisfactory closure of Major non-conformances and closure or a corrective action plan for Minor non-conformances is implemented by the client and approved by DNV GL.</p>
12.3 In cases where BEIA or PSIA is 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.	Not applicable.

13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	<p>No, this is the draft report stage.</p> <p>Not yet compliant. May be considered compliant and recommended certified only after satisfactory closure of Major non-conformances and satisfactory closure or a corrective action plan for Minor non-conformances is implemented by the client and approved by DNV GL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final certification decision will be taken in final report after completion of stakeholder period. • Until final certification decision by DNV GL the applicant is NOT yet certified and can not claim ASC Aquaculture certification status.
13.2 The Eligibility Date (if applicable)	<p>The Eligibility Date will be the date of certification if/when certification is granted.</p> <p>Final certification decision will be taken in final report after completion of stakeholder period.</p>
13.3 Is a separate CoC certificate required for the producer? (yes/no)	No, not for the unit of certification.

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.	Final certification decision will be taken in final report
13.4.2 The scope of the certificate	Production of Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>).
13.4.3 Instructions to stakeholders that any complaints or objections to the CAB decision are to be subject to the CAB's complaints procedure. This section shall include information on where to review the procedure and where further information on complaints can be found.	<p>Stakeholders can contact DNV GL and/or Lead Auditor as specified in report section I</p> <p>Audit report opening, contact information is also available in notifications received as stakeholder from DNV GL. Information and documents related to contacting or complaints to DNV GL is available at www.dnvgl.com</p>

14 Surveillance

14.1 Next planned Surveillance	
14.1.1 Planned date	2020 - Specific date not decided at this stage.
14.1.2 Planned site	Jibbersholmane
14.2 Next audit type	
14.2.1 Surveillance 1	SA1 - 2020
14.2.2 Surveillance 2	
14.2.3 Re-certification	
14.2.4 Other (specify type)	