

### **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

20.03.2020

PDF 1.3 CAB Contact Person

PDF 1.3.1 Name of Contact Person

Jan Petter Kosmo

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	jan.petter.kosmo@dnvgl.com
PDF 1.3.5 Phone number	+47 957 48 769
PDF 1.3.6 Other	

**PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client**

PDF 1.4.1 Name of the Client	Nova Sea AS
PDF 1.4.1.a Name of the unit of certification	10893 Rensøya N
PDF 1.4.2 Name of Contact Person	Sabine Fossmo
PDF 1.4.3 Position in the client's organisation	Quality manager

PDF 1.4.4 Mailing address	Nova Sea AS 8764 LOVUND, NORWAY
PDF 1.4.5 Email address	sabine.fossmo@novasea.no
PFD 1.4.6 Phone number	+47 976 89 537
PDF 1.4.7 Other	Phone +47 75 09 19 00

#### 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	<i>Owned</i>
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)

10893 Rensøya N	66°30.172N / 12°04.260E	Atlantic salmon in scope	Owned	SA2: Week 11-2020 (09. In production - 13.03.2020) and week 13-2020 (23. - 27.03.2020). Audit in week 13 to be performed remote due to Corona disease.

#### PDF 1.7 Species and Standards

Standard	Species (scientific name) produced	Included in scope (Yes/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used	Version Number
Salmon 1.3	Salmo salar	Yes	ASC	1.3

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

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in-person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted
Mattilsynet	Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Nordland Fylkeskommune	Local authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications

Kystverket	Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Fiskeridirektoratet	Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Fylkesmannen i Nordland	Local authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Nordland Fylkes Fiskarlag	Fishermen organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Træna Fiskarlag	Fishermen organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications

Træna Kommune	Local authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Træna jeger og friluftsförening	Local hunter and outdoor organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Træna båtforening	Local boat organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Visit Helgeland	Tourist organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Naturvernforbundet i Ytre Helgeland	Nature organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications

Naturvernforbundet i Nordland	Nature organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Opplev Træna	Local tourist organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Træna Kystlag	Local organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Geir Sjøseth (Modolv Sjøset Fisk AS)	Local company	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications
Træna Næringsforum	Local organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	During audit notification - Before Audit	Written notifications


#### PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed:	27.10.2017
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit:	09.03.2020
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s):	Week 11-2020 (09. - 13.03.2020) and week 13-2020 (23. - 27.03.2020). Audit in week 13 to be performed remote due to Corona disease.
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/Decision:	Certification decision made in Initial Audit Final Report 03.04.2018. Site remains certified after Surveillance Audit 2 -2020.

#### PDF 1.10 Audit Team

Column1	Name	ASC Registration
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor	Jan Petter Kosmo
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts	
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor	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	Nova Sea AS
1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Draft Certification Report/ Final certification report/Surveillance report]	ASC Surveillance audit 2, final report
1.3 CAB name	DNV GL Business Assurance Norway AS
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Jan Petter Kosmo
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Jan Petter Kosmo - lead auditor, author of report Darius Pamakstys - social auditor
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Sabine Fossmo - Quality manager
1.7 Date	05.06.2020

## 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) ISA is Infectious salmon anemia virus. 4) BNW is basic need wage. 5) VR is variation request. 5) FHP is Fish health plan. 6) CV is "curriculum vitae" for a fish group. 7) IK is internal control system. 7) NINA is Norwegian institute for Nature Research. 9) IMR is Institute of Marine Research. 10) PD is Pancreas Disease. 11) VHP is Veterinary Health Plan. 12) HMS is HSE (Health, Safety and Environment). 13) H&S is Health and Safety. 14) PPE is Personal Protective Equipment. 15) OHS is Occupational Health and Safety. 16) "Nytek" NS9415 (Norwegian Standard 9415) are technical certifications of Marine fish farms with Requirements for design, dimensioning, production, installation and operation. 17) MTB/MAB is Maximum Allowed Biomass. 18) GG is GLOBALG.A.P. 19) GGN is GLOBALG.A.P. unique registration number. 20) BNW is Basis Needs Wage. 21) Sami population is indigenous population. 22) NIFES is National Institute of Nutrition and Seafood Research. 23) TU is Trade Unions.

## 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 audit of 10893 Rensøya N, 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, accommodations, technical and control room.
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 (*select all the types of audit that apply in the list*)

Surveillance audit 2 - 2020

4.4.1 Number of sites included in the unit of certification

Initial audit - 02/ 2018

Surveillance audit 1 - 05/ 2019

Surveillance audit 2 - 03/ 2020

Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy

Owned by client

Subcontracted by client

10893 Rensøya N

NA

10893 Rensøya N

NA

10893 Rensøya N

NA

4.5 A summary of the major findings

Refer to report section II Audit template, Summary of findings and IV Audit Report - Closing for NCs found during audit.

CONFIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION:

To enhance transparency the company decided to leave all submitted information open and accessible.

4.6 The Audit determination

The final certification decision has been taken after needed activities, as per ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements Version 2.2 April 2019.

The organization/site described in this report is:

- Compliant and thus remains certified.

## 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

[jan.petter.kosmo@dnvgl.com](mailto:jan.petter.kosmo@dnvgl.com)

5.4 Other Contact Information

Phone to DNV GL +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*)

The site is a conventional floating cage salmon farm. The production cages are floating circular cages with pointed nets. Central on the farm is a feed barge, with centralized feeding system and visual/camera control of feeding. All installations are certified according to Norwegian legislation "NS-9415 NYTEK" regulations standard. Smolts supplied by Helgeland Smolt (site Sundsfjord [previous Sundsfjord Smolt]).

**6.3** Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification

GlobalG.A.P. Certified, GGN 4049928437327, valid 2019-05-07 - 2020-05-06.

**6.4** Other certification(s) obtained by the UoC before this audit

**6.5** Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the current year

2020: 1359 tons

<b>6.6</b>	<u>Actual</u> annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>previous</u> year ( mandatory for surveillance and recertification <del>annex 1</del> )	2019: 3523 tons
<b>6.7</b>	Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification (select one or more in the list)	Net cages at sea
<b>6.8</b>	Number of employees working at the unit of certification (see notes in comment to this cell )	5
<b>6.9</b>	Size, and/or number of ponds, pens (if multi site, per site)	20 pens á 90/100/120 meter circumference

## 7 Scope

<b>7.1</b>	The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Salmon Standard, version 1.3 July 2019
<b>7.2</b>	The species produced at the applicant farm (in English and Latin names)	Atlantic Salmon (Salmo salar)

<p><b>7.3</b> 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 site is a seasite with cages/pens of which all are in use for this generation. All cages were covered by the audit. 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, on-growing, only.</p>
<p><b>7.4</b> 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>Fish goes directly from the seasite to the slaughterhouse. Only approved wellboats is used during transshipments of salmon between the site and holding cages/harvest plant. Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting other salmon farms/sites without cleaning/disinfection. The possibility for mixture of salmon in holding 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 holding cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant. Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept in electronic system FishTalk/Landax and in hard copies.</p>

- 7.5** Description of the receiving water body(ies). The farm is located in the fiord Trænfjorden in Nordland county. Site's receiving water-body is Trænfjorden (Træna municipality). Regional water-body authority is Nordland County. This is a coastal water area. Categorized as a coastal waters, of Euhaline nature (>30‰ salinity). Ecological quality is defined as very good. Chemical condition is not defined in public documentation. Details [www.vann-nett.no](http://www.vann-nett.no)
- The site is under voluntary ABM system. There is other salmon farming activity in the area. There are natural wild salmon populations in the area. Overview of salmon watercourses in the area are available in map tools from the Environment Agency / Salmon Registry: <http://lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no/>

## 8 Audit Plan

- 8.1** The names of the auditors and the dates when each of the following were undertaken or completed: conducting the audit, writing of the report, reviewing the report, and taking the certification decision.
- Jan Petter Kosmo, lead auditor  
Darius Pamakstys, social auditor  
Onsite audit was finished 27.03.2020  
Technical Review of Surveillance audit 2 report were finished 03.06.2020  
Surveillance audit 2 report sent to ASC 05.06.2020

- 8.2** Previous Audits (if applicable):

		Standard	Closing deadline - status - closing date of each NC
		NC reference number	
8.2.1	Initial audit - 02/ 2018	IA-2018-1	2.1.1 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
		IA-2018-2	2.1.2 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
		IA-2018-3	2.3.1 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-4	2.5.1 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-5	4.2.1 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-6	4.2.2 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-7	4.3.2 Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-8	4.3.4 Major NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-9	4.3.5 Major NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
		IA-2018-10	4.4.1 Major NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).



Surveillance audit 1 - 05/ 2019	IA-2018-11	4.4.3	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
	IA-2018-12	4.7.1	Major NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
	IA-2018-13	4.7.3	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-14	5.1.6	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-15	5.2.2	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (13.03.2018).
	IA-2018-16	6.1.1	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-17	6.4.1	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (11.03.2018).
	IA-2018-18	6.5.1	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-19	6.5.2	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-20	6.5.3	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (08.04.2018).
	IA-2018-21	6.5.4	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (08.04.2018).
	IA-2018-22	6.5.6	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (08.05.2019).
	IA-2018-23	6.6.2	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (08.04.2018).
	IA-2018-24	6.6.3	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-25	6.7.2	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-26	6.8.1	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (08.04.2018).
	IA-2018-27	7.1.1	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-28	7.1.2	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed (08.04.2018).
	IA-2018-29	7.1.3	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-30	8.1	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-31	8.3	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-32	8.20	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	IA-2018-33	8.23	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA1-2019. Closed in SA1 (10.05.2019).
	SA1-2019-1	4.5.2	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA2-2020. Closed in SA2 (27.03.2020)
	SA1-2019-2	8.1	Major NC. Closing deadline 20.07.2019. Closed (05.07.2019).
	SA1-2019-3	8.14	Minor NC. Closing deadline SA2-2020. Closed in SA2 (27.03.2020)
	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
09. - 13. and 23. - 27. March 2020	Main office Nova Sea AS at Lovund and production site. 09. - 13.03.2020 (on-site) and 23. - 27.03.2020 (remote)
	No inputs from stakeholders received after submitted audit notifications or in audit process.
	Surveillance Audit 2-2020 Report
	Surveillance Audit 2-2020 Report
05.06.2020	Surveillance Audit 2-2020 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.

Sabine Fossmo - Quality manager  
 Stian Amble - Biology and quality Responsible  
 Samuel Anderson - Environment responsible  
 Tommy Sørensen - site manager Rensøya N  
 Kristin Ottesen - veterinarian HaVet  
 Sondre Soma Pohl - HSE responsible  
 Odd Stensland - technical responsible sea production  
 Martin Sagerup - production coordinator  
 Line Holm - Quality manager Helgeland Smolt

The audit was held in the company's office at Lovund, focusing on technical and legal matters, mainly, with relevant operational and administrative staff present. The second part of the audit comprised a visit to the site, covering remaining technical and administrative issues and completed the social responsibility issues. Part of the audit had to be changed from onsite and held as a remote audit due to the COVID-19 situation and in accordance with "ASC policy for audits during the Covid-19 outbreak" dated 18.03.2020. The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including site staff, typically a combination of document reviews and staff interviews. Surveillance Audit follow-up of Non Conformances from previous audit and risk-based periodic review of the social responsibility principles 6 and 7 of ASC Salmon Standard was performed by SA8000 auditor as desktop review of relevant documentation. Demonstrations of equipment and processes took place, relevant to the scope of the audit, according to the ASC Salmon Standard v1.3 and following guidelines in the ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.3.

**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)	Relevance to be contacted	Date of contact	CAB responded Yes/No	Brief summary of points Raised	Use of comment by CAB	Response sent to stakeholder


**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 fallowing period included in the audit (*only for surveillance and re-certification audits*)

NA

**Audit report- ASC Salmon Standard v.1.:**

Corresponds to Salmon standard v. 1.3

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						
Indicator		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	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.	Quality system "Landax" with link to relevant laws, regulations and requirements in procedures. Link to applicable laws and regulations on frontpage of Landax and automatic email to quality manager if new version.	Compliant		
		b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable.	Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland 05.12.2013 for Rensøya N MAB 3600 ton. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 23.08.2016 for Kalvhylla MAB 3120 ton and Rensøy N MAB 3600 ton, licenses N ME0001 and N ME0005.			
		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 by Directorate of Fisheries in 2019 and so far in 2020. No inspection by Fylkesmannen i Nordland in 2019 and so far in 2020. No inspection by Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority in 2019 and so far in 2020. Inspection by NFSA 08.05.2019 resulted in no non-conformances.			
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	Not within conservation area, seen map from Norwegian Environment Agency with protected areas. Impact on the area is evaluated in permit documents and further risk assessed.			
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.	Nova Sea AS registered in official register "Brønnøysundregistrene" with nr. 961056268. Authorized auditor statement for 2018 from pwc - P.E.P 16.05.2019.	Compliant		
		b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	Online access to lovdata.no with laws and regulations.			
		c. Register with national or local authorities as an "aquaculture activity".	Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland 05.12.2013 for Rensøya N MAB 3600 ton. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 23.08.2016 for Kalvhylla MAB 3120 ton and Rensøy N MAB 3600 ton, licenses N ME0001 and N ME0005. Operation plan ("Driftsplan") for 2020 approved by Directorate of Fisheries 10.01.2020 for sites in Nova Sea AS, includes Hestholmen, Rensøy N, Skogsholmen, Buktodden NØ, Skonseng, Sundsøy, Stokkasjøen, Igerøy Ø, Klipen, Kalvhylla, Svinvær, Djupvik, Rendalsvik, Skolsvik, Isbergan, Meløysjøen, Teksmøna, Storvik, Kokvika, Kalvøya, Nordbotnet, Bukkøy Ø and Renga.			

1.1.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	Online access to lovdata.no with laws and regulations.	Compliant		
	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	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 inspection by Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority in 2019 and so far in 2020.			
1.1.4	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.	Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland 05.12.2013 for Rensøya N MAB 3600 ton. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 23.08.2016 for Kalvhylla MAB 3120 ton and Rensøy N MAB 3600 ton, licenses N ME0001 and N ME0005. Operation plan ("Driftsplan") for 2020 approved by Directorate of Fisheries 10.01.2020 for sites in Nova Sea AS, includes Hestholmen, Rensøy N, Skogsholmen, Buktodden NØ, Skonseng, Sundsøy, Stokkasjøen, Igerøy Ø, Klipen, Kalvhylla, Svinvær, Djupvik, Rendalsvik, Skolsvik, Isbergan, Meløysjøen, Teksmøna, Storvik, Kokvika, Kalvøya, Nordbotnet, Bukkøy Ø and Renga.	Compliant		
		b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	As described in above permits. ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 113-5-18ASC Rensøya N. MOM-C survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 03.01.2019 (field work 31.05.2018), report 112-5-18C Rensøya N. MOM-B report by AquaKompetanse 01.06.2018, status 1.			
		c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	Biomass reported to government via Altinn end of each month, e.g. report for February 2020, reported 03.03.2020 biomass 698 tons, 7 cages. Environmental reports and surveys reported to Altinn, e.g. MOM-B 19.06.2018 and MOM-C 04.01.2019			
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.					
<b>Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 2.1 - Modification of the Benthic Sampling Methodology</b> 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.						
	<b>Indicator:</b> Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in	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.	ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 113-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 7 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5).			
		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.	Reference stations: ASC ref 1 and ASC ref2 Stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4 Stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5			

2.1.1	sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1  <b>Requirement:</b> Redox potential > 0 mV or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 µMol/L  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]	c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	Option 1	Compliant		Stations outside AZE: ASC 3: 367 ASC 4: 361
		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).	ASC survey performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass).			
		e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.	Stations outside AZE: ASC 3: 367 ASC 4: 361			
		f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration ( µM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.	Survey according to ASC Salmon Standard v1.1, ISO 5667:2004, ISO 16665:2013			
		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.	Submitted to ASC 02.05.2019			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1  <b>Requirement:</b> 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  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]	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 .				
		a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1).	ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 113-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 7 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5).	Compliant		Stations outside AZE: ASC 3: 3,84 ASC 4: 3,12
		b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement.	#2 Shannon-Wiener Index used			
		c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).	ASC survey performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass).			
		d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method.	#2 Shannon-Wiener Index used			
		e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method.	Stations outside AZE: ASC 3: 3,84 ASC 4: 3,12			
		f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.	#2 Shannon-Wiener Index used			
		g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.	#2 Shannon-Wiener Index used			
		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.	Survey according to ASC Salmon Standard v1.1, ISO 5667:2004, ISO 16665:2013			

		i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 02.05.2019			
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] <a href="http://www.azti.es/en/ambi-azti-marine-biotic-index.html">http://www.azti.es/en/ambi-azti-marine-biotic-index.html</a> .					
2.1.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<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>c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.</p>	<p>ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 113-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 7 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5). Report 60396.01 "Aqua Kompetanse. ASC-C undersøkelse Rensøy, 2018. Bløtbunn" Akvaplan niva 12.09.2018 regarding soft-bed.</p> <p>Survey according to ASC Salmon Standard v1.1, ISO 5667:2004, ISO 16665:2013, NS 9410:2016, M-608/2016 "Grenseverdier for klassifisering av vann, sediment og biota" (Miljødirektoratet 2016) and guidance 02:2013 (rev 2015) "Klassifisering av miljøtilstand i vann". Pollution indicator species based on ecologic groups as described in Norwegian Sensitivity Index (NSI) for marine macro invertebrates (2013).</p> <p>Stations inside AZE: ASC 1: 2 ASC 2: &gt;2 ASC 3: 2</p> <p>Survey according to ASC Salmon Standard v1.1, ISO 5667:2004, ISO 16665:2013, NS 9410:2016, M-608/2016 "Grenseverdier for klassifisering av vann, sediment og biota" (Miljødirektoratet 2016) and guidance 02:2013 (rev 2015) "Klassifisering av miljøtilstand i vann". Pollution indicator species based on ecologic groups as described in Norwegian Sensitivity Index (NSI) for marine macro invertebrates (2013).</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 09.05.2019</p>	Compliant	Stations inside AZE: ASC 1: 2 ASC 2: >2 ASC 3: 2	
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).					
		a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern.	ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 1137-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5).			



2.1.4	<b>Indicator:</b> Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible modelling system	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].	ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 1137-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5).	Compliant			
	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]	c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data.	ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 1137-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5).				
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Weekly average percent saturation [9] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [10] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4  <b>Requirement:</b> ≥ 70% [11]  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [11]	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.1 - Monitoring Average Weekly Percent Saturation of Dissolved Oxygen</b> 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: - 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.  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.  <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.  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.					
		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.	Seen record for week 12-2019 to 08-2020. Minimum 77,0% oxygen and minimum 6,9 mg oxygen per liter.	Compliant		≥ 70%	
		b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.	No missing data				
		c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.	Seen record for week 12-2019 to 08-2020. Minimum 77,0% oxygen and minimum 6,9 mg oxygen per liter.				
		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).	No measurements below 70% dissolved oxygen has been registered/observed. No measurements below 2 mg/l dissolved oxygen has been registered/observed.				
		e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.	AkvaGroup sensor system. Change of "cap" every second year.				

		f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/L DO <b>Requirement:</b> 5% <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/L DO.  b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	All above limits.  Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020	Compliant		0 %
2.2.3	<b>Indicator:</b> 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] <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [15] <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [15]	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  b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.  c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.	Classification and targets for water bodies at the website vann-nett (run by The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate).  Very good ecologic state for coastal water in "Trænfjorden" at website vann-nett (run by The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate).  Very good	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	<b>Indicator:</b> 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 <b>Requirement:</b> Consistency with reference site <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [16]	a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months.  b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.  c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	Classification and targets for water bodies at the website vann-nett (run by The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate).  Classification and targets for water bodies at the website vann-nett (run by The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate).  Classification and targets for water bodies at the website vann-nett (run by The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate).	N/A	Classification and targets for water bodies at the website vann-nett (run by The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate).	
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [17]) of the farm on a production cycle basis  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand</b> 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. $BOD = ((\text{total N in feed} - \text{total N in fish}) * 4.57) + ((\text{total C in feed} - \text{total C in fish}) * 2.67)$ .  • 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 <a href="http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html">http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html</a> .  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.  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.				
		a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.	Previous cycle (2017G): BOD (mTO2) 3604. Last full cycle (2018G): BOD (mTO2) 4608.	Compliant		Last full cycle (2018G): BOD (mTO2) 4608.
		b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 27.03.2020			
Footnote	[17] BOD calculated as: $((\text{total N in feed} - \text{total N in fish}) * 4.57) + ((\text{total C in feed} - \text{total C in fish}) * 2.67)$ . 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 <a href="http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html">http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html</a> .					
2.2.6	<b>Indicator:</b> 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.  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Document control systems in good culture and hygiene that includes all appropriate elements.	Approved veterinary drugs according to VHP. Substitution of chemicals to reduce use of harmful chemicals. Seen digital cleaning plan and log, clean and tidy on site.	Compliant		
		b. Apply the systems ensuring that staff are aware, qualified and trained to properly implement them.	Verified during audit			
		-	ASC survey by Aqua kompetanse AS 19.12.2018 (field work 31.05.2018), report 1137-5-18ASC Rensøya N, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: ASC ref1 and ASC ref2, stations outside AZE: ASC 3 and ASC 4, stations inside AZE: ASC 1, ASC 2 and ASC 5).			
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>		<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>		
2.3.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of fines [18] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [20] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2)  <b>Requirement:</b> < 1% by weight of the feed  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Instruction "Instruks for kontroll av for og foringsanlegg for støv og knus" 19.12.2019 regarding feed samples (frequency, sieve opening, amount, etc.). Procedure "Mottakskontroll av for og foravvikshåndtering" 29.01.2018 describes quarterly testing, sampling method, feed reception, etc.		Compliant	0,14 %
		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.	Seen sampling plan and record for Nova Sea with quarterly sampling. Q4-2019, 0,14% fines				
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	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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 assessments in Landax includes predators, escape, noise, lice, medicaments, light, exhaust, carbon dioxide, etc.		Compliant		
		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 assessments evaluated and updated regularly. Separate plans for reducing risk.				
		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.	Report "Biodiversitetshäfte 2020" with species and referrals to relevant risk assessments. Report "Lokal miljøvurdering ved bruk av medikamentelle behandlinger" 31.10.2017 regarding potential impact by the use of medicament treatments. Seen email 11.09.2019 with consideration Slice / AMX use at Rensøya N with environmental concerns. Risk assessments in Landax includes predators, escape, noise, lice, medicaments, light, exhaust, carbon dioxide, etc.				
2.4.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [20] or High Conservation Value Areas [21] (HCVAs)  <b>Requirement:</b> None [22]  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [22]	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to Requirements that Farms are not sited within Protected Areas or HCVAs</b> The following exceptions shall be made for Indicator 2.4.2:  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).  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.  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.  <b>Definitions</b> <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."  <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					

	<div>a. Provide Geographical Information System (GIS) files according to ASC guidelines (see note above) showing the boundaries of the farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) as defined above (see also 1.1.1a)</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div>	<div>Not within conservation area, seen map from Norwegian Environment Agency with protected areas.</div> <div>Statement site not in HCVA, 29.11.2017 signed Odd Strøm - Nova Sea AS.</div> <div>Not within HCVA</div> <div>Not within HCVA</div>	N/A	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 ( <a href="http://www.hcvnetwork.org/">http://www.hcvnetwork.org/</a> ).				
Footnote	<div>[22] The following exceptions shall be made for Standard 2.4.2:</div> <div><div>• 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).</div><div>• 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.</div><div>• 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.</div></div>				
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	<div>Indicator: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used</div> <div>Requirement: 0</div> <div>Applicability: All</div>	<div>a. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs have been used by the farm.</div> <div>-</div>	<div>ADD/AHD used from 26.05.2017 - 10.12.2017. Not in use now.</div> <div>No ADD/AHD used.</div> <div>Verified not in use on site.</div>	Compliant	0
		<div>a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.</div>	<div>Procedure "Fellingstillatelse, avlving, dødsfall av predatorer og/eller rødlistearter og rapportering" 12.09.2019 includes welfare, written approval from production manager/daily manger, reporting, recording, etc.</div> <div>In procedure, link to list "Rødlistearter (2015) i Nordland, relevante naturtyper" with endangered and critical species in the area.</div>		

2.5.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Number of mortalities [25] of endangered or red-listed [26] marine mammals or birds on the farm  <b>Requirement:</b> 0 (zero)  <b>Applicability:</b> All	b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.	Landax non-conformance system from 01.04.2019 - present gives 5 incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) with search for "biodiversitet". None of the species endangered. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G. None of the species endangered. FishTalk site diary includes predator records 01.04.2019 - present, 0 mortalities of endangered species.	Compliant		0
		c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.	Landax non-conformance system from 01.04.2019 - present gives 5 incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) with search for "biodiversitet". None of the species endangered. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G. None of the species endangered. FishTalk site diary includes predator records 01.04.2019 - present, 0 mortalities of endangered species.			
		d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1)	List "EN og CR fugler og sjøpattedyr for Nordland" with endangered and critical birds and mammals in the area 14.03.2019.			
		-	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [28]  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G. Dead in roof-net: 1x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus. Live in roof-net and lethal action performed: 2x Phalacrocorax carbo	Compliant		
		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.	2 Phalacrocorax carbo killed (17.02.2019 and 19.02.2019). The birds were entangled in the bird net, and according to Norwegian law for animal welfare, killed considering the welfare (could not live or be rescued) of the birds. In such cases the bird could be killed.			
		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].	According to procedure "Fellingstillatelse, avliving, dødsfall av predatorer og/eller rødlistearter og rapportering" 12.09.2019.			
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.					
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>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"</b></p> <p>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:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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.</p>						

2.5.4	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [30] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [29]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Company website (www.novasea.no) states 0 lethal incidents on the 2017G. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G.	Compliant		
		a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.3), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.	Company website (www.novasea.no) states 0 lethal incidents on the 2017G. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G.			
		b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.4a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).	Company website (www.novasea.no) states 0 lethal incidents on the 2017G. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G.			
Footnote	[29] Posting results on a public website is an example of “easily publicly available.” Shall be made available within 30 days of the incident and see Appendix VI for transparency requirements.					
2.5.5	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of lethal incidents [30] on the farm over the prior two years  <b>Requirement:</b> < 9 lethal incidents [31], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Company website (www.novasea.no) states 0 lethal incidents on the 2017G. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G.	Compliant		5
		b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.	Company website (www.novasea.no) states 0 lethal incidents on the 2017G. Company website (www.novasea.no) states 5 lethal incidents (3x Phalacrocorax carbo and 2x Larus canus) on the 2018G.			
		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 28.02.2020			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	Risk assessments in Landax includes predators, e.g. risk 283 updated 07.06.2019.	Compliant		
		b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.6a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents.	Risk assessments evaluated and updated regularly. Separate plans for reducing risk.			
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.					
<b>Instruction to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1</b> 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: 1) the farm does not release any water to the natural environment; or 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).  Auditors shall fully document the rationale for any such exemptions in the audit report.						

3.1.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme.	ABM agreement "Samarbeide subregion Helgeland" for the area from Nord-Trøndelag to Meløy in Nordland, includes lice and treatments. Cooperation is managed by HaVet and cooperation between all farmers in the region. Agreement still in progress, seen production plan for subregion (from Bolga - Bindal) until 2020. Operation plan ("Driftsplan") for 2020 approved by Directorate of Fisheries 10.01.2020 for sites in Nova Sea AS, includes Hestholmen, Rensøy N, Skogsholmen, Buktodden NØ, Skonseng, Sundsøy, Stokkasjøen, Igerøy Ø, Klipen, Kalvhylla, Svinvær, Djupvik, Rendalsvik, Skolsvik, Isbergan, Meløysjøen, Teksmøna, Størvik, Kokvika, Kalvøya, Nordbotnet, Bukkøy Ø and Renga.	Compliant		
		b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including: - coordination of stocking; - fallowing; - therapeutic treatments; and - information sharing.	Seen MoM from HaVet leading a meeting in 22.10.2019 regarding status, production areas, agreement, knowledge sharing, election of leader, etc. Participants: HaVet (secretary), Nova Sea, MOWI, Sinkaberg-Hansen, Kobbvågslaks, LetSea, Seløy Sjøfarm, Lovundlaks, Havbrukssenteret, Selsøyvik Havbruk, etc. Seen weekly lice report for Subregion Helgeland made by HaVet, updated for week 12 in 2020, includes lice numbers, treatments, temperature in zones. Includes data from all producers/sites in the area.			
		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.	Seen MoM from HaVet leading a meeting in 22.10.2019 regarding status, production areas, agreement, knowledge sharing, election of leader, etc. Participants: HaVet (secretary), Nova Sea, MOWI, Sinkaberg-Hansen, Kobbvågslaks, LetSea, Seløy Sjøfarm, Lovundlaks, Havbrukssenteret, Selsøyvik Havbruk, etc. Seen weekly lice report for Subregion Helgeland made by HaVet, updated for week 12 in 2020, includes lice numbers, treatments, temperature in zones. Includes data from all producers/sites in the area.			
		d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
		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.				



3.1.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]</p>	<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>Project "Elveovervåking Helgeland" regarding status for anadromous fish stocks in an assumed farming influenced area. Seen project description with participants from Nova Sea, Ferskvannsbiologen and Skandinavisk naturovervåking, signed by Nova Sea, Lovundlaks, Kvarøy fiskeoppdrett, 05.07.2017 regarding financial contribution.</p> <p>Project regarding spawning area in Nordland ("Nordland 2023"), cooperates with GIFAS and Norsk Villaksforvaltning.</p> <p>Participation in project "Marin overvåking Nordland" regarding the influence of farming, with e.g. Akvaplan NIVA, NCE Aquaculture, NINA and University in Nordland. Contributes with man-hours, samples, equipment and financial.</p> <p>Participation in project group in project "Automatisk sorteringsanlegg for anadrom fisk" together with Mosjøen og Omegn Næringsutvikling and Kunnskapsparken Helgeland. Both participation and economic support.</p> <p>Supports master thesis (access to equipment and sites) at University in Nordland.</p> <p>Stated on GIFAS website: GIFAS cooperates with Sundsfjord Smolt.</p> <p>Project "Climefish", financed by European Union. Nova Sea AS delivers data from 7 sites to Nofima. Presentation "Climate change and salmon aquaculture" presented at Arctic Frontiers, Tromsø 20-24. January 2019.</p> <p>Company delivers data to Barentswatch which is a source for data for research, etc.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- providing researchers with access to farm-level data;</li> <li>- granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or</li> <li>- facilitating research activities in some equivalent way.</li> </ul>	<p>Some of the projects described in 3.1.2 a. 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>Not denied projects from NGOs, academics and governments in 2016 to so far in 2019.</p> <p>Procedure "Forskningssamarbeid" 11.09.2019 regarding a documented process for handling research requests and cooperation.</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>Project "Elveovervåking Helgeland" regarding status for anadromous fish stocks in an assumed farming influenced area. Seen project description with participants from Nova Sea, Ferskvannsbilogen and Skandinavisk naturovervåking, signed by Nova Sea, Lovundlaks, Kvarøy fiskeoppdrett, 05.07.2017 regarding financial contribution.</p> <p>Project regarding spawning area in Nordland ("Nordland 2023"), cooperates with GIFAS and Norsk Villaksforvaltning. Seen minutes of meeting 26.-27-08-2019 from Norsk Villaksforvaltning 12.09.2019</p> <p>Participation in project "Marin overvåking Nordland" regarding the influence of farming, with e.g. Akvaplan NIVA, NCE Aquaculture, NINA and University in Nordland. Contributes with man-hours, samples, equipment and financial. Seen email from M.J. - NCE Aquaculture 04.10.2017 regarding the project.</p> <p>Supports master thesis (access to equipment and sites) at University in Nordland. Seen master thesis May 2013 naming O.A.F. and S.A. - Nova Sea AS as fatnes og Stian Amble.</p> <p>Stated on GIFAS website: GIFAS cooperates with Sundsfjord Smolt.</p> <p>Project "Climefish", financed by European Union. Nova Sea AS delivers data from 7 sites to Nofima. Seen email from researcher at University of Stirling 05.03.2020 regarding data from Nova Sea AS.</p> <p>Company delivers data to Barentswatch which is a source for data for research, etc.</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><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the entire ABM; and</li><li>- the individual farm.</li></ul>	<p>Norwegian Food Safety Authority set limits and governmental treatment regime for site and ABM, while ABM/HaVet define actual operations and treatment regime. Sea lice load reported to Altinn weekly and made public on <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a>. ABM/HaVet reports status in area monthly to participating companies.</p>	Minor	<p>0,85 mature female lice per fish (week 31), 1,14 mature female lice per fish (week 39), 0,80 mature female lice per fish (week 40) and 0,58 mature female lice per fish (week 50) in 2019 (legal limit 0,5).</p> <p>26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 5257 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.</p>	
	<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 load reported to Altinn weekly and made public on <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a>. ABM/HaVet reports status in area monthly to participating companies.</p> <p>No monitoring of wild salmon allowed, feedback from governmental monitoring of wild salmon incorporated.</p>				
	<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.</p>	<p>NFSA set limits and governmental treatment regime for site and ABM. Recorded in FishTalk, and automatic reported to Altinn weekly.</p> <p>0,85 mature female lice per fish (week 31), 1,14 mature female lice per fish (week 39), 0,80 mature female lice per fish (week 40) and 0,58 mature female lice per fish (week 50) in 2019 (legal limit 0,5).</p> <p>In sensitive period 2019 (week 21-26), max. 0,00 mature female lice per fish (legal limit 0,2).</p> <p>Max. 0,46 mature female lice per fish (week 2) from week 1 - 8 in 2020 (legal limit 0,5).</p> <p>See 3.1.7 for sensitive period.</p> <p>26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 5257 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.</p>				
	<p>d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020</p>				

3.1.4	<b>Indicator:</b> Frequent [35] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [36] within seven days of testing  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	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).	Procedure "Kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus" 08.02.2020 states counting of lice on 20 fish per cage in week 19 to 26, and counting of lice on 10 fish per cage in week 27 to 18. Counting of lice according to regulation "Lakselusforskriften" and guidance to the regulation. Average from count in each cage reported to governments. Includes ASC limit of 0,2 in sensitive period after July 2019. Seen weekly report with ASC limit in sensitive period.	Compliant		
		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.	Sea lice load reported to Altinn weekly and made public on <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a> . No missing data for 18G.			
		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.	Procedure "Kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus" 08.02.2020 states counting of lice on 20 fish per cage in week 19 to 26, and counting of lice on 10 fish per cage in week 27 to 18. Counting of lice according to regulation "Lakselusforskriften" and guidance to the regulation. Average from count in each cage reported to governments. Includes ASC limit of 0,2 in sensitive period after July 2019. Seen weekly report with ASC limit in sensitive period.			
		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.	Reported weekly to Altinn. Results available at <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a> (also link to Barentswatch on company website).			
		e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.	Sea lice load reported to Altinn weekly and made public on <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a> .			
		f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
		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."					
	<b>Indicator:</b> 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	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmonid Health and Migration</b>  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.  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.  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".  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.				

3.1.5	<b>Indicators of the farm</b>  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Salmo salar naturally occurring in area.</p> <p>Reports "Beiarnelva og Saltdalselva" 2008 - 2012 by Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, "Oppvandring av anadrom laksefisk i 10 vassdrag i Nordland i 2012 - en vurdering av innslag av rømt oppdrettsfisk" by Ferskvannsbiologen and "Sluttrapport til Mattilsynet av lakselussituasjonen på vill laksefisk langs Norskekysten i 2011" by Institute of Marine Research. "Risikorapport Norsk fiskeoppdrett 2019" by IMR. Seen Map from "lakseregisteret" by Norwegian Environment Agency as basis for map with farm and an area of 80 km around (includes salmon rivers/waterways). Participates in research project regarding lice on wild salmon (Sila/Flostrand).</p> <p>Sensitive period defined in regulation "Forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus i akvakulturanlegg", states less than 0,2 adult female lice per fish from Monday week 21 to Sunday week 26.</p> <p>Sufficient awareness demonstrated in interview.</p>	Compliant		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> 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.  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	<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.</p> <p>b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI.</p>	<p>Salmo salar naturally occurring in area.</p> <p>Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law. Participates in research project regarding lice on wild salmon (Sila/Flostrand).</p> <p>Reports "Beiarnelva og Saltdalselva" 2008 - 2012 by Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, "Oppvandring av anadrom laksefisk i 10 vassdrag i Nordland i 2012 - en vurdering av innslag av rømt oppdrettsfisk" by Ferskvannsbiologen and "Sluttrapport til Mattilsynet av lakselussituasjonen på vill laksefisk langs Norskekysten i 2011" by Institute of Marine Research. "Risikorapport Norsk fiskeoppdrett 2019" by IMR. Seen Map from "lakseregisteret" by Norwegian Environment Agency as basis for map with farm and an area of 80 km around (includes salmon rivers/waterways). Participates in research project regarding lice on wild salmon (Sila/Flostrand).</p> <p>Map at <a href="http://www.lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no">www.lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no</a>. Reports at <a href="http://www.nina.no">www.nina.no</a> and <a href="http://www.imr.no">www.imr.no</a>.</p> <p>Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.</p>	<p>Salmo salar naturally occurring in area.</p>			

3.1.7	<b>Indicator:</b> In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish [39]. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2.	b. Establish the sensitive periods [39] of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.	Sensitive period defined in regulation "Forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus i akvakulturanlegg", states less than 0,2 adult female lice per fish from Monday week 21 to Sunday week 26.	Compliant	0,00
	<b>Requirement:</b> 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish	c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2.	In sensitive period 2019 (week 21-26), max. 0,00 mature female lice per fish (legal limit 0,2).		
	<b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [32]	d. Provide the CAB with evidence there is a 'feedback loop' between the targets for on-farm lice levels and the results of monitoring of lice levels on wild salmonids (Appendix II-2).	Continuous wild fish sealice monitoring not possible (not allowed according to national legislation). Monitoring done by governmental research institutes. Direct feedback loop hence impossible to obtain.		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [40]  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.	N/A	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.
		b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before June 13, 2012.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.		
		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.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.		
		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).	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.		
		-	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.		
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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All [43]</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.2.2 - Exceptions to Allow Production of Non-Native Species</b></p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.2, "jurisdiction" is defined the same as "area" in 3.2.1.</p>		N/A	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.	
		a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI).	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
		b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.			
		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).	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.			
		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.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.			
		e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.			
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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.	N/A	Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.	
		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.	Health report Nordland Rensefisk by HaVet 04.07.2019 for delivery of lumpfish in week 27-2019.			
		c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.	Salmo salar is native in the region. Cyclopterus lumpus is native in the region.			
Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):		
3.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Use of transgenic [44] salmon by the farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.	Nova Sea policy "Nova Sea konsernpolitikk for mattrygghet, dyrevelferd, kvalitet, miljø, energi og klima" approved by Odd Strøm 14.03.2019, states no use of genmodified fish or feed.	Compliant		
		b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	AquaGen statement, 15.01.2019, FL - AquaGen, no GM.			
		c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.	Purchase only smolt of AquaGen origin.			

Footnote	[44] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them						
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of escapees [46] in the most recent production cycle  <b>Requirement:</b> 300 [47]  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.  b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle.  c. Maintain the monitoring records described in 3.4.1a for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [47]).  d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [47]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the farm could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.  e. Submit escape monitoring dataset to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (www.fiskeridir.no).  0 escapes in the most recent production cycle.  No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (www.fiskeridir.no).  No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (www.fiskeridir.no).  Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020	Compliant		0	
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Accuracy [48] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers  <b>Requirement:</b> ≥ 98%	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.  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).  c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).	Counting performed at FW site, vaccination numbers used for stocking number at sea net cage. Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered. Statement from Vaki 98 - 100% accuracy (vaccine machines "Macro and Micro"), machines used by Helgeland Smolt and Sundsfjord Smolt. Statement from AquaScan fishcounter (1 - 30 kg) 98 - 100% accuracy, machines used by wellboat. Fishcounter at calibrated and adjusted, control shows deviation of 1,3% (4 deliveries by Novatrans).  Vaccination numbers in FW used as accurate number stocked.  Counting not performed at site	Compliant		98-100%	

	Applicability: All	-	Counting performed at FW site, vaccination numbers used for stocking number at sea net cage. Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered. Statement from Vaki 98 - 100% accuracy (vaccine machines "Macro and Micro"), machines used by Helgeland Smolt and Sundsfjord Smolt. Statement from AquaScan fishcounter (1 - 30 kg) 98 - 100% accuracy, machines used by wellboat. Fishcounter at calibrated and adjusted, control shows deviation of 1,3% (4 deliveries by Novatrans).			
		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).	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
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	Indicator: Estimated unexplained loss [49] of farmed salmon is made publicly available  Requirement: Yes  Applicability: All	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss</b> The Estimated Unexplained Loss (EUL) of fish is calculated at the end of each production cycle as follows:  EUL = (stocking count) - (harvest count) - (mortalities) - (recorded escapes)  Units for input variables are number of fish (i.e. counts) per production cycle. Where possible, farms should use the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count. This formula is adapted from footnote 59 of the ASC Salmon Standard.		Minor	EUL 18G: 2,3% (18 426 fish). 02.04.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo, NC closed based on Nova Sea AS internal NC 6863 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	2,30 %
	a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1).	Specific site reports and records documented and available in production and recording system.				
	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.	EUL 17G: 0,15% (1 113 fish). EUL 18G: 2,3% (18 426 fish). 02.04.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo, NC closed based on Nova Sea AS internal NC 6863 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.				
	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.	Seen on ASC dashboard at company website, www.novasea.no				
	d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020				
	-	EUL not within normal range. 02.04.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo, NC closed based on Nova Sea AS internal NC 6863 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.				
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.					
		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.	Procedure "Forebygge og avdekke rømming" 17.10.2018 regarding escape prevention and to discover escape. Contingency plans at site includes escape limitation, information, actions, catch, reporting, measures and evaluation.			



3.4.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<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"><li>- net strength testing;</li><li>- appropriate net mesh size;</li><li>- net traceability;</li><li>- system robustness;</li><li>- predator management;</li><li>- record keeping;</li><li>- reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors);</li><li>- planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and</li><li>- planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies.</li></ul>	<p>Procedure "Klargjøring av lokalitet" 09.05.2019 regarding preparations before release of fish, net inspection, mooring inspection, etc.</p> <p>Procedure "Prosedyre for nøter" 05.02.2019 regarding net and prevention of escape by inspection, reporting of deviation and documentation.</p> <p>Procedures refers to "Brukerhåndbok" for specific measures per equipment.</p> <p>Procedure "Drift og vedlikehold av flytekrager, hamsterhjul, m.m." 07.03.2019 regarding equipment, inspection and documentation.</p> <p>Procedures refers to "Brukerhåndbok" for specific measures per equipment.</p> <p>In Nova Sea only personnel with certificate of apprenticeship or escape prevention training can inspect farm.</p>	Compliant	
		<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"><li>- system robustness;</li><li>- predator management;</li><li>- record keeping;</li><li>- reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors);</li><li>- planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and</li><li>- planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies.</li></ul>	<p>Open system</p>		
		<p>d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.</p>	<p>Farm certificate "APN-011" by Akvaplan niva 25.04.2016 valid for 5 years.</p> <p>No nets in sea during audit.</p> <p>Inspections of farm recorded in Havbruksloggen, one inspections listed as overdue (no fish in farm and the farm is preparing for new release).</p> <p>Seen contingency plan regarding escape.</p>		
		<p>e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.</p>	<p>Escape prevention training or certificate of apprenticeship needed for staff performing inspection of site.</p> <p>Seen examples of certificate of apprenticeship.</p>		
		<p>-</p>	<p>Verified during interview.</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><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds</b></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 4.4.2. 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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [50].</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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].</p>	<p>Previous generation (17G): 3 761 239 kg total (100% Skretting). Last complete generation (18G): 4 849 214 (94% MOWI Feed and 6% EWOS) Cargill: <a href="http://www.cargill.com">www.cargill.com</a> MOWI Feed: <a href="http://www.mowi.com">www.mowi.com</a> Skretting: <a href="http://www.skretting.com">www.skretting.com</a></p> <p>Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to Skretting 09.11.2017. Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in email to MOWI Feed 10.02.2020.</p> <p>Cargill: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373825744, valid to 16.06.2020. Skretting: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.2020 MOWI Feed: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4056186198808, valid to 10.07.2020.</p> <p>Method #2</p> <p>EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020. MOWI Feed: "Statement on compound fish Feed", 15.10.2019. Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.</p>	Compliant			

		-	Statement and certificate 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	<b>Indicator:</b> Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1)  <b>Requirement:</b> < 1.2  <b>Applicability:</b> All	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.2.1 - Calculation of FFDRm</b>  Farms must calculate the Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the client understands how to accurately calculate FFDRm;</li><li>- the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate FFDRm (i.e. all feed specs for &gt; 6 months) for the current production cycle; and</li><li>- 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 &lt; 1.2).</li></ul>					
		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.	Last complete generation (18G): 4 849 214 (94% MOWI Feed and 6% EWOS) Ewos FFDRm: 0,52 (trimmings 39,9%). MOWI feed FFDRm: 0,45 (trimmings 12%). Cargill (EWOS) statement "Erklæring - Dokumentasjon og informasjon om fór levert iht. ASC" 04.07.2018. Marine Harvest Fish Feed statement "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC feed requirements in ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture", January 2018.		Compliant		Previous full cycle 2018G: FFDRm 0,48
		b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.	Ewos FFDRm: 0,52 (trimmings 39,9%). MOWI feed FFDRm: 0,45 (trimmings 12%).				
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).	Previous full cycle 2018G: eFCR 1,07				
		d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.	Previous full cycle 2018G: FFDRm 0,48				
		e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 27.03.2020				
4.2.2	<b>Indicator:</b> 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)	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.					Previous full
		a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.	Last complete generation (18G): 4 849 214 (94% MOWI Feed and 6% EWOS) Ewos FFDRo 1,42 (trimmings 25,7%). MOWI feed FFDRo: 1,73 (trimmings 5%).				
		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.	Ewos FFDRo 1,42 (trimmings 25,7%). MOWI feed FFDRo: 1,73 (trimmings 5%).				

	<p><b>Requirement:</b> FFDRo &lt; 2.52 or (EPA + DHA) &lt; 30 g/kg feed</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.</p> <p>d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.</p> <p>e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2.</p> <p>f. Submit FFDRo or EPA &amp; DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Previous full cycle 2018G: FFDRo 1,83</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 27.03.2020</p>	Compliant		Previous full cycle 2018G: FFDRo 1,83
Footnote	<p>[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 (<a href="http://www.iucnredlist.org">http://www.iucnredlist.org</a>).</p>					
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
4.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Not required</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> N/A</p>	-				
Footnote	<p>[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.</p>					
Footnote	<p>[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.</p>					
		<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.2 - FishSource Score of Fish Used in Feed</b></p> <p>To determine FishSource scores of the fish species used as feed ingredients, do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-go to <a href="http://www.fishsource.org/">http://www.fishsource.org/</a></li><li>- type the species into the search function box and choose the accurate fishery</li><li>-confirm that the search identifies the correct fishery then scroll down or click on the link from the menu on the left reads "Scores"</li></ul> <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><b>Indicator:</b> 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>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).</p>	<p>MOWI Feed: "Statement on compound fish feed" 15.10.2019 and "ASC FM FO use update Rensøya and Hestholmen" updated March 2020</p> <p>Skretting: "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture", January 2018 and "2018 marine raw material mass balance calculation Skretting Norway".</p> <p>Cargill (EWOS): "Erklæring - Dokumentasjon og informasjon om før levert iht. ASC" 13.03.2020.</p>			

4.3.2	<p><b>Requirement:</b> All individual scores <math>\geq 6</math>, and biomass score <math>\geq 6</math></p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>b. Confirm that each individual score <math>\geq 6</math> and the biomass score is <math>\geq 6</math>.</p>	<p>Mass balance approach to demonstrate compliance through the species purchased and which comply with the ASC requirement. Skretting 2018: 51,5 - 87,9% of fishmeal from whole fish (ASC compliant), 12,1% - 48,5% of fishmeal from byproducts/trimmings (ASC compliant), 47,6 - 67,5% of fishoil from whole fish (ASC compliant) and 32,5 - 52,4% of fishoil from byproducts/trimmings (ASC compliant). Cargill (EWOS) 2019: 98,8% of fishmeal are ASC compliant, 80,1% of fishoil from whole fish are ASC compliant. MOWI Feed 2018G: 73% of fishmeal are ASC compliant, 54% of fishoil from whole fish are ASC compliant.</p>	Compliant		All individual scores $\geq 6$ , and biomass score $\geq 6$
		<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as a priority for assessment.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>	Independent assessment for all species included in the feed			
		-	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><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.3 - Third-Party Verification of Traceability</b></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: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.2020 Cargill: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373825744, valid to 16.06.2020. MOWI Feed: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4056186198808, valid to 10.07.2020.</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: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.2020 Cargill: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373825744, valid to 16.06.2020. MOWI Feed: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4056186198808, valid to 10.07.2020.</p>			
	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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</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>MOWI Feed: "Statement on compound fish feed" 15.10.2019 and "ASC FM FO use update Rensøya and Hestholmen" updated March 2020 Skretting: "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture", January 2018 and "2018 marine raw material mass balance calculation Skretting Norway". Cargill (EWOS): "Erklæring - Dokumentasjon og informasjon om før levert iht. ASC" 13.03.2020.</p>			

4.3.4	<p>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><b>Requirement:</b> None [59]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except as noted in [59]</p>	<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>EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020. MOWI Feed: "Policy on sustainable salmon feed". Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.</p>	Compliant		
		<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>EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020. MOWI Feed: "Policy on sustainable salmon feed". Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.</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><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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>www.cargill.com "Cargill Supplier Code of Conduct" www.skretting.com "Nutreco Supplier Code of Conduct" www.mowi.com "Leading the Blue revolution plan"</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 regarding feed raw material sources, 11.03.2018 approved by Odd Strøm - Nova Sea AS.</p>				
	<p>c. Compile a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients in all feed.</p>	<p>MOWI Feed: "Statement on compound fish feed" 15.10.2019 and "ASC FM FO use update Rensøya and Hestholmen" updated March 2020 Skretting: "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture", January 2018 and "2018 marine raw material mass balance calculation Skretting Norway". Cargill (EWOS): "Erklæring - Dokumentasjon og informasjon om før levert iht. ASC" 13.03.2020.</p>				
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 <a href="http://www.iucnredlist.org/">http://www.iucnredlist.org/</a> .					
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						
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>	<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>			
4.4.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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]</p>	<p>a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a)</p>	<p>Cargill: <a href="http://www.cargill.com">www.cargill.com</a> MOWI Feed: <a href="http://www.mowi.com">www.mowi.com</a> Skretting: <a href="http://www.skretting.com">www.skretting.com</a></p>	Compliant		
		<p>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.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.cargill.com">www.cargill.com</a> "Cargill Supplier Code of Conduct" <a href="http://www.skretting.com">www.skretting.com</a> "Nutreco Supplier Code of Conduct" <a href="http://www.mowi.com">www.mowi.com</a> "Policy on sustainable salmon feed"</p>			

	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.	Skretting: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.2020 Cargill: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4050373825744, valid to 16.06.2020. MOWI Feed: GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4056186198808, valid to 10.07.2020.			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [62]  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.  b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent)  c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b).  d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed.  e. Provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [62]	Statement regarding feed raw material sources, 14.03.2019 approved by Odd Strøm - Nova Sea AS.  Statement regarding feed raw material sources, 14.03.2019 approved by Odd Strøm - Nova Sea AS.  Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to Skretting 09.11.2017. Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in email to Mowi Feed 10.02.2020. Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to Cargill/EWOS 30.07.2018 and 10.02.2020.  EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020 and "Cargill Aqua Nutrition Sustainability Report 2018" MOWI Feed: "Policy on sustainable salmon feed". Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.  EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020 and "Cargill Aqua Nutrition Sustainability Report 2018" MOWI Feed: "Policy on sustainable salmon feed". Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.	Compliant		100 %
Footnote	[62] Any alternate certification scheme would have to be approved as equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.					
4.4.3	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [65]  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020. MOWI Feed: "Statement on compound fish Feed", 15.10.2019. Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.  EWOS/Cargill: "Statement regarding EWOS compound Fish Feed" 13.01.2020. MOWI Feed: "Statement on compound fish Feed", 15.10.2019. Skretting: "Feed and raw material CV" January 2020.  Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020	Compliant		
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):			
4.5.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [66] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling)  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	Statement Nova Sea signed Odd Strøm 14.02.2019 states no dumping and waste disposal according to Norwegian law and delivered to recycling stations.	Compliant		
		b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean.	Statement Nova Sea signed Odd Strøm 14.02.2019 states no dumping and waste disposal according to Norwegian law and delivered to recycling stations.			
		c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.	Procedure "Avfallshåndtering sjø" 03.01.2020 states ensilage delivered to Hordafør, cages delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, nets/ropes to Egersund Net (and further to Nofir, if copper treated to SHMIL), feed bags delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, special waste delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, metal delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, household waste delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, electronic waste delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, light bulbs delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS. Procedure also describes storage, delivery time and handling. Medicines/treatments should be delivered to Europharma.			
		d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.	Skirts delivered to Vevelstad (and further to Botngaard for recycling). Cages/feed pipes delivered to Containerservice/ Østbø/ Retura/ IRIS (and further to recycling). Nets/ropes to Vevelstad (and further to Nofir for recycling). Metals to Østbø/ Retura/ IRIS			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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)	Procedure "Avfallshåndtering sjø" 03.01.2020 states ensilage delivered to Hordafør, cages delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, nets/ropes to Egersund Net (and further to Nofir, if copper treated to SHMIL), feed bags delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, special waste delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, metal delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, household waste delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, electronic waste delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS, light bulbs delivered to Østbø/Retura/IRIS. Procedure also describes storage, delivery time and handling. Medicines/treatments should be delivered to Europharma.	Compliant		
		b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)	Skirts delivered to Vevelstad (and further to Botngaard for recycling). Cages/feed pipes delivered to Containerservice/ Østbø/ Retura/ IRIS (and further to recycling). Nets/ropes to Vevelstad (and further to Nofir for recycling). Metals to Østbø/ Retura/ IRIS			
		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.	Seen Environment Diploma 2018 for Nova Sea, delivery of 57.190 kg fish farm nets (decrease of approx. 97.223 kg oil equivalents). Seen Environment Diploma 2019 for Nova Sea, delivery of 1548 kg plastic (decrease of approx. 2632 kg oil equivalents). Nets from 2019 stored at Vevelstad and will be sent to Nofir in 2020. Environmental report from Botngaard regarding delivery of 42 skirts in 2018-19 with recycling degree and CO2 reduction (3851 kg). Seen documentation of delivery of 5160 kg waste (batteries, oil, paint, etc.) to Østbø in second half of 2019. Seen documentation of delivery of 2 containers á 35 cubic meter with mixed waste to Retura HAF so far in 2020.			
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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish produced/production cycle</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.1 - Energy Use Assessment</b> 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.</p> <p>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).</p>				
		a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.	Last production cycle (2018G): Diesel 1 368 000 000 kJ (Scope 1) Electricity 637 000 000 kJ (Scope 2) Total 2 005 000 000 kJ Not completed (will be updated after Q1-2020)	Compliant		Last production cycle (2018G): 431 753 kJ/ton biomass
		b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kJ) during the last production cycle.	Last production cycle (2018G): Diesel 1 368 000 000 kJ (Scope 1) Electricity 637 000 000 kJ (Scope 2) Total 2 005 000 000 kJ Not completed (will be updated after Q1-2020)			
		c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (t) produced during the last production cycle.	4 643,9 ton biomass			
		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 production cycle (2018G): 431 753 kJ/ton biomass			
		e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 02.05.2019 (2017G submitted, as data for 2018G is not complete)			
		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. Scope 2 Electricity. Assessed and compared between sites and production forms.			
		<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.2 - Annual GHG Assessment</b> 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).</p> <p>Note: For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>); methane (CH<sub>4</sub>); nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>).</p>				

4.6.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [68]) emissions [69] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm.	Records verified.	Compliant	194 315 kg CO2
		b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	Last production cycle (18G): Scope 1: 100 606 kg CO2 Scope 2: 93 709 kg CO2 Total: 194 315 kg CO2 Not completed (will be updated after Q1-2020)		
		c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors.	Scope 1 diesel and scope 2 is purchased electricity.		
		d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases to CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	CO2 used		
		e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC 02.05.2019 (2017G submitted, as data for 2018G is not complete)		
		f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.	Calculations and assessments provided.		
		Footnote	[68] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> ); methane (CH4); nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF <sub>6</sub> ).		
Footnote	[69] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.				
4.6.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [70] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.3 - GHG Emissions of Feed</b> 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: - 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.  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.  Note2: Feed supplier's calculations must include Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 GHG emissions as specified in Appendix V, subsection 2.		Compliant	Last production cycle (2018G): 9 688 ton CO2.
		a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed).	Cargill (EWOS) GHG emission factor 1,38. MOWI Feed GHG emission factor 2,04.		
		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.	Last complete generation (18G): 4 849 ton feed		
		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.	Last production cycle (2018G): 9 688 ton CO2.		
		d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 27.03.2020		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> For farms that use copper-treated nets [73], evidence that nets are not cleaned [74] or treated in situ in the marine environment  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [71]	a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping.	Copper-based treatment are not in use.	N/A	Copper-based treatment are not in use.	
		b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets.	Fallowing period			
		c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets.	Copper-based treatment are not in use.			
		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.	Copper-based treatment are not in use.			
		e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment [75]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [71]	a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land.	Egersund Net at Vevelstad cleans net on land.	Compliant		
		b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place.	Procedure at off-site facility "Beskrivelse av Egersund Net sin vaskeprosess" 05.12.2017, includes waste handling. Procedure from Egersund net "Måling og registrering av inntaks- og avløpsvann fra renseanlegg" 20.05.2017 states the shall not discharge waste water containing more copper than intake water contains. Waste water cleaned and copper collected and delivered to Retura Shmil for recycling. Copper sedimented in own tank and stored for further disposal. Waste water is analyzed regularly for copper to ensure good cleaning process.			
		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.	Seen confirmation from Retura SHMIL regarding delivery from Egersund net (departement Vevelstad) in the period 01.01.2019 - 31.12.2019: 83 710 kg copper-mud organic, 12 190 kg copper-mud unorganic, waste to grading 12 700 kg, etc. Seen Environment Diploma 2018 for Nova Sea, delivery of 57.190 kg fish farm nets (decrease of approx. 97.223 kg oil equivalents). Seen Environment Diploma 2019 for Nova Sea, delivery of 1548 kg plastic (decrease of approx. 2632 kg oil equivalents). Nets from 2019 stored at Vevelstad and will be sent to Nofir in 2020. Environmental report from Botngaard regarding delivery of 42 skirts in 2018-19 with recycling degree and CO2 reduction (3851 kg).			
Footnote	[75] Treatment must have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper if the farm uses copper-treated nets.					
	<b>Indicator:</b> 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	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).				
		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.	Copper-based treatment are not in use.			

4.7.3	<p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [71]</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>Stations outside AZE: ASC 3 (10,8 mg Cu/kg) ASC 4 (2,8 mg Cu/kg)</p> <p>Copper-based treatment are not in use.</p>	N/A	Copper-based treatment are not in use.	
4.7.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that copper levels [76] are &lt; 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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 &lt; 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight.</p> <p>c. If copper levels in 4.7.4b are <math>\geq 34</math> 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>Copper-based treatment are not in use.</p> <p>Copper-based treatment are not in use.</p> <p>Copper-based treatment are not in use.</p> <p>Copper-based treatment are not in use.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020</p>	N/A	Copper-based treatment are not in use.	
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><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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>Fallowing period</p> <p>Fallowing period</p>	N/A	Fallowing period	
<b>PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER</b>						
<i>Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [77]</i>						
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>	<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>			
Footnote	[77] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.6.					
5.1.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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>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>VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattias Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.</p>	Compliant		

	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [78].	VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattias Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.			
5.1.2	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.  b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed as the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [78] and fish health manager(s) [79].  c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.	Minimum 12 visits per year. Visit by designated veterinarian consist of e.g. inspection of fish and dead fish, diagnose, training, etc. Report from routine visit (Journal) 26.02.2019 by PN - HaVet; diagnosis, environment, historic, cleaner fish, obduction of fish, observations, parasites, treatments, welfare, samples, etc.  Kristin Ottesen, HPR 8338485, valid to 10.05.2048 Kristoffer Moen Hansen, HPR 10083631, valid to 12.10.2068 Svein Inge Arnestad, HPR 10083621, valid to 04.09.2069 Kristine Vatnan, HPR 10069108, valid to 18.06.2064 Paal Neshagen, HPR 10078659, valid to 11.08.2062 Iselin Karlsen, HPR 10045612, valid to 26.10.2065  Kristin Ottesen, HPR 8338485, valid to 10.05.2048 Kristoffer Moen Hansen, HPR 10083631, valid to 12.10.2068 Svein Inge Arnestad, HPR 10083621, valid to 04.09.2069 Kristine Vatnan, HPR 10069108, valid to 18.06.2064 Paal Neshagen, HPR 10078659, valid to 11.08.2062 Iselin Karlsen, HPR 10045612, valid to 26.10.2065	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.					
5.1.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner  <b>Requirement:</b> 100% [80]  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner.  b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities.  c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.	Daily removal of dead fish (registration in FishTalk system) and processed to ensilage. Ensilage collected on tank and delivered to Hordafør, e.g. 07.03.2020 delivered 19 ton ensilage to Hordafør.  Daily removal of dead fish (registration in FishTalk system) and processed to ensilage. Ensilage collected on tank and delivered to Hordafør, e.g. 07.03.2020 delivered 19 ton ensilage to Hordafør.  No exceptional mortalities on previous cycle (2018G) were dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis.	Compliant		100 %
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.					
		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.				

5.1.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100% [81]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain detailed records for all mortalities and post-mortem analyses including: - 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>	<p>FishTalk record shows all mortalities and causes. Complete cycle (2017G): Total mortality 3,2% (virus 0,0% + unexplained 1,1% = 1,1%). 1,1% unexplained mortality gives 33,8% unexplained mortality of total mortality 3,2%. Last complete cycle (2018G): Total mortality 6,8% (virus 0,4% + unexplained 0,5% = 0,9%). 0,9% unexplained mortality gives 7,9% unexplained mortality of total mortality 6,8%.</p>	Compliant		100 %
	<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>All mortalities are diagnosed and post-mortem analysis are done on a statistically relevant number of fish (ref unspecified numbers above). Lab analyses routinely.</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>Minimum 12 visits per year. Visit by designated veterinarian consist of e.g. inspection of fish and dead fish, diagnose, training, etc. Report from routine visit (journal) 26.02.2019 by PN - HaVet; diagnosis, environment, historic, cleaner fish, obduction of fish, observations, parasites, treatments, welfare, samples, etc.</p>				
	<p>d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications.</p>	<p>Record are available and documented in FishTalk, all mortalities are categorized.</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>Record are available and documented in FishTalk, all mortalities are categorized.</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>Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020</p>				
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><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum viral disease-related mortality [82] on farm during the most recent production cycle</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 10%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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>FishTalk record shows all mortalities and causes. Complete cycle (2017G): Total mortality 3,2% (virus 0,0% + unexplained 1,1% = 1,1%). 1,1% unexplained mortality gives 33,8% unexplained mortality of total mortality 3,2%. Last complete cycle (2018G): Total mortality 6,8% (virus 0,4% + unexplained 0,5% = 0,9%). 0,9% unexplained mortality gives 7,9% unexplained mortality of total mortality 6,8%.</p>	Compliant		0,9 %
	<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>FishTalk record shows all mortalities and causes. Complete cycle (2017G): Total mortality 3,2% (virus 0,0% + unexplained 1,1% = 1,1%). 1,1% unexplained mortality gives 33,8% unexplained mortality of total mortality 3,2%. Last complete cycle (2018G): Total mortality 6,8% (virus 0,4% + unexplained 0,5% = 0,9%). 0,9% unexplained mortality gives 7,9% unexplained mortality of total mortality 6,8%.</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 28.02.2020</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	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6%  <b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 40% of total mortalities  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms with > 6% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle.	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.	FishTalk record shows all mortalities and causes. Complete cycle (2017G): Total mortality 3,2% (virus 0,0% + unexplained 1,1% = 1,1%). 1,1% unexplained mortality gives 33,8% unexplained mortality of total mortality 3,2%. Last complete cycle (2018G): Total mortality 6,8% (virus 0,4% + unexplained 0,5% = 0,9%). 0,9% unexplained mortality gives 7,9% unexplained mortality of total mortality 6,8%.	Compliant	7,9 %
		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.	FishTalk record shows all mortalities and causes. Complete cycle (2017G): Total mortality 3,2% (virus 0,0% + unexplained 1,1% = 1,1%). 1,1% unexplained mortality gives 33,8% unexplained mortality of total mortality 3,2%. Last complete cycle (2018G): Total mortality 6,8% (virus 0,4% + unexplained 0,5% = 0,9%). 0,9% unexplained mortality gives 7,9% unexplained mortality of total mortality 6,8%.		
		c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020		
5.1.7	<b>Indicator:</b> A farm-specific mortalities reduction programme that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	Note: Farms have the option to integrate their farm-specific mortality reduction program into the farm's fish health management plan (5.1.1).			
		a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.	VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattis Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.	Minor	Not seen evaluation of fish health targets after 1st year in sea as planned according to site specific fish health plan. 26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 6856 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.
		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.	Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattis Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.		
		c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.	Not seen evaluation of fish health targets after 1st year in sea as planned according to site specific fish health plan. 26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 6856 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.		
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [83]					
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>		<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>	
Footnote	[83] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.2.1, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.10.				
<b>Instruction to Clients and CABs for Criterion 5.2 - Records Related to Therapeutic Treatments</b>					
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><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment;</li><li>- product name and chemical name;</li><li>- reason for use (specific disease)</li><li>- date(s) of treatment;</li><li>- amount (g) of product used;</li><li>- dosage;</li><li>- t of fish treated;</li><li>- the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and</li><li>- the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.</li></ul>	<p>Treatments done are anaesthetics (Finquel and Benzocaine) and delicing (Slice and AlphaMax), all under responsible veterinarian's prescriptions. No Antibiotics used.</p>	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>Prescriptions and FishTalk records available.</p> <p>E.g. Prescription 509041 for Rensøya, veterinarian KMH 10.12.2019, 4 liter Benzocaine, 7 daydegrees withdrawal period.</p> <p>E.g. FishTalk record for cage 14; Benzocaine treatment 17.02.2020 states withdrawal period until 20.02.2020.</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>	<p>Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020</p>				
Footnote	[84] Chemicals used for the treatment of fish.					
5.2.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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>Procedure "Godkjente legemidler i Nova Sea AS" 10.03.2020, to be revised 01.03.2021 with indication, product, therapeutic, withdrawal, MRL, marketing holder, marketing authorization</p> <p>Seen list of antibiotics and treatments that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, "Forbudte legemidler og stoffer i animalske varer" 10.03.2020, includes Norway, EU, UK, Canada, Chile, Japan, USA.</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 mandatory testing by NIFES on site and/or at harvest line. Results published in yearly NIFES report.</p> <p>Additional sampling performed by Nova Sea AS, "Results from Nova Sea monitoring programme on undesirable substances in Atlantic salmon" dated 21.01.2020 with test result of e.g. dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCB's.</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><b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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>Prescriptions available.</p> <p>E.g. Prescription 509041 for Rensøya, veterinarian KMH 10.12.2019, 4 liter Benzocaine, 7 daydegrees withdrawal period.</p>	Compliant		100 %
	<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>100 % of treatments are prescribed by a veterinarian, prescriptions stored in system.</p>				



5.2.4	<b>Indicator:</b> Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a).	100% of treatments are prescribed by a veterinarian. Prescriptions in system. Treatments registered in FishTalk with withholding periods as defined in prescription. Procedure "Bruk og kontroll av legemidler i Nova Sea" 10.03.2020 includes instruction for storage, control, withholding, CV and prescription.	Compliant		
		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.	Documented in FishTalk. Treated fishgroups marked in FishTalk according to days/degree-days withholding period stated in prescription.			
		c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.	Documented in FishTalk. Treated fishgroups marked in FishTalk according to days/degree-days withholding period stated in prescription.			
5.2.5	<b>Indicator:</b> The farm shall publicly report (via Appendix VI) the: 1. Weighted Number of Medicinal Treatments (see Appendix VII) for each production cycle 2. The parasiticide load for each agent over the production cycle 3. The benthic parasiticide residue levels <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Using farm data for therapeutants usage (5.2.1a) and the calculation presented in Appendix VII, calculate the Weighted Number of Medicinal Treatments (WNMT) 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.	2018G: 1,1	Compliant		1,1
		b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the WMNT score.	Calculations verified			
		c. Submit data on farm level WMNT score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
5.2.6	<b>Indicator:</b> The Weighted Number of Medicinal Treatments shall be at or below the country Entry Level (see Appendix VII) <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Review WNMT scores from 5.2.5a to determine if the score is at or below the Country Entry Level (see Appendix VII)	WNMT below 5 (Entry level Norway)	Compliant		< 5
		b. As applicable, submit data to ASC on WNMT score for the most recent production cycle (Appendix VI).	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
5.2.7	<b>Indicator:</b> The farm shall reduce the Weighted Number of Medicinal Treatments, after achieving indicator 5.2.6, with 25% per 2 years until the WNMT is at or below the Global Level (see Appendix VII). <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Every 2 years after achieving 5.2.6, check the WNMT score calculated 2 years before as above (5.2.5a). Calculate the percent difference in WMNT score between current cycle and cycle of 2 years before.	WNMT below 3 (Global level)	Compliant		<3
		b. As applicable, submit data to ASC on WMNT score for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI).	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			

5.2.8	<p><b>Indicator:</b> The farm shall implement Integrated Pest Management (IPM) according to the guidance in Appendix VII.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	a. Implement Integrated Pest Management (IPM) into farm management plans (see Appendix VII).	IPM according to "Kontroll av lakselus og IPM i Nova Sea-konsernet" 2020, on public website (www.novasea.no). VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattias Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.	Compliant		
		b. Review and update IPM on a production cycle basis to reflect the effectiveness of applied methods and to determine next approaches.	IPM according to "Kontroll av lakselus og IPM i Nova Sea-konsernet" 2020, on public website (www.novasea.no). VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattias Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.			
5.2.9	<p><b>Indicator:</b> The farm shall public present (e.g. via company website) the IPM-measures that the company applies which need to be approved by a authorised veterinarian.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	a. Ensure the latest version of the IPM is public on the company website	IPM according to "Kontroll av lakselus og IPM i Nova Sea-konsernet" 2020, on public website (www.novasea.no).	Compliant		
		b. Ensure the IPM is signed-off by an authorized veterinarian.	IPM according to "Kontroll av lakselus og IPM i Nova Sea-konsernet" 2020, on public website (www.novasea.no). VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Site specific health plans for Rensøya H18 - signed designated veterinarian Mattias Bendiksen Lund, updated 24.04.2019. The local plan includes goals, visit log, etc.			
5.2.10	<p><b>Indicator:</b> The farm shall monitor parasiticide residue levels annually in the benthic sediment directly outside the AZE.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p>	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.	NA, pending further guidance from ASC	N/A	NA, pending further guidance from ASC	
		b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 5.2.10	NA, pending further guidance from ASC			

	<b>Applicability:</b> All	c. 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.	NA, pending further guidance from ASC			
		d. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analysed an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results.	NA, pending further guidance from ASC			
5.2.11	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments <b>Requirement:</b> None <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles.	No antibiotics used prophylactic the recent cycles	N/A		
		b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3)	No antibiotics used prophylactic the recent cycles			
		c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.13).	No antibiotics used prophylactic the recent cycles			
5.2.12	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO ) <b>Requirement:</b> None <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [89].	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 6th revision, 2018, updated 2019. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used at site.	Compliant		
		b. If the farm has <u>not</u> used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.12a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit.	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 6th revision, 2018, updated 2019. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used at site.			
		c. If the farm <u>has</u> used antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.12a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit.	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 6th revision, 2018, updated 2019. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used at site.			
		d. If yes to 5.2.12c, 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	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 6th revision, 2018, updated 2019. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used at site.			
5.2.13	<b>Indicator:</b> Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle <b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 3 <b>Applicability:</b> All	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	N/A	No antibiotics used	
		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			
5.2.14	<b>Indicator:</b> If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Use results from 5.2.13b to show whether more than one antibiotic treatment was used in the most recent production cycle. If not, then the requirement of 5.2.14 does not apply. If yes, then proceed to 5.2.14b.	No antibiotics used	N/A	No antibiotics used	
		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	No antibiotics used			
		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			

		d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020			
5.2.15	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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).  b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.	Procedure "Fakturering i Visma" 10.10.2017 states that CV shall follow sales.  FishTalk records available, e.g. CV unit 2, 2018G: Benzocaine treatment ended 18.11.2019, quarantine until 20.11.2019.	Compliant		
<i>Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments</i>						
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>	<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>			
5.3.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.3.1 - Identifying the 'Expected Effect' of Medicinal Treatment</b> 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.  <u>Example: sea lice treatment with emamectin benzoate</u> 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.  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.				
		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.  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.  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.  d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.	Risk assessment before each treatment and test of sensitivity (resistance) before treatment. Also environmental report for risk of use of therapeutants in area.  No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.  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.	
5.3.2	<b>Indicator:</b> When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Risk assessment before each treatment and test of sensitivity (resistance) before treatment. Also environmental report for risk of use of therapeutants in area.  No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	
	<b>Indicator:</b> Specific rotation, providing that the farm has >1 effective medicinal treatment product	a. Determine how many effective medicinal treatment products the farm uses.	Medicinal treatments: 2017G: 1 x Slice 2018G: 1 x AlphaMax and 1 x Slice			

5.3.3	available, every third treatment must belong to a different family of drugs.  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	b. If farm uses >1 effective medicinal treatment product, ensure every third treatment belongs to a different family of drugs.	Two treatments last generation (2018G)	N/A	Not >1 effective medicinal treatment on 2018G	
Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [95]						
		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.  -	Stocking 2017G from 26.05.2017 to 13.06.2017, last harvest date 04.08.2018. Stocking 2018G from 09.10.2018 to 12.10.2018.  Stocking 2017G from 26.05.2017 to 13.06.2017, last harvest date 04.08.2018. Stocking 2018G from 09.10.2018 to 12.10.2018.  All salmon on the site are a single-year class (2018G)	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 categorized nor suspected for the most recent production cycle. No UIA detected nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4 a for details of monitoring.  Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorized nor suspected for the most recent production cycle. No UIA detected nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4 a for details of monitoring.  No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.  No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.  Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020	N/A	No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.	
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><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of compliance [101] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [102]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.4.3 - Compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code</b></p> <p>Indicator 5.4.3 requires that farms show evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (see <a href="http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171">http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171</a>). 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"><li>- depopulation of the infected site;</li><li>- implementation of quarantine zones (see note below) in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen; and</li><li>- additional actions as required under Indicator 5.4.4.</li></ul> <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.	Link to OIE "Aquatic Animal Health Code 2019" (relevant diseases in list are Pancreas Disease and Infectious Salmon Anemia Virus). Link to "OIE listed diseases, infections and infestations in force in 2020".	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.	VHP for Nova Sea includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. signed Kristin Ottesen - HaVet 01.03.2019 (valid to 31.03.2020). Preliminary VHP for Nova Sea for 2020 includes diseases/parasites, treatments, health goals, cleaner fish, proactive measures, handling, veterinary visits, etc. Kristin Ottesen - HaVet March 2020. Link to OIE "Aquatic Animal Health Code 2019" (relevant diseases in list are Pancreas Disease and Infectious Salmon Anemia Virus). Link to "OIE listed diseases, infections and infestations in force in 2020".			
		-	Verified during audit.			
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. <a href="http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171">http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171</a> .					
5.4.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> If an OIE-notifiable disease [103] is confirmed on the farm, evidence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. the farm, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected</li><li>2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [104]</li><li>3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease</li><li>4. the farm promptly [105] made findings publicly available</li></ol>	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.	Site management and veterinarian has the responsibility to inform governments if notifiable diseases occur.	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.				

	<p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020</p>			
		-	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 haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and Gyrodactylosis (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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 of employers or employers' organizations."</p> <p>c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.</p> <p>d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	<p>Over 50% workers are organized. The information on Freedom of association is presented in Self declaration of Social Practice. Workers aware of their right.</p> <p>TU worker representative: Jon Arne Nygaard for the area. The worker representative works with organized employees. Safety representative for area is elected Tor Erik Sarassen.</p> <p>The worker representative communicate with employees in meetings and by phone or e-mail. NC evidence: In interview TU representative states, that he has insufficient information about activities in HR (hiring, dismissing, discrimination handling, conflict/grievance solving etc.) to do good service for workers. The time for meeting and communicating the workers is not properly allocated, as no dedicated procedure for replacing TU representative at his direct job is defined. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Email 08.04.2019 fra HR manager to site manager Buktodden (were TU work) regarding the time TU has free from site to work with TU matters. MoM 19.02.2019 TU at NNN, HK and FF and HR manager. Discussed: meeting frequency, vacation, flex time, work descriptions, personal handbook, information to employees, etc. Protocol 11.05.2018 meeting TU FF, production manager and HR manager. Regarding main agreement, information to TU, regular meetings TU and production manager once a month, equipment, access to company and departments, meetings in work time, discussions on ordinary production in company. One day per month the TU has free to work with TU matters (includes meeting with management), in addition time to work with TU matters at end of days and in the period without fish. Planned: TU has time for TU work 16.05.2019 (10 hours).</p> <p>Interview confirms information above</p>	Compliant	<p>In interview TU representative states, that he has insufficient information about activities in HR (hiring, dismissing, discrimination handling, conflict/grievance solving etc.) to do good service for workers. The time for meeting and communicating the workers is not properly allocated, as no dedicated procedure for replacing TU representative at his direct job is defined. Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions Accepted Jan Petter Kosmo/ Darius Pamakstys 2019-05-24: Based on evidences provided during SA1 Status is Closed</p>	

6.1.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association.	The Job contracts has link to Self declaration of Social Practice of the Company.	Compliant		
		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 right is communicated via training of quality system which has Self declaration of Social practice. Site managers are responsible to communicate the Self declaration of Social practice to all employees.			
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms information above.			
6.1.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	No outstanding cases what are in conflict with standard requirements.	Compliant		
		b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.	Collective bargaining agreement in place as Tariff agreement.			
		c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).	Collective bargaining agreement in place as Tariff agreement.			
Criterion 6.2 Child labor						
Compliance Criteria						
6.2.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Number of incidences of child [107] labor [108]  <b>Requirement:</b> None  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Standard requirements apply.	Compliant		0
		b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).	The youngest employee on the date of certification - over 18 years old.			
		c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.	Records are kept in HR system.			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of young workers [109] that are protected [110]  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.	Most of the relevant training young workers have to receive as all other employees. The job conditions and limitations are defined in job contract attachment for young workers.	Compliant		100 %
		b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.	The young workers are identified by IDs.			
		c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.	Timesheets are available			
		d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.	Work is organized in normal 5 days weeks or on 7/7 shifts.			
		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 general hazards that should be avoided are discussed with young workers prior to each work.			
		f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.	No young workers were employed on the date of the audit.			
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 labour contractors or training credit programs).  b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.  c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.  d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.  e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.  f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted. Separate contracts for crediting of higher education could be signed with specific conditions for working in company after the education.  Confirmed by interview.  No cases identified  No cases identified  No cases identified.  Payroll records are available. The interviews has confirmed above information.	Compliant		0
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 favour 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.  b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.  c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.  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 anti-discrimination policy is presented in Self declaration of Social practice.  Whistle blowing procedure in place (ID13447 revision 2018).  The tariff agreement is the base of equal pay, it is applied to all employees.  Site Manager and employees were trained on diversity in 2018. NC evidence: Interview with management. Training documents and missing evidences of non-discrimination training.	Compliant	Interview with management. Training documents and missing evidences of non-discrimination training. Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Closed	
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.					
6.4.2	Indicator: Number of incidences of discrimination  Requirement: None  Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.  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.	No cases identified.  Interview has confirmed absence of discrimination cases.	Compliant		0
Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety						
		Compliance Criteria				

6.5.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [117] and policies on a yearly basis  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	The H&S procedures are in place. The site level Safety Job Analysis is applied prior to hazardous works to assess and discuss related risks. NC evidence: Missing documents. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Safety drill once a year. Risk assessments define the theme of the drill. Safety drill (fire and evacuation) performed 10.09.2018, signed employees and HSE manager. Additional drills on boats according to predefined program (Meng).	Compliant	Missing documents. Interview with management and employees revealed limited knowledge of emergency procedures. Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions Accepted Jan Petter Kosmo/ Darius Pamakstys 2019-05-24: Based on evidences provided during SA1 Status is Closed	100 %
		b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	NC evidence: Interview with management and employees revealed limited knowledge of emergency procedures. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Safety drill once a year. Risk assessments define the theme of the drill. Safety drill (fire and evacuation) performed 10.09.2018, signed employees and HSE manager. Additional drills on boats according to predefined program (Meng).			
		c. Employer conducts health and safety training for all employees on a regular basis (once a year and immediately for all new employees), including training on potential hazards and risk minimization, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and effective use of PPE.	Regular external and internal trainings are conducted.			
Footnote [117] Health and safety training shall include emergency response procedures and practices.						
6.5.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals).	The list of H&S hazards is maintained together with list of H&S risks.	Compliant	Workers interview indicated missing regular activities to check PPE. E.g. inflatable life vests are not checked regularly. Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions Accepted Jan Petter Kosmo/ Darius Pamakstys 2019-05-24: Based on evidences provided during SA1 Status is Closed	
		b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.	All needed PPE is provided.			
		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.	The procedure and forms for PPE use are in place. H&S Training is conducted annually. NC evidence: workers interview indicated missing regular activities to check PPE. E.g. inflatable life vests are not checked regularly. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Training in PPE "Årlig oppfriskning verneutstyr" includes protective shoes, helmet, lifejacket and VHF. Maintenance free lifejackets changed if defect. Helmet changed every second year (old helmets delivered to supplier/waste). Supplier has records of when to change, last changed October 2017 (to be changed in October 2019).			
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The interviews has confirmed above information.			
	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of a health and safety risk	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).	The risk assessment is conducted in register of H&S hazards. The risks are maintained in company level and site level. The annual risk assessment update is organized. Last round was 2017-07. As well risks are discussed during SJA (safe job analysis) discussions prior to any hazardous activities event like splitting, de-icing, harvesting etc.		Workers interview	

6.5.3	assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).	Annual general training is applied for all employees by site managers. The Safety Job Analysis is applied prior to each hazardous work. NC evidence: workers interview has revealed that risk assessment was not communicated to some of them.	Compliant	has revealed that risk assessment was not communicated to some of them. Darius Pamakstys 08.04.2018: Closed	
		c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.	The procedures are adapted in relation to risk assessment and H&S accidents investigation results.			
6.5.4	Indicator: Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.	H&S accidents are reported in system database.	Compliant	The records in Landax system are missing for root cause analysis results. Darius Pamakstys 08.04.2018: Closed	
		b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations.	H&S violations and investigations are reported in system database.			
		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.	Corrective action plan for accidents are developed and implemented, Root cause analysis to be applied. NC evidence: The records in Landax system are missing for root cause analysis results.			
		d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.	No accidents took place at this site. Information from other sites provided via e-mail and monthly summary.			
6.5.5	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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	Sufficient insurance is provided for all employees who has the contract with the company.	Compliant		
6.5.6	Indicator: Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.		Compliant	No statement available. Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions Accepted Jan Petter Kosmo/ Darius Pamakstys 2019-05-24: Based on evidences provided during SA1 Status is Closed	
		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.	The records of diving activities with the lists of personnel involved are maintained. NC evidence: No statement available. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Procedure "Bruk av dykketjenester" 14.03.2019 states diving companies to be approved before used, yearly approval. Check of diving certificates and health declaration according to list before every dive. Agreement on dive services signed JR Dykkeservice 28.02.2018; diving on all Nova Sea sites and if an emergency situation be prepared to dive. Audit JR Dykkeservice 01.02.2018, includes diving regulation, diving certificates, health declarations and social criteria's ASC.			
		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.	Copies of divers' certificates are maintained .			
Criterion 6.6 Wages						
		Compliance Criteria				

6.6.1	<b>Indicator:</b> The percentage of workers whose basic wage [118] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [119]  <b>Requirement:</b> 0 (None)  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	Salaries are defined in protocols of collective bargaining agreements' with TU, valid from 2016 to 2018	Compliant	0 %
		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.	Employer records confirm that salaries are paid in line with Tarif agreement for fishery sector.		
		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.	Interview confirms fair salaries		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [120]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	NC evidence: No evidences of employer and worker representatives cooperation to assess basic needs wages.	Compliant	No evidences of employer and worker representatives cooperation to assess basic needs wages.  Missing basic needs wage calculation. Darius Pamakstys 08.04.2018: Closed
		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.	NC evidence: Missing basic needs wage calculation.		
		c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	Interview confirms fair salaries I line with Tariff agreement.		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [121]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.	The contracts refer to tariff agreement for the wage. Other support and bonuses are presented in company's intranet. The benefits are defined in job proposals for employees. NC evidence: job contracts are missing the reference to documents with defined benefits and support. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: New template (has started to use it), refers to pension and insurance in personal handbook. Personal handbook includes information on pension, insurance, leave, gifts, company cabin, hotel agreements, support fund, etc.	Compliant	Job contracts are missing the reference to documents with defined benefits and support.  Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions Accepted Jan Petter Kosmo/ Darius Pamakstys 2019-05-24: Based on evidences provided during SA1 Status is Closed
		b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.	Interview confirms that method for setting wages is 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.	Payments are made into personal bank accounts.		
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The interviews has confirmed above information.		
Footnote	[121] Payments shall be rendered to workers in a convenient manner.				
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting					
Compliance Criteria					
	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of workers who have contracts [122]	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.	Contracts are maintained.		

6.7.1	<p><b>Requirement:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>b. There is no evidence for labour-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.</p> <p>c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	<p>No evidences of labour-only contracting.</p> <p>The interviews has confirmed above information.</p>	Compliant		100 %
Footnote	<p>[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.</p>					
6.7.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.</p> <p>c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.</p>	<p>The subcontractors evaluation procedure and related documents do not apply social accountability criteria. NC evidence: Missing documents and records, Interview with management. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Seen procedure "Underleverandører, kritiske- og øvrige leverandører til Nova Sea" 21.03.2019, states subcontractors to be audited yearly (includes social part) and critical suppliers evaluated (includes social issues). Seen example of two supplier evaluations with questions regarding social practice, integration, diversity and freedom of association.</p> <p>Company has list of approved subcontractors, but social accountability criteria were not used for approval. NC evidence: Missing documents and records, Interview with management. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Seen procedure "Underleverandører, kritiske- og øvrige leverandører til Nova Sea" 21.03.2019, states subcontractors to be audited yearly (includes social part) and critical suppliers evaluated (includes social issues). Seen example of two supplier evaluations with questions regarding social practice, integration, diversity and freedom of association.</p> <p>NC evidence: Very few records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2 are maintained. Jan Petter Kosmo 07.05.2019: Seen procedure "Underleverandører, kritiske- og øvrige leverandører til Nova Sea" 21.03.2019, states subcontractors to be audited yearly (includes social part) and critical suppliers evaluated (includes social issues). Seen example of two supplier evaluations with questions regarding social practice, integration, diversity and freedom of association.</p>	Compliant	<p>Missing documents and records, Interview with management. Very few records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2 are maintained. Darius Pamakstys 11.03.2018: Root cause, corrective and preventive actions Accepted Jan Petter Kosmo/ Darius Pamakstys 2019-05-24: Based on evidences provided during SA1 Status is Closed</p>	
Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution						
Compliance Criteria						
6.8.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Employer has a clear labour conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.</p> <p>b. Workers are familiar with the company's labour conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>NC evidence: The whistle blowing policy is not fully developed to provide conflict resolution in a confidential manner.</p> <p>Workers demonstrate understanding of conflict resolution.</p> <p>No conflict cases identified.</p>	Compliant	<p>The whistle blowing policy is not fully developed to provide conflict resolution in a confidential manner. Darius Pamakstys 08.04.2018: Closed</p>	
	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [122] within a 90 day timeframe</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labour conflicts that are raised.</p>	<p>No records, as were no cases.</p>			

6.8.2	are addressed [123] within a 90-day timeframe <b>Requirement:</b> 100% <b>Applicability:</b> All	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 records, as were no cases.  No records, as were no cases. Interview confirms no cases fact.	Compliant	No records, as were no cases.	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	<b>Indicator:</b> Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions <b>Requirement:</b> None <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	No evidences of incorrect behaviour.  No cases identified.  The interviews has confirmed above information.	Compliant		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [125] <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	The disciplinary actions are defined in Working rules of the company.  The interviews has confirmed fair and effective disciplinary 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	<b>Indicator:</b> Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [126] <b>Requirement:</b> None <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	The working time schemes are approved in Tariff agreement with Trade unions. In line with 6.10.1 c) The scheme of 7 days on-job and 7 days-off is used with 10 hours of working day not including lunch break.  The working time is managed within legal requirements.  The scheme 7 by 7 is used with 10 hours of working day. The working time and off-time are balanced. The work in shifts is defined in job contracts.  The interviews has confirmed above information.	Compliant		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Overtime is limited, voluntary [127], paid at a premium rate [128] and restricted to exceptional circumstances <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> 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 is paid at premium rate.  Overtime is managed within labour law  The interviews has confirmed voluntary overtime, the special cases agreed in collective bargaining agreement.	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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the company regularly performs training of staff in fish husbandry, general farm and fish escape management and health and safety procedures  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Policy of supporting education is present. The financial support for training is given.	Compliant		
		b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).	Records available in HR IT system.			
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	The interviews has confirmed education encouraging by managers.			
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility						
		Compliance criteria				
6.12.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Demonstration of company-level [129] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labour requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.	Company level policies in place.	Compliant		
		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.	Approved.			
		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).	Applied in whole company.			
		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).	Access is provided, policies verified.			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of regular and meaningful [130] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).	The meeting was organised 07.06.2019 at Aloha Cafe, Træna, for local community and stake holders. Using the variation second meeting of the year will be substituted by ongoing communication.	Compliant		
		b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.	2 representatives of stakeholders were present			
		c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.	Invitation to meeting is asking for contribution to agenda.			

	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3).	The discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments is well defined in presentation material and was discussed during the meeting.			
		e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.	Posters, invitation, minutes of meeting are maintained.			
		f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.	No interview was used with stakeholders.			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence and evidence of an effective [131] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations.	The complaint procedure is presented.	Compliant		
		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).	No complaints received.			
		c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).	No complaints received.			
		d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.	No interview were used with stakeholders			
Footnote	[131] Effective: In order to demonstrate that the mechanism is effective, evidence of resolutions of complaints can be given.					
7.1.3	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (use of anaestatic baths is not regarded a therapeutant)	Company has system for posting the notifications at the sites during the therapeutic treatments.	Compliant		
		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).	The signs will be posted on the site during the treatments.			
		c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1)	The health risks were communicated during consultation meeting.			
		d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.	No interview were used with stakeholders			
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 fulfil 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 neighbouring 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 neighbours. Effective community consultations are one of the best ways to identify such impacts to neighbour 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 neighbours should create a forum where any key issue can be discussed and resolved.						



7.2.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [133]	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.  b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.  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.  d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.	Company communicated with Sami representative during the application for license to operate sea farm, what covered hearing process.  The national/local laws and regulations are known.  Company contacted Sami representatives. E-mail communication records available  No traditional and indigenous groups were interviewed, as certification related hearing process include local Sami groups.	Compliant		
7.2.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [133]  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.  b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.	Company contacted Sami representatives. No interest to continue consultations was presented by Indigenous group.  No traditional and indigenous groups were interviewed, as certification related hearing process include local Sami groups.	Compliant		
Footnote	[133] All standards related to indigenous rights only apply where relevant, based on proximity of indigenous territories.					
7.2.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [134] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.  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.  c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.	No specific protocol agreement is developed, as no interest from indigenous community expressed.  No specific protocol agreement is developed, as no interest from indigenous community expressed.  No traditional and indigenous groups were interviewed, as certification related hearing process include local Sami groups.	N/A	No specific protocol agreement is developed, as no interest from indigenous community expressed.	
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [135] without community approval  <b>Requirement:</b> None  <b>Applicability:</b> 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).  b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.  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 resources are assessed and communicated with community during the operation license application processing.  The resources are assessed and communicated with community during the operation license application processing. Any changes, having influence to resources, during operation undergo hearing process prior to their implementation.  No interview were used with stakeholders	Compliant		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.  b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.	The resources are assessed and communicated with community during the operation license application processing. Any changes, having influence to resources, during operation undergo hearing process prior to their implementation.  No interview were used with stakeholders	Compliant		
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		Helgeland Smolt (dep. Sundsfjord)				
Standards related to Principle 1						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> 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).  b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.  c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	Submitted to ASC 28.02.2020  License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 30.05.2013, NG53, for 15 million smolt. Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland 06.03.2013 for 15 million smolt/1500 ton feed. Requires MOM-B survey every 4th year and cleansing of discharge water.  Inspection by Fylkesmannen i Nordland, seen letter from Fylkesmannen i Nordland 11.06.2018 stating closed non-conformance. Inspection by Directorate of Fisheries 07.10.2019 states no non-conformances. Inspection by NFSA 04.11.2019 states no non-conformances.  Samples in May to October 2019 shows average 64% cleansing of KOF and average 61% cleansing of SS. Sample 15.01.2020 shows 87% cleansing of suspended solids og 87% cleaning of KOF (sample analyzed by Eurofins/Labora).	Compliant		
8.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Compliance with labor laws and regulations <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labor laws and regulations.  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)	The statement of compliance to requirements of ASC standard principle 6.1 - 6.11 and labour laws is available (signed on 2019-02-12)  Labour law inspection 2017-05-17 with no deviations found.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 2						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
		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.				

8.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</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>Risk assessment for environment, updated 02.03.2020, includes escape, chemicals, waste , infection, biodiversity, etc. Escape 20.09.19 Sediment survey by Argus Miljø 30.05.2018, status 1 (good) regarding heavy metals in general (sample by discharge point shows status 2 for Cadmium and status 3 for Zink). MOM-B by Argus Miljø 13.10.2019, status 1.</p> <p>Waste plan "Avfallsplan" 26.08.2019 includes rest waste, paper, special waste, metal, plastic (delivers waste to HAF). Mud delivered to "Kystmiljø" from Helgeland Smolt (avd. Reppen) and to "Kystmiljø" from Helgeland Smolt (avd. Sundsfjord). Procedure for biodiversity "Bevaringsplan for dyreliv og mangfold" 14.01.2020 includes birds, wild fish, waste, organic waste, escape, etc.</p>	Compliant		
8.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 4 kg/t of fish produced over a 12-month period</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.4 - Calculating Total Phosphorus Released per Ton of Fish Produced</b></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"><li>- the smolt supplier has records showing the total quantity of sludge removed from site over the relevant time period;</li><li>- the supplier determined phosphorus concentration (% P) in removed sludge by sampling and analysing representative batches; and</li><li>- the sludge was properly disposed off site and in accordance with the farm's biosolid management plan.</li></ul>				7,5 kg phosphor in discharge water per ton biomass produced 3,7 kg phosphor in discharge water (after min 50% cleansing) per ton biomass produced
		<p>a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months.</p>	<p>2019: 1 202 777 kg feed used</p>	Compliant		
		<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).</p>	<p>Calculated average approx. 1,5 %.</p>			
		<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.</p>	<p>18 042 kg phosphor from feed</p>			
		<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.</p>	<p>1 381 260 kg biomass produced</p>			
		<p>e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1.</p>	<p>5 939 kg phosphor in fish biomass</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>74 100 kg mud delivered. 1 778 kg phosphor in mud</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>10 324 kg phosphor discharged 7,5 kg phosphor in discharge water per ton biomass produced 3,7 kg phosphor in discharge water (after min 50% cleansing) per ton biomass produced VR accepted by ASC 05.09.2014</p>			
Standards related to Principle 3						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
		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.	Salmo salar is native to region.			

8.5	<b>Indicator:</b> 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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [137]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers except as noted in [137]	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 ).	Salmo salar is native to region.	N/A	Salmo salar is native to region.
		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.	Salmo salar is native to region.		
		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.	Salmo salar is native to region.		
		e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.	Salmo salar is native to region.		
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.				
8.6	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of escapees [138] in the most recent production cycle  <b>Requirement:</b> 300 fish [139]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers except as noted in [139]	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.	No incident reported in the most recent production cycle. Verified by Directorate of Fisheries escape incidents overview (www.fidir.no)	Compliant	0
		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.	No incident reported in the most recent production cycle.		
		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]).	ASC statement for Sundsfjord Smolt and Helgeland Smolt signed TAG 2019-02-12 regarding compliance to criteria 8.2 a, 8.5 a, 8.6 c, 8.12 c, 8.13 b, 8.14 a, 8.15 c, 8.16/8.17 b, 8.18 c, 8.19 a and 8.21 a.		
		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.	One escape incident 12.11.2014 with 10 fish escaped.		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Accuracy [140] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish  <b>Requirement:</b> ≥98%  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Seen test Maskon vaccination machine 07.02.2019, 3224 fish counted in 4 batches, accuracy of 99,7 - 100%, signed Line Holm. If grading are performed after vaccination, VAKI counter is used, statement showing 98-100% accuracy. Seen report from Wingvax for week 45-2019 with accuracy of 99,5%. Seen report from Wingvax for week 8-2020 with accuracy of 99,97%.	Compliant	98-100 %
		B. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	Seen generation reports from delivery to harvest with acceptable deviances (< 2%).		
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling)  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Delivery of 1657 kg electric waste, 2 175 kg waste burnable, 52 kg medical waste, etc. to Østbø in the period 01.01. - 06.03.2020.	Compliant		
8.9	<b>Indicator:</b> 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)  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Records for 2019 verified	Compliant		
		b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last year.	Energy scope 1: 1 644 638 400 kJ (diesel) Energy scope 2: 44 814 391 200 kJ (electricity) SUM 34 424 107 600 kJ			
		c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year.	Produced biomass: 1 381 260 kg			
		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.	Energy efficiency: 33 635 263 kJ/ton biomass			
		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			
8.10	<b>Indicator:</b> 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)  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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 for 2019 verified	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.	Total 2019 Produced biomass: 1 381 260 kg CO2 scope 1: 120 976 kg (from diesel) CO2 scope 2: 6 597 674 kg (from electricity) CO2 total: 6 718 651 kg			
		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.	Total 2019 Produced biomass: 1 381 260 kg CO2 scope 1: 120 976 kg (from diesel) CO2 scope 2: 6 597 674 kg (from electricity) CO2 total: 6 718 651 kg			
		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.	Conversion factors Scope 1: 3,17 kg Co2 per kg diesel (The Norwegian emission inventory 2009 SSB, tetthet 0,84 kg/liter (SSB 2008), 36,2 MJ/liter SSB 2008 Scope 2: 0,53 kg Co2 per kWh (Norsk varedeklarasjon 2018), 1kWh equals 3,6 MJ SSB 2008.			

Footnote	[141] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> ); methane (CH <sub>4</sub> ); nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF <sub>6</sub> ).					
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.  b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.	Health plan for Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) signed Janette Festvåg 2020-03-09. Includes health control, veterinary visits (12 per year), diseases, preventive measures, disease measures, vaccine, parasites, screening, water quality, destruction, welfare, density, starvation, training, medicines, sedations, notification, etc. Appendix: list of diagnosis, list of treatments, notifiable diseases (list 1, 2 and 3).  Health plan for Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) signed Janette Festvåg 2020-03-09.	Compliant		
8.12	<b>Indicator:</b> 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]  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	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.  b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.  c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received.  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.	Health plan for Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) signed Janette Festvåg 2020-03-09. Includes health control, veterinary visits (12 per year), diseases, preventive measures, disease measures, vaccine, parasites, screening, water quality, destruction, welfare, density, starvation, training, medicines, sedations, notification, etc. Appendix: list of diagnosis, list of treatments, notifiable diseases (list 1, 2 and 3).  Health plan for Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) signed Janette Festvåg 2020-03-09. Includes health control, veterinary visits (12 per year), diseases, preventive measures, disease measures, vaccine, parasites, screening, water quality, destruction, welfare, density, starvation, training, medicines, sedations, notification, etc. Appendix: list of diagnosis, list of treatments, notifiable diseases (list 1, 2 and 3).  Seen Health declarations; Sundsfjord Smolt tank VH3-8 (to Rensøy N cage 1), vaccine Pentium Forte +, Aquagen broodstock, 29.10.2018, signed veterinarian JF. No confirmed/suspected diseases and no restrictions.  100% vaccinated according to national legislation.	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><b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of smolt groups [144] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.13-- Testing of Smolt for Select Diseases</b></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>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>Health plan for Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) signed Janette Festvåg 2020-03-09. Includes health control, veterinary visits (12 per year), diseases, preventive measures, disease measures, vaccine, parasites, screening, water quality, destruction, welfare, density, starvation, training, medicines, sedations, notification, etc. Appendix: list of diagnosis, list of treatments, notifiable diseases (list 1, 2 and 3).</p>	Compliant		100 %
		<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>Seen Health declarations; Sundsfjord Smolt tank VH3-8 (to Rensøy N cage 1), vaccine Pentium Forte +, Aquagen broodstock, 29.10.2018, signed veterinarian JF. No confirmed/suspected diseases and no restrictions.</p>			
Footnote	<p>[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.</p>					
8.14	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 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><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> 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"><li>- name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment;</li><li>- product name and chemical name;</li><li>- reason for use (specific disease)</li><li>- date(s) of treatment;</li><li>- amount (g) of product used;</li><li>- dosage;</li><li>- mt of fish treated;</li><li>- the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and</li><li>- the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.</li></ul>	<p>Seen Smoltdocumentation/Health report, e.g. From Sundsfjord Smolt tank VH3-8, to Rensøy N cage 1, 82 000 fish, vaccine Pentium Forte +, Aquagen broodstock, 08.10.2018. FishTalk record show use of sedation Finquel and treatment with Formaldehyde.</p>	Compliant		

8.15	<b>Indicator:</b> 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]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	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].	Seen list of antibiotics and treatments that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, "Forbudte legemidler og stoffer i animalske varer" 10.03.2020, includes Norway, EU, UK, Canada, Chile, Japan, USA.	Compliant		
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	ASC statement for Sundsfjord Smolt and Helgeland Smolt signed TAG 2019-02-12 regarding compliance to criteria 8.2 a, 8.5 a, 8.6 c, 8.12 c, 8.13 b, 8.14 a, 8.15 c, 8.16/8.17 b, 8.18 c, 8.19 a and 8.21 a.			
		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.	No banned treatments used.			
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	<b>Indicator:</b> Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle  <b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 3  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a).	No antibiotics used. Seen Smoltdocument/CV with treatments identified.	Compliant		0
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.	No antibiotics used. Seen Smoltdocument/CV with treatments identified.			
8.17	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [147]  <b>Requirement:</b> None [148]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [147].	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 6th revision, 2018, updated 2019.	Compliant		
		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.	ASC statement for Sundsfjord Smolt and Helgeland Smolt signed TAG 2019-02-12 regarding compliance to criteria 8.2 a, 8.5 a, 8.6 c, 8.12 c, 8.13 b, 8.14 a, 8.15 c, 8.16/8.17 b, 8.18 c, 8.19 a and 8.21 a.			
		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.	No antibiotics used. Seen Smoltdocument/CV with treatments identified.			
Footnote	[147] The 3rd edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: <a href="http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/CIA_3.pdf">http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/CIA_3.pdf</a> .					
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.					
8.18	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of compliance [149] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [150]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	Note: see instructions for Indicator 5.4.3 regarding evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.		Compliant		
		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).	Seen OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code on internet.			
		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.	ASC statement for Sundsfjord Smolt and Helgeland Smolt signed TAG 2019-02-12 regarding compliance to criteria 8.2 a, 8.5 a, 8.6 c, 8.12 c, 8.13 b, 8.14 a, 8.15 c, 8.16/8.17 b, 8.18 c, 8.19 a and 8.21 a.			
		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.	ASC statement for Sundsfjord Smolt and Helgeland Smolt signed TAG 2019-02-12 regarding compliance to criteria 8.2 a, 8.5 a, 8.6 c, 8.12 c, 8.13 b, 8.14 a, 8.15 c, 8.16/8.17 b, 8.18 c, 8.19 a and 8.21 a.			
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. <a href="http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171">http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171</a> .					



Standards related to Principle 6						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.19	<b>Indicator:</b> 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.	The access to electronic document system of the smolt supplier. The procedures address main requirements of the principle 6.	Compliant		
	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	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 statement of compliance to requirements of ASC standard principle 6.1 - 6.11 and labour laws is available (signed on 2018-10-18). The documents defines main requirements of principle 6.			
Standards related to Principle 7						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.20	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.20 - Consultation and Engagement with Community Representatives</b>  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.				
		a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community.	Meeting was on 2018-10-01 one participant Meeting was 2019-03-11 with seven participants. Not seen stakeholder meetings for smolt supplier Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) in 2020. 26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: Seen Nova Sea internal NC 6637. Corrective actions accepted	Minor	Not seen stakeholder meetings for smolt supplier Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) in 2020. 26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: Seen Nova Sea internal NC 6637. Corrective actions accepted	
		b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements.	Posters, invitation, minutes of meeting show compliance with requirements of the standard.			
8.21	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.	The procedure of handling of non-conformances is applied for handling complaints.	Compliant		
8.22	<b>Indicator:</b> Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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 site is operating in are of rain deer feeding areas. All communications, agreements and limitations were solved in the period for obtaining operation licence.	Compliant		
		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.	Smolt site is operating in are of rain deer feeding areas. All communications, agreements and limitations were solved in the period for obtaining operation licence.			
8.23	<b>Indicator:</b> Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier.	Smolt site is operating in are of rain deer feeding areas. All communications, agreements and limitations were solved in the period for obtaining operation licence.	Compliant		
		b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.	The invitation was sent to Sami representatives. No representatives came to meeting.			

<b>ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT</b> In addition to the requirements above, if the smolt is produced in an open system, evidence shall be provided that the following are met:						
8.24	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for stocking smolts produced in cage-culture  <b>Requirement:</b> Permitted only if supplying farms are 1) operated in a region where indigenous salmonids are present of the same species being cultivated and 2) the farm is certified to the ASC Freshwater trout Standard  <b>Applicability:</b> open (net-pen) production of smolt	a. Obtain documentary evidence that the smolt suppliers operates in a region where indigenous salmonids are present of the same species being cultivated.  b. Obtain documentary evidence that the smolt supplier is certified to the ASC Freshwater trout Standard	No net-pens, tanks only.  No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
<b>ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS</b> 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]:						
8.25	<b>Indicator:</b> Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2)  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [155]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	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	No discharge to freshwater	
Footnote	[155] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.25.					
8.26	<b>Indicator:</b> Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2)  <b>Requirement:</b> 60% [156,157]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b).  b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation.  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 a least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2).	No discharge to freshwater  No discharge to freshwater  No discharge to freshwater	N/A	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.					
8.27	<b>Indicator:</b> 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)  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys.  b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).  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  No discharge to freshwater  No discharge to freshwater	N/A	No discharge to freshwater	
8.28	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4)	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.  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  No discharge to freshwater	N/A	No discharge to	

0.40	<b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	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	14/15	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 Findings

11.1 DO NOT DELETE ANY COLUMN

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

11.3 Each NC is raised against a standard indicator or a CAR requirement

11.4 Use the "sort" function for presenting the list to your liking (e.g. grading, status, closure deadline, etc.)

11.5 Add new rows as needed

11.6 Adjust the column wide as needed - to show the whole text

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	Related VR (#)	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB	Deadline for NC close-out	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Actual date of close-out	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
SA2-20-1	3.1.3	Minor	0,85 mature female lice per fish (week 31), 1,14 mature female lice per fish (week 39), 0,80 mature female lice per fish (week 40) and 0,58 mature female lice per fish (week 50) in 2019 (legal limit 0,5). 26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 5257 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	Barentswatch.no	27.03.2020	Closed		Started with cleanerfish to late. Large infestation of lice i front of the release of cleanerfish.	Delicing performed in week 32 with good result. Responsibility changed to site leader.	27.06.2020	26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 5257 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	26.05.2020					
SA2-20-2	3.4.3	Minor	EUL 18G: 2,3% (18 426 fish). 02.04.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo, NC closed based on Nova Sea AS internal NC 6863 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	Site report, FishTalk	27.03.2020	Closed		The reason for this discrepancy is unknown, but it is likely a result of uncounted mortalities due to predation (we keep track of mortalities that are predator related where a fish is injured, but it is impossible to know how many are eaten by predators). Rensøya N is near large, documented (see SEAPOP) colonies of cormorants. When fish are set out in the autumn at this farm, it means they are quite small when the cormorants arrive for the wintering period. This can lead to a large predation pressure. Rensøya N lost over 10.000 fish (registered) to predation from cormorants during the previous generation, so it is not unlikely that 18.000 were eaten by the cormorants successfully.	Corrective actions: The farm changed their bird nets in the winter of 2018 after predation pressure increased from 20 x 20 cm openings to 10 x 10 cm openings. Additionally, they were the first farm to use a pilot project involving drones to scare cormorants. Preventive actions: Only use bird nets with 10 x 10 cm openings on farms near registered cormorant colonies, search for alternative predator scaring techniques, if possible do not set out on farms that are at an increased risk of predation in the autumn (if you set out in the late spring, the fish will be larger during the winter and thus less interesting targets for the cormorants).	27.06.2020	02.04.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo, NC closed based on Nova Sea AS internal NC 6863 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	02.04.2020					
SA2-20-3	5.1.7	Minor	Not seen evaluation of fish health targets after 1st year in sea as planned according to site specific fish health plan. 26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 6856 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	Site specific health plan for Rensøy N H18	27.03.2020	Closed		Due to human failure this has not been a priority.	Corrective: Fish health plan has been evaluated. Preventive: The evaluations will be integrated into a multidisciplinary context and evaluated more thoroughly and elucidate several aspects.	27.06.2020	26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: NC closed based on Nova Sea internal NC 6856 with actions, root cause and corrective actions.	26.05.2020					
SA2-20-4	8.20	Minor	Not seen stakeholder meetings for smolt supplier Helgeland Smolt (Reppen and Sundsfjord) in 2020.	Interview	27.03.2020	Open/Accepted		Smolt suppliers has always been included in the stakeholder meetings together with Nova Sea AS. Stakeholders for smolt suppliers has also been invited on this meetings. Due to misunderstandings we were not aware that this was not satisfactory.	Corrective: We will arrange a stakeholder meeting once a year and invite stakeholders for smolt suppliers. This will be performed as soon as the situation permits. Preventive: Arrange a meeting once a year, this will be announced on e-mail, flyers and on facebook.	27.06.2020	26.05.2020, Jan Petter Kosmo: Seen Nova Sea internal NC 6637. Corrective actions accepted		26.05.2020	Meeting not performed due to COVID-19.	RC-2021	Accepted	26.05.2020

## 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). Only transport from one seasite to the slaughterhouse at the time.

<p>10.3 The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Wellboat services are subcontracted. Approved wellboat companies are used during transhipments of salmon between the site and holding cages/harvest plant. Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting other salmon farms/sites in the same assignment. The possibility for mixture of salmon in holding 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 holding cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant. Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept in electronic system FishTalk and 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>

Owned by client

Subcontracted by client

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

Number of sites included in the unit of certification

1	NA
1	0

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

Site name(s)	Reason(s)
NA	NA

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

The company has a robust and well implemented quality system, which covers the whole organization from smolts to sales.  
All stages of fish live cycle within the scope of this certification standard are traceable. Documents describe a satisfactory control with incoming products, from freshwater sites and external suppliers, and corresponding documentation of production sites and suppliers. Digital information is handled in FishTalk/Landax for on-growing phase in seawater and from freshwater stage.

#### 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 certification, or

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 authorized 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/holding cages to the harvest/processing plant. From this point the ASC Salmon Standard certificate stops and the ASC CoC certificate takes over. The harvest plant is ASC CoC certified (ref. to [www.asc-aqua.org](http://www.asc-aqua.org) where updated information can be found):  
Nova Sea AS, certificate code ASC-C-01705 (valid 21.02.2018 - 21.02.2021) .

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

No, not for the unit of certification.



## 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

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.

The principles where full compliance was found: 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7.

For the rest of the principles, 3, 5 and 8, full compliance was not found, although most of these were mainly compliant.

The audit hence resulted in 4 Minor category Non-Conformities and 0 Major category Non-Conformities. VR used during audit: VR nr.39 approved 15.09.2014 by ASC on phosphorus release from smolt producer. Rationale for use of VR 39 during audit is that as for accepted VR 39 the smolt producers effluent is seawater not freshwater. VR nr. 179 approved 24.08.16 by ASC for translation of reports into local language (Norwegian). Reports will be accepted in English. VR nr. 97 approved 20.08.2015 by ASC for calculation of PTI based on biomass. VR nr. 227 approved 10.05.2019 by ASC for indicator 3.1.7 defines limit to <0,2 mature sealice females per salmon. Rationale for use is that the site as for VR227 is within Norwegian jurisdiction and Norwegian legislation. If necessary stakeholders can get in touch with DNVGL and we can translate necessary information. VR list and updated documentation for VR can be found on the ASC website: <http://www.asc-aqua.org/>

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)

The site has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the ASC Salmon Standard is expected for the future. Final certification decision has been taken. The site remains compliant and recommended to remain certified.

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)

YES . Certificate was issued after Initial Audit 2018 and remains certified after Surveillance Audit 2 -2020.

- Final certification decision was taken in final report of Initial Audit 2018 and the farm remains certified after Surveillance Audit 2 2020.
- After certification decision by DNV GL the applicant remains certified and can claim ASC Aquaculture certification status.

13.2 The Eligibility Date (if applicable)	The Eligibility Date is the date of certification. Certificate validity 03.04.2018 - 03.04.2021.
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.	Certificate validity 03.04.2018 - 03.04.2021.
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	Stakeholders can contact DNV GL and/or Lead Auditor as specified in report section I 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 <a href="http://www.dnvgl.com">www.dnvgl.com</a>

## 14 Surveillance

14.1 Next planned Surveillance	
14.1.1 Planned date	2021 - Specific date not decided at this stage.
14.1.2 Planned site	Rensøya N
14.2 Next audit type	
14.2.1 Surveillance 1	
14.2.2 Surveillance 2	
14.2.3 Re-certification	RC - 2021
14.2.4 Other (specify type)	

