

### **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.*

*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

31.08.2017

#### **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

PDF 1.3.4 Email address	jan.petter.kosmo@dnvgl.com
PDF 1.3.5 Phone number	+47 957 48769
PDF 1.3.6 Other	

**PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client**

PDF 1.4.1 Name of Company	Cermaq Norway AS
PDF 1.4.2 Name of Contact Person	Mats William Snåre
PDF 1.4.3 Position in the client's organisation	Environmental Coordinator
PDF 1.4.4 Mailing address	Cermaq Norway AS Nordfoldveien 165 8286 NORDFOLD, NORWAY
PDF 1.4.5 Email address	<a href="mailto:mats.snare@cermaq.com">mats.snare@cermaq.com</a>
PDF 1.4.6 Phone number	+47 23 68 55 00

PDF 1.4.7 Other

Phone +47 23 68 55 00 Direct +47 23 68 55 33 Mobile +47 92 63 99 25
---

### PDF 1.5 Unit of Certification

PDF 1.5.1 Single Site

Single site

PDF 1.5.2 Multi-site

--

PDF 1.5.3 Group certification

--

### PDF 1.6 Sites to be audited

Site Name	GPS Coordinates	Other Location Information	Planned Site Audit(s)	Date of planned audit
13412 Dypeide	68o49.4970N / 14o46.5180E	North Norway, Nordland County, Øksnes Municipality. Receiving water body: Børøyfjorden, Ryggefjorden, Møklandsfjorden.	IA	Week 44-45 in 2017

### PDF 1.7 Species and Standards

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

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

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in-person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted
<b>Mattilsynet</b>	Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Nordland Fylkeskommune</b>	Local authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Kystverket</b>	Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Fiskeridirektoratet</b>	Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Fylkesmannen i Nordland</b>	Local authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Nordland Fylkes Fiskarlag</b>	Fishermen organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Øksnes Fiskarlag</b>	Fishermen organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications

\* Except unannounced audits, for which this form will be sent to the ASC and AAB without being published

<b>Øksnes Kommune</b>	Local authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Bø kystfiskarlag</b>	Fishermen organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications
<b>Norges kystfiskarlag</b>	Fishermen organization	Written notifications with request for submissions, and if needed telephone	Before audit and when draft report is published	Written notifications

#### PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed:	31.05.2017
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit:	30.10.2017
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s):	Week 44-45 in 2017 (31.10.2017 - 09.11.2017)
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/ Decision:	The final certification decision has been taken after needed activities, as per ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements Version 1.1 April 2017. • Compliant and thus certified.

#### PDF 1.10 Audit Team

	Column1	Name	ASC Registration Reference
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor	Jan Petter Kosmo	
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts	Kjell Roar Bekkevold	
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**
- 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	Cermaq Norway AS
1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report]	ASC Initial audit, final report
1.3 CAB name	DNV GL
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 Kjell Roar Bekkevold - lead auditor, reviewer
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Mats William Snåre, Environmental Coordinator
1.7 Date	05.02.2018

### 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. 6) FHP is Fish health plan. 7) 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.

#### 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	ASC audit of Dypeide 13412, a seasite
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	Production of Atlantic salmon ( <i>Salmo salar</i> )
4.3	Type of unit of certification ( <i>select only one type of unit of certification in the list</i> )	Single farm
4.4	Type of audit ( <i>select all the types of audit that apply in the list</i> )	Initial audit 2017
4.5	A summary of the major findings	Refer to report section II Audit template and IV Audit Report - Closing for NCs found during audit
4.6	The Audit determination	<p>The Audit determination at Final report stage:</p> <p><b>Compliant.</b> Considered compliant and recommended certified now that satisfactory closure or a corrective action plan for Minor non-conformances is implemented by the client and is approved by DNV GL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final certification decision has been taken in this Final Report after completion of stakeholder period.</li> <li>• Certification decision is made by DNV GL and the applicant is certified and can claim ASC Aquaculture certification status.</li> </ul>

#### 5 CAB Contact Information

5.1	CAB Name	DNVGL
5.2	CAB Mailing Address	Veritasveien 11322 HøvikNorway
5.3	Email Address	jan.petter.kosmo@dnvgl.com
5.4	Other Contact Information	Phone to DNVGL +47 67 57 99 00

#### 6 Background on the Applicant

6.1	Information on the Public Disclosure Form (Form 3) except 1.2-1.3 All information updated as necessary to reflect the audit as conducted.	Yes
-----	---	-----



6.2	A description of the unit of certification (for initial audit) / changes, if any (for surveillance and recertification audits)	Dypeide is a conventional floating cage salmon farm. The production cages are floating circular cages (100 / 120 meters circumference), with pointed nets. Central on the farm is a feed barge, with centralized feeding system and visual control of feeding. All installations are certified according to Norwegian legislation "NS-9415 NYTEK" regulations standard. Smolts supplied by internal suppliers.
6.3	Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	
6.4	Other certification(s) obtained before this audit	
6.5	Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>current</u> year	2017: 1840 tons
6.6	<u>Actual</u> annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>previous</u> year ( mandatory for surveillance and recertification audits )	2016: 0 tons
6.7	Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification (select one or more in the list)	Net cages at sea
6.8	Number of employees working at the unit of certification	5 (+2 shared with site Langøyhovden)
<b>7 Scope</b>		
7.1	The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Salmon Standard, version 1.1 April 2017
7.2	The species produced at the applicant farm	Atlantic salmon ( <i>Salmo salar</i> )
7.3	A description of the scope of the audit including a description of whether the unit of certification covers all production or harvest areas (i.e. ponds) managed by the operation or located at the included sites, or whether only a sub-set of these are included in the unit of certification. If only a sub-set of production or harvest areas are included in the unit of certification these shall be clearly named.	Dypeide is a seasite with 7 cages of which all are in use for this generation. All cages were covered by the audit
7.4	The names and addresses of any storage, processing, or distribution sites included in the operation (including subcontracted operations) that will potentially be handling certified products, up until the point where product enters further chain of custody.	Fish goes directly from the seasite to the slaughterhouse. Only approved wellboats is used during transshipments of salmon between the site and waiting 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 waiting cages from salmon from other farm/sites is also prevented by biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the harvesting/processing plant used. There are slaughtered fish from only one waiting cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept in electronic system FishTalk/Intelex and in hard copies.

**7.5** Description of the receiving water body(ies).

The farm is located east of Tindsøya in Nordland county. Site's receiving water-body is Børøyfjorden, Ryggefjorden, Møklandsfjorden (Øksnes municipality). Regional water-body authority is Nordland County. This is a coastal water area. Categorised as a coastal waters, of Euhaline nature (>30‰ salinity). Ecological quality is defined as good. Chemical condition is not defined in public documentation. Details [www.vann-nett.no](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  
Kjell Roar Bekkevold, technical reviewer  
Onsite audit was finished 09.11.2017  
Initial audit draft report sent to technical review 29.11.2017  
Technical Review of Initial audit draft report were finished 12.12.2017  
Initial audit draft report sent to ASC 12.12.2017  
Final Report finished 28.01.2018.  
Technical review of Final Report finished 05.02.2018  
Final report sent ASC 06.02.2018

**8.2** Previous Audits (if applicable):

NC reference number	Standard clause reference	Closing deadline - status - closing date of each NC
---------------------	---------------------------	---

8.2.1 Initial audit - mm/yyyy  
Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy  
Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy  
  
Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy  
  
Unannounced audit - mm/ yyyy  
  
NC close-out audit - mm/ yyyy  
Scope extension audit mm/ yyyy


**8.4** Audit plan as implemented including:

8.4.1 Desk Reviews

8.4.2 Onsite audits

8.4.3 Stakeholder interviews and Community meetings

8.4.4 Draft report sent to client

8.4.5 Draft report sent to ASC

8.5.5 Final report sent to Client and ASC

Dates	Locations
04.09.2017	
31.10.2017 - 09.11.2017	Onsite
	No submissions received from notified stakeholders.
29.11.2017	Initial audit 2017 report
12.12.2017	Initial audit 2017 report
06.02.2018	Initial audit 2017 report

**8.7** 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.

Mats William Snåre - environmental coordinator  
Karl F. Ottem - fish health manager  
Torbjørn Hjertø - health and safety manager  
Ann Ellingsen - site manager Langøyhovden and Dypeide  
Tommy Olsen - site manager Svartfjell  
Kjell Hansen - production manager ongrowing  
Marit H. Hansen - freshwater manager  
Evy Røymo - quality coordinator  
Mona Johansen - HR manager

The audit was held in the company's office at Nordfold, focusing on technical and legal matters, mainly, with relevant operational and administrative staff present. The second part of the audit comprised a site visit to Dypeide, covering remaining technical and administrative issues and completed the social responsibility issues. The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including site staff, typically a combination of document reviews and staff interviews. The interviews pertinent to the Social Responsibility Section of the ASC Salmon Standard were held in conditions allowing for confidentiality of the dialogues and under no constraints of free speech of the interviewees. These interviewees are not named in the report for the same reason. Demonstrations of equipment and processes took place, relevant to the scope of the audit, according to the ASC Salmon Standard v1.1 and following guidelines in the ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.1.

**8.8** Stakeholder submissions, including written or other documented information and CAB written responses to each submission.

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

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard						
Created by the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue						
Scope: species belonging to the genus <i>Salmo</i> and <i>Oncorhynchus</i>						
PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS						
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations						
		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence	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	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws.	Quality system "Intelex" with link to relevant laws, regulations and requirements in procedures. Document "Offentlige bestemmelser" is a list of all relevant laws, regulations and requirements with link to the law/regulation/requirement.	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 09.09.2014 for Dypeide MAB 2340 tons. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 18.09.2014 for Dypeide MAB 2340 tons, licenses N Ø 0004, N Ø 0007, N Ø 0017, N SG0018, N SG0029 and N HM0005.			
		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).	Inspection by Norwegian Food Safety Authority 04.04.2017, no non conformities detected. No inspection by Directorate of Fisheries in 2017. No inspections by "Arbeidstilsynet" in 2017.			
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	Not within conservation area, seen map from "kart.naturbase.no" with protected areas. Impact on the area is evaluated in permit documents and further risk assessed minimum yearly (last in 2017).			
		e. Others, please describe				
1.1.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> 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.	Cermaq Norway AS registered in official register "Brønnøysundregisteret" with nr. 961922976. Authorised auditor statement for 2016 (period ending 31.03.2017) from Deloitte - R.L. 23.06.2017.	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".	Cermaq Norway AS registered in official register "Brønnøysundregisteret" with nr. 961922976. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune 24.10.2017 for Svartfjell MAB 5460 tons (3600 tons after 31.12.2019), licenses N SG0003, N SG0005, N SG0014, N HM0009, N SG0041, N SG0042, N SG0043, N SG0044 and N SG0045. Operation plan approved by Directorate of Fisheries 12.01.2017 for area (including Svartfjell, Langøyhovden and Dypeide). Svartfjell: planned release 06.01. - 30.06.2017 and planned fallowing 01.11. - 31.12.2018. Langøyhovden: planned release 02.05. - 15.06.2017 and planned fallowing 01.01. - 01.05.2017. Dypeide: planned release 01.01. - 31.07.2017 and planned fallowing 15.06. - 31.12.2018.			
		d. Others, please describe				
1.1.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	Online access to lovdata.no with laws and regulations.	Compliant		
		b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	No inspections by "Arbeidstilsynet" registered in present generation on site.			
		c. Others, please describe				

1.1.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.</p> <p>b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.</p> <p>c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland 09.09.2014 for Dypeide MAB 2340 tons. Operation plan approved by Directorate of Fisheries 12.01.2017 for area (including Svartfjell, Langøyhovden and Dypeide). Svartfjell: planned release 06.01. - 30.06.2017 and planned following 01.11. - 31.12.2018. Langøyhovden: planned release 02.05. - 15.06.2017 and planned following 01.01. - 01.05.2017. Dypeide: planned release 01.01. - 31.07.2017 and planned following 15.06. - 31.12.2018.</p> <p>As described in above permits. MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017, report 8985.01.</p> <p>Biomass reported to government via Altinn end of each month, e.g. report for September 2017, reported 04.10.2017 biomass 984 tons (7 cages). Environmental reports and surveys reported to Altinn max 1 month after report is finished.</p>	Compliant		
<b>PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION</b> <i>Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]</i>						
2.1.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Redox potential &gt; 0 millivolts (mV) or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<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.</p> <p>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.</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. 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).</p> <p>e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p> <p>f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p> <p>g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. If site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC.</p> <p>h. Others, please describe</p>	<p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.</p> <p>Reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2. Stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4. Station inside AZE: C1.</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1. MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at &gt;75% peak biomass) last production cycle.</p> <p>Stations outside AZE: C2: 41,9 C3: 121,5 C4: -0,2</p> <p>Redox potential measured according to national regulation (NS 9410:2016)</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Minor	<p>Redox potential at stations outside AZE not &gt;0: C4 -0,2 mV. MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at &gt;75% peak biomass) last production cycle. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.</p>	54,4
		<p>a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1).</p> <p>b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement.</p>	<p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.</p> <p>#2 Shannon Wiener used</p>			

2.1.2	<p><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</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score <math>\leq 3.3</math>, or Shannon-Wiener Index score <math>&gt; 3</math>, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score <math>\geq 15</math>, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score <math>\geq 25</math></p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).</p> <p>d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.</p> <p>h. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analyzed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results.</p> <p>i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.</p> <p>j. Others, please describe</p>	<p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1. MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at <math>&gt;75\%</math> peak biomass) last production cycle.</p> <p>Option #2 Shannon Wiener used</p> <p>Stations outside AZE: C2: 4,1 C3: 3,61 C4: 3,71</p> <p>Option #2 Shannon Wiener used</p> <p>Option #2 Shannon Wiener used</p> <p>Field work, sorting, specie identification and calculation according to NS-EN ISO/IEC 17025. Evaluation benthos according to NS 9410:2016 and guidance 02:2013 (Anon 2013) Program used is Primer v5.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Minor	<p>MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at <math>&gt;75\%</math> peak biomass) last production cycle.</p> <p>Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.</p>	3,8
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> <math>\geq 2</math> 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>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.</p> <p>Field work, sorting, specie identification and calculation according to NS-EN ISO/IEC 17025. Guidance on sampling of marine sediments ISO 5667-19. Water quality - Guidelines for quantitative sampling and sample processing of marine soft bottom macro fauna. Evaluation benthos according to NS 9410:2016 and guidance 02:2013 (Anon 2013). Program used is Primer v5.</p> <p>Stations inside AZE: C1: 2 highly abundant species, 1 of these is not a pollution indicator specie.</p> <p>Field work, sorting, specie identification and calculation according to NS-EN ISO/IEC 17025. Guidance on sampling of marine sediments ISO 5667-19. Water quality - Guidelines for quantitative sampling and sample processing of marine soft bottom macro fauna. Evaluation benthos according to NS 9410:2016 and guidance 02:2013 (Anon 2013). Program used is Primer v5.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Minor	<p>Number of macrofaunal taxa within AZE not <math>\geq 2</math> highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species: C1 2 highly abundant species, where 1 is not a pollution indicator specie.</p> <p>MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at <math>&gt;75\%</math> peak biomass) last production cycle.</p> <p>Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.</p>	1
		<p>a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern before 3 years have passed since publication of the Standard on June 13, 2012.</p>	<p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.</p>			

2.1.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modeling system</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, within three years of the publication [8] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>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].</p> <p>c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with &gt; 6 months of monitoring data.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.</p> <p>MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.</p>	Compliant		
Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [12]						
2.2.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Weekly average percent saturation [13] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [14] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≥ 70% [15]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [15]</p>	<p>a. Monitor and record on-farm percent saturation of DO at a minimum of twice daily using a calibrated oxygen meter or equivalent method. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months.</p> <p>b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.</p> <p>c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.</p> <p>d. If any weekly average DO values are &lt; 70%, or approaching that level, monitor and record DO at a reference site and compare to on-farm levels (see Instructions).</p> <p>e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.</p> <p>f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Nortek "Realfish" continuous logging (every 10 minutes) of oxygen, salinity and temperature at 2 sampling stations (5 and 10 meters). Seen record for the period week 25 to 38 in 2017. Minimum 82,1% oxygen and maximum 111,0% oxygen. Minimum 7,21 mg oxygen per liter and maximum 10,35 mg oxygen per liter. Not seen record covering 6 months or more.</p> <p>Not seen written justification for missing data.</p> <p>Nortek "Realfish" continuous logging (every 10 minutes) of oxygen, salinity and temperature at 2 sampling stations (5 and 10 meters). Seen record for the period week 25 to 38 in 2017. Minimum 82,1% oxygen and maximum 111,0% oxygen. Minimum 7,21 mg oxygen per liter and maximum 10,35 mg oxygen per liter.</p> <p>No measurements below 70% dissolved oxygen has been registered/observed. No measurements below 2 mg/l dissolved oxygen has been registered/observed.</p> <p>Seen Nortek "Realfish" system at site. Calibration and service per year/generation at supplier.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Minor	<p>Not seen oxygen records for ≥ 6 months and not seen written justification for any missed samples. Seen record for the period week 25 to 38 in 2017. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.</p>	Minimum 82,1%
2.2.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/liter DO</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 5%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/l DO.</p> <p>b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>All above limits. Not seen record covering 6 months or more.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Minor	<p>Not seen oxygen records for ≥ 6 months. Seen record for the period week 25 to 38 in 2017. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.</p>	> 2
2.2.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets [16], demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently [17] classified as having "good" or "very good" water quality [18]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes [19]</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB whether relevant targets and classification systems are applicable in the jurisdiction. If applicable, proceed to "2.2.3.b". If not applicable, take action as required under 2.2.4</p> <p>b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.</p>	<p>EU Water Directive 2000 gives water quality objectives for area Øksnes community (reference to vann-nett.no/). Ecologic condition and chemical state are classified 81,8% presumed good, 4,5% presumed very good, 9,1% presumed moderate and 4,5% undefined.</p> <p>EU Water Directive 2000 gives water quality objectives for area Øksnes community (reference to vann-nett.no/). Ecologic condition and chemical state are classified 81,8% presumed good, 4,5% presumed very good, 9,1% presumed moderate and 4,5% undefined.</p>	Compliant		

	<b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [19]	c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.	EU Water Directive 2000 gives water quality objectives for area Øksnes community (reference to vann-nett.no/). Ecologic condition and chemical state are classified 81,8% presumed good, 4,5% presumed very good, 9,1% presumed moderate and 4,5% undefined.			
		d. Others, please describe				
2.2.4	<b>Indicator:</b> For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [20] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5, testing a minimum of once weekly in both locations. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months.	EU Water Directive 2000 gives water quality objectives for area Øksnes community (reference to vann-nett.no/). Ecologic condition and chemical state are classified 81,8% presumed good, 4,5% presumed very good, 9,1% presumed moderate and 4,5% undefined.	Compliant		
		b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.	EU Water Directive 2000 gives water quality objectives for area Øksnes community (reference to vann-nett.no/). Ecologic condition and chemical state are classified 81,8% presumed good, 4,5% presumed very good, 9,1% presumed moderate and 4,5% undefined.			
		c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	EU Water Directive 2000 gives water quality objectives for area Øksnes community (reference to vann-nett.no/). Ecologic condition and chemical state are classified 81,8% presumed good, 4,5% presumed very good, 9,1% presumed moderate and 4,5% undefined.			
		d. Others, please describe				
2.2.5	<b>Indicator:</b> Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [21]) of the farm on a production cycle basis  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.	Present cycle 17G (from release to 02.10.2017): BOD (mTO2) 101,91 Full production cycle will be provided when fish is harvested, will be followed up at SA1.	Compliant		101,91
		b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		c. Others, please describe				
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
2.3.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of fines [22] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [23] (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 [23]	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.	Procedure "Prosedyre for førmottak og lagring" 01.06.2017 describes monthly sampling and testing at feed reception. In the period 14.10. - 30.10.2017 feed samples showed fines 0,00 - 0,08% (4 samples in October).	Minor	Not seen record of percentage of fines in feed from last 3 months. Seen 4 samples in October. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	0,04 %
		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.	In the period 14.10. - 30.10.2017 feed samples showed fines 0,00 - 0,08% (4 samples in October). Not seen samples from last 3 months.			
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species						
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	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.	Report "Biodiversitetsfokusert risikovurdering - Vesterålen (Langøyhovden, Dypeide)" 07.03.2017, includes sensitive and protected habitats, redlisted species, lice, escape, treatments, potential effects of farming, water quality, environmental state, salmon carrying areas, etc. Includes actions and goals for environment and biodiversity. In "Intelext": Risk assessment "Risikovurdering Ytre miljø Langøyhovden/Dypeide" 22.02.2017 and procedure "Prosedyre for risikovurdering".	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.	Report "Biodiversitetsfokusert risikovurdering - Vesterålen (Langøyhovden, Dypeide)" 07.03.2017, includes sensitive and protected habitats, redlisted species, lice, escape, treatments, potential effects of farming, water quality, environmental state, salmon carrying areas, etc. Includes actions and goals for environment and biodiversity. In "Intelext": Risk assessment "Risikovurdering Ytre miljø Langøyhovden/Dypeide" 22.02.2017 and procedure "Prosedyre for risikovurdering".			



		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 "Biodiversitetsfokuset risikovurdering - Vesterålen (Langøyhovden, Dypeide)" 07.03.2017, includes sensitive and protected habitats, redlisted species, lice, escape, treatments, potential effects of farming, water quality, environmental state, salmon carrying areas, etc. Includes actions and goals for environment and biodiversity. In "Intelex": Risk assessment "Risikovurdering Ytre miljø Langøyhovden/Dypeide" 22.02.2017 and procedure "Prosedyre for risikovurdering".			
		d. Others, please describe				
2.4.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [24] or High Conservation Value Areas [25] (HCVAs)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None [26]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [26]</p>	<p>a. Provide a map showing the location of the farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) as defined above (see also 1.1.1a).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Not within or in conflict with conservation area, seen map from "kart.naturbase.no" with protected areas.</p> <p>Statement "Erklæring naturvernområder" 10.10.2017 site not in HCVA, signed M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS.</p> <p>Not within HCVA</p> <p>Not within HCVA</p>	Compliant		
<b>Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]</b>						
2.5.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 0, within three years of the date of publication [28] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a written statement affirming that the farm's management is committed to eliminate all usage of acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) by June 13, 2015.</p> <p>b. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs were used by the farm after June 13, 2015 (applicable only after the specified date).</p> <p>-</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used, seen statement "Erklæring om bruk av akustiske skremmere" for Langøyhovden and Dypeide 06.07.2017, signed M.W.S. and A.E. - Cermaq Norway</p> <p>No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used, seen statement "Erklæring om bruk av akustiske skremmere" for Langøyhovden and Dypeide 06.07.2017, signed M.W.S. and A.E. - Cermaq Norway</p> <p>Verified not in use on site.</p>	Compliant		
2.5.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Prior to the achievement of 2.5.1, if ADDs or AHDs are used, maximum percentage of days [29] in the production cycle that the devices are operational</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 40%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All, until June 13, 2015</p>	<p>a. Maintain a log for the use of any ADDs or AHDs on farm that includes recording the number of days (24-hour cycles) during which the devices were used.</p> <p>b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle.</p> <p>-</p> <p>d. Submit data on number of days that ADDs/AHDs were used to the ASC as per Appendix VI. Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used, seen statement "Erklæring om bruk av akustiske skremmere" for Langøyhovden and Dypeide 06.07.2017, signed M.W.S. and A.E. - Cermaq Norway</p> <p>No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used, seen statement "Erklæring om bruk av akustiske skremmere" for Langøyhovden and Dypeide 06.07.2017, signed M.W.S. and A.E. - Cermaq Norway</p> <p>Verified not in use on site.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant		
2.5.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of mortalities [30] of endangered or red-listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 0 (zero)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.</p> <p>b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.</p> <p>c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.</p> <p>d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1)</p> <p>-</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Procedure "Prosedyre for samspill med dyr og fugler" 30.06.2016 with reporting and description of evt. lethal actions. Bird nets used and risk assessed.</p> <p>Company website (www.cermaq.com) states 0 reported lethal incidents (per 30.10.2017) Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.</p> <p>Company website (www.cermaq.com) states 0 reported lethal incidents (per 30.10.2017) Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.</p> <p>Seen list "Rødlista Kyst og Saltvann Nordland 2017" with redlisted mammals and birds.</p> <p>No mortalities of redlisted or endangered marine mammals and birds in the area registered on site.</p>	Compliant		0

2.5.4	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [32] 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 [33]  <b>Applicability:</b> All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [33]	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.	No lethal actions taken at farm. Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.	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.	No lethal actions taken at farm. Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.			
		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 [33].	No lethal actions taken at farm. Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.			
		d. Others, please describe				
2.5.5	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.	Company website (www.cermaq.com) states 0 reported lethal incidents (per 30.10.2017).	Compliant		0
		b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).	Company website (www.cermaq.com) states 0 reported lethal incidents (per 30.10.2017).			
		c. Others, please describe				
2.5.6	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior two years  <b>Requirement:</b> < 9 lethal incidents [36], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.4a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required.	Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.	Compliant		
		b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.	Seen log for incidents stating 0 birds in 2017. Previous generation was 2012G.			
		c. Send ASC the farm's data for all lethal incidents [35] 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 26.10.2017.			
		d. Others, please describe				
2.5.7	<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.	Report "Biodiversitetsfokuset risikovurdering - Vesterålen (Langøyhovden, Dypeide)" 07.03.2017, includes redlisted species, potential effects of farming, environmental state, etc. Includes actions and goals for environment and biodiversity. In "Intelext": Risk assessment "Risikovurdering Ytre miljø Langøyhovden/Dypeide" 22.02.2017 and procedure "Prosedyre for risikovurdering".	Compliant		
		b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.7a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents.	In "Intelext": Risk assessment "Risikovurdering Ytre miljø Langøyhovden/Dypeide" 22.02.2017 and procedure "Prosedyre for risikovurdering".			
		c. Others, please describe				
PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS						
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [38,39]						
		a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme.	ABM agreement "Samordnet plan for bekjempelse av lakselus - del 1" region Hålogaland valid from 01.11.2017, managed by Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste, including farmers in the area and includes information sharing, coordinated treatments, delicing, states less than 0,2 adult female lice per fish from Monday week 21 to Sunday week 26, treatments, control and evaluation of treatments. "Del 2" includes the two farmers in the subregion Øksnes and Vestbygd, includes following, status in the region, etc. Sensitive period defined in "Forskrift om endring i forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus", states less than 0,2 adult female lice per fish from Monday week 21 to Sunday week 26. Procedure regarding lice "Prosedyre for samordnet kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus" 04.04.2017. VHP 21.03.2017 for Dypeide includes biosecurity, health, infection control, diseases, surveillance, sampling, welfare, lice, treatments, list of treatments with dosage, withdrawal period, MRL, WHO classification, MRL reference, signed veterinarian K.F.O. - Cermaq Norway AS.			
	<b>Indicator:</b> Participation in an Area-					

3.1.1	<p>ABM management plan 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 [38]</p>	<p>b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- coordination of stocking;</li> <li>- fallowing;</li> <li>- therapeutic treatments; and</li> <li>- information sharing.</li> </ul> <p>c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with all requirements in Appendix II-1, including definition of area, minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements.</p> <p>d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>ABM agreement regulates the coordination and Labora administrates the coordination. Reporting from Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste e.g. "Statusoppdatering lakselus Subregion Hålogaland", 25.10.2017, includes Langøyhovden, Dypeide and other sites in region with resistance tests (bioassay), status lice per site, treatments, effect, etc. Operation plan approved by Directorate of Fisheries 12.01.2017 for area (including Svartfjell, Langøyhovden and Dypeide). Svartfjell: planned release 06.01. - 30.06.2017 and planned fallowing 01.11. - 31.12.2018. Langøyhovden: planned release 02.05. - 15.06.2017 and planned fallowing 01.01. - 01.05.2017. Dypeide: planned release 01.01. - 31.07.2017 and planned fallowing 15.06. - 31.12.2018.</p> <p>ABM agreement "Samordnet plan for bekjempelse av lakselus - del 1" region Hålogaland valid from 01.11.2017, managed by Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste, including farmers in the area and includes information sharing, coordinated treatments, delicing, states less than 0,2 adult female lice per fish from Monday week 21 to Sunday week 26, treatments, control and evaluation of treatments. "Del 2" includes the two farmers in the subregion Øksnes and Vestbygd, includes fallowing, status in the region, etc.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant		
3.1.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> A demonstrated commitment [40] 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 [38]</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>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>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>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>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Cermaq Norway has participated/contributed in several projects, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Ruseprosjektet i Varpa" (catch of wild fish for research, lice count and determination if its wild or farmed fish which goes up in the river). Seen annual report for 2016. Cermaq Norway gives economical support to project.</li> <li>ProBarents is starting a project regarding tracing of marine waste. Seen email 14.09.2017 to J.R.M. in ProBarents regarding participation. Cermaq Norway provides test sites.</li> <li>"ClimeFish" administrated by Nofima regarding sustainable production of fish. Seen article at Nofima website 11.02.2016. Cermaq Norway shall test fish online for quality.</li> <li>"CtrlAqua" by Nofima/University in Bergen/Uni Research regarding closed farming. Seen annual report for 2016, Cermaq Norway participate with site and knowledge.</li> </ul> <p>Some of the projects described in 3.1.2 includes non-financial support.</p> <p>No research projects denied. Region manager in Nordland decides if company shall participate in proposed research project.</p> <p>Cermaq Norway has participated/contributed in several projects, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Ruseprosjektet i Varpa"; seen annual report for 2016.</li> <li>ProBarents project; seen email 14.09.2017 to J.R.M. in ProBarents regarding participation.</li> <li>"ClimeFish"; seen article at Nofima website 11.02.2016.</li> <li>"CtrlAqua"; seen annual report for 2016.</li> </ul>	Compliant		
		<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/Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste 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/Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste reports status in area monthly to participating companies.</p>			

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 [38]</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>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>d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Sea lice load reported to Altinn weekly and made public on <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a>. ABM/Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste 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>NFSA set limits and governmental treatment regime for site and ABM. Recorded in FishTalk, and automatic reported to Altinn weekly.</p> <p>Week 2-37 in 2017: max. 0,17 (week 37) mature female lice per fish. Below 0,1 adult female in sensitive period.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant		0,17
3.1.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<p>a. Prepare an annual schedule for testing sea lice that identifies timeframes of routine testing frequency (at a minimum, monthly) and for high-frequency testing (weekly) due to sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles).</p> <p>b. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for sea lice. If farm deviates from schedule due to weather [41] maintain documentation of event and rationale.</p> <p>c. Document the methodology used for testing sea lice ('testing' includes both counting and identifying sea lice). The method must follow national or international norms, follows accepted minimum sample size, use random sampling, and record the species and life-stage of the sea lice. If farm uses a closed production system and would like to use an alternate method (i.e. video), farm shall provide the CAB with details on the method and efficacy of the method.</p> <p>d. Make the testing results from 3.1.4b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within seven days of testing. If requested, provide stakeholders access to hardcopies of test results.</p> <p>e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.</p> <p>f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Procedure "Prosedyre for lusetelling" 03.03.2017 states lice count every 7 day if water temperature is over 4 degrees Celsius and every 14 day if water temperature is below 4 degrees Celsius, lice counting at 20 fish per cage (counting in all cages), etc.</p> <p>Weekly internal meetings regarding lice, e.g. 02.11.17, lice status per site (includes Svartfjell, Langøyhovden and Dypeide), treatment, effect, etc.</p> <p>Sea lice load reported to Altinn weekly and made public on <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a>. Sea lice data missing for week 2, 3, 5 and 6, not seen justification.</p> <p>Weekly testing according to NFSA regulation. Sealice numbers and lifestage identified and recorded. Procedure "Prosedyre for lusetelling" 03.03.2017 states lice count every 7 day if water temperature is over 4 degrees Celsius and every 14 day if water temperature is below 4 degrees Celsius, lice counting at 20 fish per cage (counting in all cages), etc.</p> <p>Reported weekly to Altinn. Results available at <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a> (also link to Barentswatch on Cermaq Norway website ).</p> <p>Reported weekly to Altinn. Results available at <a href="http://www.barentswatch.no">www.barentswatch.no</a> (also link to Barentswatch on Cermaq Norway website ).</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Minor	Sea lice data missing for week 2, 3, 5 and 6, not seen justification. Jan Petter Kosmo 23.01.2018: Closed. The 2 weeks with missing lice counting are justified (due to technical issues).	
3.1.5	<p><b>Indicator:</b> In areas with wild salmonids [43], evidence of data [44] and the farm's understanding of that data, around salmonid migration routes, migration timing and stock productivity in major waterways within 50 kilometers of the farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<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>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Salmo salar naturally occurring in area.</p> <p>Report "Biodiversitetsfokuset risikovurdering - Vesterålen (Langøyhovden, Dypeide)" 07.03.2017, includes salmon carrying areas. Sensitive period defined in regulation "Forskrift om endring i forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus", states less than 0,2 adult female lice per fish from Monday week 21 to Sunday week 26.</p> <p>Sensitive period defined in regulation "Forskrift om endring i forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus", 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		

3.1.6	<p><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.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</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.	Surveillance of sea lice level on wild salmonids administrated by IMR. Result published in report "Risikorapport for norsk fiskeoppdrett 2017" by IMR. Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law. Additional information in "Smolt - En kunnskapsoppdatering" M136 - 2014 from Miljødirektoratet.	Compliant		
		b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.	Surveillance of sea lice level on wild salmonids administrated by IMR. Result published in report "Risikorapport for norsk fiskeoppdrett 2017" by IMR. Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law. Additional information in "Smolt - En kunnskapsoppdatering" M136 - 2014 from Miljødirektoratet.			
		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.	Surveillance of sea lice level on wild salmonids administrated by IMR. Result published in report "Risikorapport for norsk fiskeoppdrett 2017" by IMR. Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law. Additional information in "Smolt - En kunnskapsoppdatering" M136 - 2014 from Miljødirektoratet.			
		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.	Report public available at <a href="http://www.imr.no">www.imr.no</a> and <a href="http://www.miljodirektoratet.no">www.miljodirektoratet.no</a>			
		e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI.	Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law.			
		f. Others, please describe				
3.1.7	<p><b>Indicator:</b> In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish [45]. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</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.	Salmo salar naturally occurring in area.	Compliant		< 0,1
		b. Establish the sensitive periods [45] of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.	Coordinated delicing in 2017 is week 18 - 20 (earliest smolt out-migration is 22. May, median 5. - 11. June [Anon 2011]). Sensitive period defined in "Forskrift om endring i forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus", states less			
		c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2.	NFSA set limits and governmental treatment regime for site and ABM, while ABM/Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste 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/Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste reports status in area monthly to participating companies. In week 21 - 26 2016 adult female lice was below 0,1. In week 21 - 26 2017 adult female lice was below 0,1.			
		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.			
		e. Others, please describe				
		Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species				
3.2.1	<p><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 SAD standard</p>	a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.	Salmo salar native to region	Compliant		
		b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard (i.e. before June 13, 2012).	Salmo salar native to 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 native to region			

	<p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes [47]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [47]</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained;</p> <p>2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce [47]; and</p> <p>3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material [47] that might survive and subsequently reproduce (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of any effluent water exiting the system to the natural environment).</p>	Salmo salar native to region			
		-	Salmo salar native to region			
		f. Others, please describe				
3.2.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research [48] 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 [49]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, within five years of publication of the SAD standard [50,51]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI).</p> <p>b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.</p>	<p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p> <p>Salmo salar native to region</p> <p>Salmo salar native to region</p> <p>Salmo salar native to region</p> <p>Salmo salar native to region</p>	Compliant		
		f. Others, please describe				
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>	<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.</p>	<p>No use of cleaner fish</p> <p>No use of cleaner fish</p> <p>No use of cleaner fish</p>	N/A	No use of cleaner fish	
		d. Others, please describe				
<b>Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species</b>						
3.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Use of transgenic [53] salmon by the farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.</p> <p>b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.</p> <p>c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.</p>	<p>Conformance declaration 06.04.2017 stating all products are GMO free, and in line with EU directive 2001/18/WE and WE 178/2002, WE 1829/2003 and WE 1839/2003, from Cermaq signed Kristin Dahlen.</p> <p>Statement from ova supplier AquaGen signed på Anders Wang 23.03.2017, stating no genetical modification, no treatments which is not allowed according to Norwegian law, AquaGen is GlobalG.A.P. certified and Freedom food certified. All smolt suppliers are internal.</p> <p>Statement from ova supplier AquaGen signed på Anders Wang 23.03.2017, stating no genetical modification, no treatments which is not allowed according to Norwegian law, AquaGen is GlobalG.A.P. certified and Freedom food certified. All smolt suppliers are internal.</p>	Compliant		
		d. Others, please describe				
<b>Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]</b>						

3.4.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of escapees [56] in the most recent production cycle <b>Requirement:</b> 300 [57] <b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [57]	a. Maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.	No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (www.fiskeridir.no).	N/A	No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (www.fiskeridir.no).	0
		b. Aggregate cumulative 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).			
		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 [57]).	No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today. Documented by report from company and register at Directorate of Fisheries (www.fiskeridir.no).			
		d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [57]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the farm could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.	No escapes registered in the period 2007 - today (one incident registered were conclusion from Directorate of Fisheries was 0 fish escaped).			
		e. Submit escape monitoring dataset to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		f. Others, please describe				
3.4.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Accuracy [58] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers <b>Requirement:</b> ≥ 98% <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	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 AquaScan 98-100 % accuracy on machines AquaScan Registration Unit CSF4000 used on wellboat for control counting. Internal counters FW sites counts at vaccination (count fish by dose of vaccine).	Compliant		≥ 98%
		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).	Vaccination numbers in FW used as accurate number stocked.			
		c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).	Counting not performed at site			
		-	Statement AquaScan 98-100 % accuracy on machines AquaScan Registration Unit CSF4000 used on wellboat for control counting. Internal counters at FW sites counts at vaccination (count fish by dose of vaccine).			
		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 26.10.2017.			
		f. Others, please describe				
3.4.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	Compliant		2,90 %
		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 2012G (previous cycle): 2,9% EUL 2017G (present cycle): not harvested yet.			
		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.	Website www.cermaq.com is prepared for publication of EUL, will be published after harvest of 2017G.			
		d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		-	Calculations understood.			
		f. Others, please describe				
		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.	"Prosedyrer for kontroll, ettersyn og renhold av not" 19.12.2016. "Prosedyrer for teknisk vedlikehold og ettersyn av utstyr" 27.07.2017. "Prosedyrer for periodisk ettersyn av anlegg, flåte og båt matfisk" 19.06.2016. "Prosedyrer for montering, ettersyn og vedlikehold av anlegg matfisk" 31.08.2017. Above mentioned procedures describes actions for preventive escape, inspection, maintenance, etc. Contingency plan "Beredskapsplan rømming matfisk og slakteri" 01.12.2016 aims to reduce escapes and the effect of escapes. Describes how to detect escape, handling of an incident, communication, training, etc. Planned test 30.11.2017.			

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>"Prosedyre for kontroll, ettersyn og renhold av not" 19.12.2016.</p> <p>"Prosedyre for teknisk vedlikehold og ettersyn av utstyr" 27.07.2017.</p> <p>"Prosedyre for periodisk ettersyn av anlegg, flåte og båt matfisk" 19.06.2016.</p> <p>"Prosedyre for montering, ettersyn og vedlikehold av anlegg matfisk" 31.08.2017.</p> <p>Above mentioned procedures describes actions for preventive escape, inspection, maintenance, etc.</p> <p>Contingency plan "Beredskapsplan rømming matfisk og slakteri" 01.12.2016 aims to reduce escapes and the effect of escapes. Describes how to detect escape, handling of an incident, communication, training, etc. Planned test 30.11.2017.</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>	Open system			
		<p>d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.</p>	<p>Regular inspection of nets, moorings, etc. according to a predefined schedule, e.g. weekly inspection of net SY1242 by K.S.L. 03.11.2017, 3-months inspection of moorings to cages by S.P. 01.09.2017, 12-months inspection of moorings at farm by K.S.L. 01.11.2017, etc.</p> <p>Technical certificate, "Anleggs sertifikat", APN-021 for the period 22.12.2012 - 21.12.2017, Akvaplan NIVA.</p> <p>Cage 1 with net SY1246, service card for net SY1246 valid to 11.09.2018, Bøteriet Steigen 11.09.2017.</p> <p>Cage 1 with ring 3793, produced April 2009, valid for 10 years.</p>			
		<p>e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.</p>	<p>Minimum one person shall have escape training among the personnel on duty on farm.</p> <p>E.g. employee NO616 has participated in escape prevention training 19.03.2015 and employee NO1274 has participated in escape prevention training 19.03.2015.</p>			
		-	Awareness demonstrated in interviews			
g. Others, please describe						
PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed						
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 [62].</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>January - August 2017: 674 607 kg total (EWOS 100 % EWOS: www.cargill.com)</p>	Compliant		
		<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>Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to EWOS 01.09.2017.</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>EWOS: GlobalG.A.P. GGN 4050373825744, valid to 24.06.2018.</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>Method #2</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 [62].</p>	<p>EWOS: ASC statement (including traceability) 13.07.2017.</p>			
		-	Statement and certificate verified.			
		g. Others, please describe				
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]						



4.2.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> &lt; 1.35</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.</p> <p>c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).</p> <p>d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.</p> <p>e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>EWOS: ASC statement (including traceability) 13.07.2017. January 2017 - August 2017: 674 607kg total (EWOS 100 %) EWOS 49,9 % of fishmeal from reduction fisheries and 50,1 % from trimmings and byproducts (listed species and stock status). 25,1 % fishmeal in feed.</p> <p>EWOS 49,9 % of fishmeal from reduction fisheries and 50,1 % from trimmings and byproducts (listed species and stock status). 25,1 % fishmeal in feed.</p> <p>EFCR 2017G: 1,00 (cycle not finished yet, full cycle will be provided after harvest). EFCR 2012G: 1,14</p> <p>FFDRm 2017G: 0,52 (cycle not finished yet, full cycle will be provided after harvest). FFDRm 2015G: 0,37</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant	1,14
4.2.2	<p><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 [64] (calculated according to Appendix IV 2)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> FFDRo &lt; 2.95 or (EPA + DHA) &lt; 30 g/kg feed</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.</p> <p>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.</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>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>EWOS: ASC statement (including traceability) 13.07.2017. January 2017 - August 2017: 674 607kg total (EWOS 100 %) EWOS 70,5 % of fishoil from reduction fisheries and 29,5 % from trimmings and byproducts (listed species and stock status). 11,1 % fishoil in feed.</p> <p>EWOS 70,5 % of fishoil from reduction fisheries and 29,5 % from trimmings and byproducts (listed species and stock status). 11,1 % fishoil in feed.</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>FFDRo 2017G: 1,35 (cycle not finished yet, full cycle will be provided after harvest). FFDRo 2015G: 1,58</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant	1,58
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials					
4.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> &lt; 5 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a policy 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.</p> <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 4.3.1a</p> <p>c. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, use feed inventory and feed supplier declarations in 4.2.1a to develop a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients.</p> <p>d. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that fishmeal and fish oil used in feed come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>"Cermaq Code of Conduct - Feed Suppliers" 18.01.2017 includes traceability, sourcing, food safety, sustainability, raw material, feed quality, management system, etc.</p> <p>"Cermaq Code of Conduct - Feed Suppliers" 18.01.2017 includes traceability, sourcing, food safety, sustainability, raw material, feed quality, management system, etc.</p> <p>EWOS: ASC statement (including sources and scheme) 13.07.2017.</p> <p>Not required yet, transition solution before a feed standard is established, ref EWOS: ASC statement (including sources and scheme) 13.07.2017.</p>	Compliant	
		<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>Fish species used in Method #2 Massbalance EWOS; Northsea Sprat, Iceland/Norway Herring, Menhaden and Blue whiting (DK/EU). Fish source score verified and found above limits. All individual scores &gt;6, BM scores &gt; 8 according to Fish source score. EWOS: ASC statement (including sources and scheme) 13.07.2017.</p>		

4.3.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score [68] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 8</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All, until June 13, 2017</p>	<p>b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 8.</p> <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> <p>-</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Correspondence verified. Individual score &gt;6 and Biomass score &gt;8.</p> <p>4.3.2 Requirement: All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 6.</p> <p>Refer to Interim solution on Marine Raw Material Requirements in the ASC Farm Standards. In effect date:21 September 2016</p> <p>No independent assessment. All have scores.</p> <p>All have scores</p>	Compliant	> 6 and >8
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, until June 13, 2017</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>b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>EWOS: GlobalG.A.P. GGN 4050373825744, valid to 24.06.2018.</p> <p>EWOS: GlobalG.A.P. GGN 4050373825744, valid to 24.06.2018.</p> <p>NA after 13.06.2017</p>	Compliant	
4.3.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products [69] or trimmings from IUU [70] catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None [72]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except as noted in [72]</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>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>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 [71] and explaining how they are able to demonstrate this (i.e. through other certification scheme or through their independent audit).</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 [72].</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017 included trimmings and by-products.</p> <p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017 included trimmings and by-products.</p> <p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017 included trimmings and by-products.</p> <p>Not from vulnerable fisheries</p>	Compliant	
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed					
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 [75] and local laws [76]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a)</p> <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>c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>January - August 2017: 674 607 kg total (EWOS 100 % EWOS: www.cargill.com)</p> <p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017 includes sourcing policy.</p> <p>EWOS: GlobalG.A.P. GGN 4050373825744, valid to 24.06.2018.</p>	Compliant	
4.4.2	<p><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 [77]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100%, within five years of the publication [78] of the SAD standards</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All, after June 13, 2017</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent)</p> <p>c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b).</p> <p>d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed.</p> <p>e. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77]</p>	<p>"Cermaq Code of Conduct - Feed Suppliers" 18.01.2017 includes traceability, sourcing, food safety, sustainability, raw material, feed quality, management system, etc.</p> <p>"Cermaq Code of Conduct - Feed Suppliers" 18.01.2017 includes traceability, sourcing, food safety, sustainability, raw material, feed quality, management system, etc.</p> <p>Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to EWOS 01.09.2017. Seen feed calculations from EWOS/Cermaq Norway dated 26.10.2017.</p> <p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017 includes information regarding soya.</p> <p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017 includes information regarding soya.</p>	Compliant	

		f. Others, please describe			
4.4.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of disclosure to the buyer [79] of the salmon of inclusion of transgenic [80] plant raw material, or raw materials derived from transgenic plants, in the feed</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, for each individual raw material containing &gt; 1% transgenic content [81]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 &gt; 6 months.</p> <p>c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>Statement from EWOS dated 13.07.2017, purchased raw material specified to GMO &lt; 0,9%</p> <p>Conformance declaration 06.04.2017 stating all products are GMO free, and in line with EU directive 2001/18/WE and WE 178/2002, WE 1829/2003 and WE 1839/2003, from Cermaq signed Kristin Dahlen.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production					
4.5.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [83] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean.</p> <p>c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.</p> <p>d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.</p>	<p>Environmental policy "Miljøpolitikk i Cermaq Norway" regarding environmental status and considerations, laws and regulations, sustainability, etc. signed Cermaq Norway - Knut Ellekjær 30.08.2017. Procedure for waste handling "Prosedyre for avfallsbehandling" 03.06.2016 states waste burning not allowed, relevant wastes listed and disposal.</p> <p>Statement 06.04.2017 Cermaq - signed Silje Ramsvatn: Cermaq Norway does not dump non-biological waste in the sea.</p> <p>Procedure for waste handling "Prosedyre for avfallsbehandling" 03.06.2016 states waste burning not allowed, relevant waste types listed and disposal. Waste plan "Avfallsplan matfisk" lists relevant waste types and disposal, e.g. rest waste to Renovest, electric waste to Renovest, feed bags to Renovest, special waste to Renovest, ensilage to Biokraft Marine/ScanBio, nets to Bøteriet Steigen, etc..</p> <p>Nets delivered to Bøteriet Steigen. Cages used as raw material in plast production. Plastic graded, pressed and delivered to waste facility.</p>	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
4.5.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. (See also 4.5.1c)</p> <p>b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)</p> <p>c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken..</p> <p>d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.</p>	<p>Procedure for waste handling "Prosedyre for avfallsbehandling" 03.06.2016 states waste burning not allowed, relevant waste types listed and disposal. Waste plan "Avfallsplan matfisk" lists relevant waste types and disposal, e.g. rest waste to Renovest, electric waste to Renovest, feed bags to Renovest, special waste to Renovest, ensilage to Biokraft Marine/ScanBio, nets to Bøteriet Steigen, etc..</p> <p>Nets delivered to Bøteriet Steigen. Cages used as raw material in plast production. Plastic graded, pressed and delivered to waste facility.</p> <p>No infractions identified.</p> <p>Delivered 200 liter oil to Reno-Vest Bedrift AS (9138571) 06.11.2017 from landbase Sandset (base for Langøyhovden and Dypeide). Delivered 50 kg oil waste to Reno-Vest Bedrift AS (9133481) 20.04.2017 from landbase Sandset (base for Langøyhovden and Dypeide). Delivered 75 kg paint to Reno-Vest Bedrift AS (9133633) 24.04.2017 from landbase Sandset (base for Langøyhovden and Dypeide). List of nets from Bøteriet Steigen AS shows disposed nets, e.g. net 788, 919 and 927 in 2017 and net 791 and 823 in 2016.</p>	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]					

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/production cycle</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.</p> <p>b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last production cycle.</p> <p>c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p> <p>f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Current production cycle (2017G): Diesel 869 294 880 kj Fuel oil 26 104 320 kj Crude oil 0 kj Bensin 0 kj Electricity 367 239 600 kj Total 1 262 638 800 kj (Scope 1: 895 399 200 kj, Scope 2: 367 239 600 kj)</p> <p>Current production cycle (2017G): Diesel 869 294 880 kj Fuel oil 26 104 320 kj Crude oil 0 kj Bensin 0 kj Electricity 367 239 600 kj Total 1 262 638 800 kj (Scope 1: 895 399 200 kj, Scope 2: 367 239 600 kj)</p> <p>985 ton biomass</p> <p>Current production cycle (2017G); 1 282 136 kj/ton biomass</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p> <p>Scope 1 Diesel, fuel oil, crude oil, petrol, propane Scope 2 Electricity. Assessed and compared between sites and production forms.</p>	Compliant		1282136
4.6.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [85]) emissions [86] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm.</p> <p>b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.</p> <p>c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors.</p> <p>d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases to CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.</p> <p>e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.</p> <p>f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Records verified.</p> <p>Current production cycle (2017G): Scope 1: 63 250 kg CO2 Scope 2: 25 927 kg CO2 Total: 89 178 kg CO2</p> <p>Scope 1 diesel from diesel workboat, truck, generator and scope 2 is purchased electricity.</p> <p>CO2 used</p> <p>Calculations and assessments provided.</p>	Compliant		89178
4.6.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [87] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, within three years of the publication [88] of the SAD standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All, after June 13, 2015</p>	<p>a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed).</p> <p>b. Multiply the GHG emissions per unit feed by the total amount of feed from each supplier used in the most recent completed production cycle.</p> <p>c. If client has more than one feed supplier, calculate the total sum of emissions from feed by summing the GHG emissions of feed from each supplier.</p> <p>d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>EWOS GHG emission factor 1,565 (2012-13).</p> <p>Last production cycle (2012G): 3633 ton feed.</p> <p>Last production cycle (2012G): 5687 ton CO2.</p>	Compliant		5687
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [89,90]						
4.7.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> For farms that use copper-treated nets [91], evidence that nets are not cleaned [92] or treated in situ in the marine environment</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [89]</p>	<p>a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping.</p> <p>b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets.</p> <p>c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets.</p> <p>d. If copper-based treatments are used, maintain documentary evidence (see 4.7.1b) that farm policy and practice does not allow for heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ.</p>	<p>According to procedure "Prosedyre for kontroll ettersyn og renhold av not" 19.12.2016 copper treated nets shall not be washed at sea, but taken up and washed at land. Not seen evidence of washing of nets at land.</p> <p>Copper-based treatment are used on nets.</p> <p>Copper-based treatment are used on nets.</p> <p>According to procedure "Prosedyre for kontroll ettersyn og renhold av not" 19.12.2016 copper treated nets shall not be washed at sea, but taken up and washed at land. Not seen evidence of washing of nets at land.</p>	Minor	<p>Copper-based treatment are used on nets. According to procedure "Prosedyre for kontroll ettersyn og renhold av not" 19.12.2016 copper treated nets shall not be washed at sea, but taken up and washed at land. Not seen evidence of washing of nets at land.</p> <p>Jan Petter Kosmo 23.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019. Seen statement 18.09.2017 and invoice 30.11.2017 from Bøteriet AS.</p>	

		e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		f. Others, please describe				
4.7.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment [93]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [89]</p>	<p>a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land.</p> <p>b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Nets are cleaned on-land by Bøteriet Steigen.</p> <p>Statement from Bøteriet Steigen 17.10.2017: Nets are cleaned and disinfected. Discharge water treated chemical and mechanical with Miramag system. Waste from washing process is delivered to Retura Shmil (recirculation of copper). No discharge to environment and recirculation of washing water.</p> <p>System has 100 % capture. Invoice 52979 from Retura Shmil to Bøteriet, regarding delivery of 23 tons of copper sediment, 22.07.2017.</p>	Compliant		
4.7.3	<p><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</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [89]</p>	<p>a. Declare to the CAB whether the farm uses copper nets or copper-treated nets. (See also 4.7.1c). If "no", Indicator 4.7.3 does not apply.</p> <p>b. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, measure and record copper in sediment samples from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE.</p> <p>c. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, maintain records of testing methods, equipment, and laboratories used to test copper level in sediments from 4.7.3b.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Copper-based treatment are used on nets.</p> <p>MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at &gt;75% peak biomass) last production cycle.</p> <p>MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at &gt;75% peak biomass) last production cycle.</p>	Minor	MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass) last production cycle. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	
4.7.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that copper levels [94] 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 [89] and excluding those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB whether:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) farm is exempt from Indicator 4.7.4 (as per 4.7.3a), or</li> <li>2) Farm has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment.</li> </ol> <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 ≥ 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, provide evidence the farm tested copper levels in sediments from reference sites as described in Appendix I-1 (also see Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2).</p> <p>d. Analyze results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body.</p> <p>e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Testing of copper levels in MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01, Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1).</p> <p>Copper level are &lt;34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment: Reference stations: Cu1 (7,37 and 7,63 mg Cu/kg) and Cu2 (10,0 and 9,17 mg Cu/kg). Stations outside AZE: C2 (14,3 and 13,4 mg Cu/kg), C3 (18,2 and 17,7 mg Cu/kg) and C4 (18,9 and 21,6 mg Cu/kg). Station inside AZE: C1 (6,4 mg Cu/kg).</p> <p>Copper level are &lt;34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment</p> <p>Copper level are &lt;34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant		15,8
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 [89]</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>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Netwax NI 3 used. Netpolish NP Super will be used in future.</p> <p>Netwax NI 3 used, contains dicopper oxide, classification according to 1271/2008: GHS09. Satisfying declared (76554) according to product information record at Norwegian Environment Agency.</p>	Compliant		
<b>PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER</b>						
<i>Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [95]</i>						
5.1.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</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>Veterinary Health Plan dated 21.03.2017 for Dypeide signed Karl F. Ottem includes biosecurity, health, infection control, diseases, surveillance, sampling, welfare, lice, treatments, list of treatments with dosage, withdrawal period, MRL and reference, WHO classification, etc.</p>	Compliant		

	Requirement: 100 %		Veterinary Health Plan dated 21.03.2017 for Dypeide signed Karl F. Ottem		
	Applicability: All	b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [96].			
		c. Others, please describe			
5.1.2	Indicator: Site visits by a designated veterinarian [96] at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager [97] at least once a month Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of visits by the designated veterinarian [96] and fish health managers [97]. If schedule cannot be met, a risk assessment must be provided.	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 10.02.2017 by Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste (veterinarian Kaja Nordland), all cages inspected, obduction of dead fish, ILAV screening of fish.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed as the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [96] and fish health manager(s) [97].	Karl Fredrik Ottem (fish health manager / designated veterinarian) from Cermag Norway, HPR 7516525, valid to 18.12.2055. Tiril Hoffstrøm Slettjord (designated veterinarian) from Cermag Norway, HPR 7896581, valid to 03.07.2062. Helene Katrine Kvam (designated veterinarian) from Labora, HPR 10023345, valid to 11.11.2065. Kaja Nordland (designated veterinarian) from Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste, HPR 7725930, valid to 29.06.2061.		
		c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.	Karl Fredrik Ottem (fish health manager / designated veterinarian) from Cermag Norway, HPR 7516525, valid to 18.12.2055. Tiril Hoffstrøm Slettjord (designated veterinarian) from Cermag Norway, HPR 7896581, valid to 03.07.2062. Helene Katrine Kvam (designated veterinarian) from Labora, HPR 10023345, valid to 11.11.2065. Kaja Nordland (designated veterinarian) from Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste, HPR 7725930, valid to 29.06.2061.		
		d. Others, please describe			
5.1.3	Indicator: Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner Requirement: 100% [98] Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner.	Daily removal of dead fish (registration in FishTalk system) and processed to ensilage. Ensilage collected on tank and delivered to Scanbio, e.g. delivery of 10 ton ensilage to Scanbio 11.10.2017 (invoice 35239).	Compliant	
		b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities.	System established for handling and documentation according to requirements in national legislation handled by NFSA. Ensilage collected on tank and delivered to Scanbio, e.g. delivery of 10 ton ensilage to Scanbio 11.10.2017 (invoice 35239).		
		c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.	ILAV screening because site is in monitoring zone.		
		d. Others, please describe			
5.1.4	Indicator: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis Requirement: 100% [99] Applicability: All	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 [96], fish health manager [97]); - cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and - classification as 'unexplained' when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6).	Last complete cycle (2012G): total mortality 3,94%, unexplained mortality 3,29%, virus 0,00 % (unexplained+virus 3,29%). Unexplained mortality 83,45% of total. Precent cycle (2017G): total mortality 5,27%, unexplained mortality 2,19%, virus 0,04% (unexplained+virus 2,23%). Unexplained mortality 41,52% of total.	Compliant	100 %
		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.	All mortalities are diagnosed and post-mortem analysis are done on a statistically relevant number of fish (ref unspecified numbers above). Lab analyses routinely.		
		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).	Report from routine visit 10.02.2017 by Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste (veterinarian Kaja Nordland), all cages inspected, obduction of dead fish, ILAV screening of fish.		
		d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications.	Record are available and documented in Fish Talk, all mortalities are categorised.		

		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).	Record are available and documented in Fish Talk, all mortalities are categorised.			
		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).	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		g. Others, please describe				
5.1.5	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum viral disease-related mortality [100] on farm during the most recent production cycle <b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 10% <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease.  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.  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).  d. Others, please describe	Last complete cycle (2012G): total mortality 3,94%, unexplained mortality 3,29%, virus 0,00 % (unexplained+virus 3,29%). Unexplained mortality 83,45% of total. Present cycle (2017G): total mortality 5,27%, unexplained mortality 2,19%, virus 0,04% (unexplained+virus 2,23%). Unexplained mortality 41,52% of total.  Last complete cycle (2012G): total mortality 3,94%, unexplained mortality 3,29%, virus 0,00 % (unexplained+virus 3,29%). Unexplained mortality 83,45% of total. Present cycle (2017G): total mortality 5,27%, unexplained mortality 2,19%, virus 0,04% (unexplained+virus 2,23%). Unexplained mortality 41,52% of total.  Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.	Compliant	3,29 %	
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.  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.  c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.  d. Others, please describe	Last complete cycle (2012G): total mortality 3,94%, unexplained mortality 3,29%, virus 0,00 % (unexplained+virus 3,29%). Unexplained mortality 83,45% of total. Present cycle (2017G): total mortality 5,27%, unexplained mortality 2,19%, virus 0,04% (unexplained+virus 2,23%). Unexplained mortality 41,52% of total.  Last complete cycle (2012G): total mortality 3,94%, unexplained mortality 3,29%, virus 0,00 % (unexplained+virus 3,29%). Unexplained mortality 83,45% of total. Present cycle (2017G): total mortality 5,27%, unexplained mortality 2,19%, virus 0,04% (unexplained+virus 2,23%). Unexplained mortality 41,52% of total.  Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.	N/A	Total mortality not > 6%	3,29 %
5.1.7	<b>Indicator:</b> A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.  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.  c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.  d. Others, please describe	Veterinary Health Plan dated 21.03.2017 for Dypeide signed Karl F. Ottem includes goal of maximum 6,5% mortality per generation.  Veterinary Health Plan dated 21.03.2017 for Dypeide signed Karl F. Ottem includes goal of maximum 6,5% mortality per generation.  In interview site staff were not aware of target for reduced mortality.	Minor	In interview site staff were not aware of actual target for reduced mortality. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	

Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]



5.2.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals [102] 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>- 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>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>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>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Allowed usage defined in VHP. No Antibiotics used. Treatments done are anaesthetics and delicing, all under responsible veterinarian's prescriptions.</p> <p>Registered in Admincontrol/Fishtalk; dates for usage, quantity and dosage, withdrawal periods, batch, etc. E.g. Prescription RP1436 by Kristoffer Berglund Andreassen for Slice vet (Emamektin), 15 tons feed, from EWOS, for lice treatment, 175 daydegrees withdrawal period, 18.04.2017. Corresponding registration in FishTalk for cage 1, 03.-13.05.2017, Emamektin, quarantine til 11.07.2017.</p> <p>WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5th revision, October 2016.</p> <p>Records of chemical and therapeutant use in FishTalk. Report from FishTalk for all treatments 2015G and 2017G provided and example of FishTalk CV with treatments listed, e.g. cage 1.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	Compliant		
5.2.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [103] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [104]</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 [104].</p> <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>-</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Internal document "Sammendrag av forbudte stoffer" includes:</p> <p>Prohibited substances in EU incl. UK and France according to EU official journal.</p> <p>Prohibited substances in Norway according to lovdata.no.</p> <p>Prohibited/allowed substances in Canada according to CFIA Aquaculture Therapeutant Residue Monitoring list.</p> <p>Prohibited/allowed substances in Japan, positive list system for Agricultural chemical residues in food, www.ffcr.or.jp</p> <p>Link to "Green book", MRL and approved substances in USA.</p> <p>NFSA mandatory testing by NIFES on site and/or at harvest line. Results published in yearly NIFES report.</p> <p>Procedure regarding internal control "Prosedyre for kontroll av produkt" 11.04.2017 states 2 tests per year for heavy metals, PCB, dioxin, pesticides, ethoxyquin, etc.</p> <p>Compliance verified and in accordance with requirements and also in accordance with reports of usage in FishTalk and list in VHP.</p>	Compliant		
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 [96] for definition of veterinarian).</p> <p>b. Maintain copies of all prescriptions and records of veterinarian responsible for all medication events. Records can be kept in conjunction with those for 5.2.1 and should be kept for the current and two prior production cycles.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>100% of treatments are prescribed by a veterinarian. Record of prescriptions in system Admincontrol. E.g. Prescription RP1436 by Kristoffer Berglund Andreassen for Slice vet (Emamektin), 15 tons feed, from EWOS, for lice treatment, 175 daydegrees withdrawal period, 18.04.2017.</p> <p>100% of treatments are prescribed by a veterinarian. Record of prescriptions in system Admincontrol.</p>	Compliant		
5.2.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a).</p> <p>b. Compile and maintain documentation on legally-required withholding periods for all treatments used on-farm. Withholding period is the time interval after the withdrawal of a drug from the treatment of the salmon before the salmon can be harvested for use as food.</p> <p>c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Veterinary Health Plan dated 21.03.2017 for Dypeide signed Karl F. Ottem includes goal of maximum 6,5% mortality per generation.</p> <p>Documented in Admincontrol/Sharepoint (in FishTalk notified/blocked according to days/degree-days withholding period stated in prescription).</p> <p>Verified in CVs for fishgroups (CV report from FishTalk).</p>	Compliant		



5.2.5	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII <b>Requirement:</b> PTI score $\leq 13$ <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Using farm data for therapeutants usage (5.2.1a) and the formula presented in Appendix VII, calculate the cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score for the most recent production cycle. Calculation should be made and updated on an ongoing basis throughout the cycle by farm manager, fish health manager, and/or veterinarian.	Calculations for last complete cycle (2012G) and present cycle (2017G) provided.	Compliant		2,52
		b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score.	PTI score (2017G): 2,52 (VR97 used in calculation). PTI score (2012G): 24,5. Not considered relevant as 2012G does not reflect today's practice. This is Initial audit, PTI from full production cycle will be provided after harvest.			
		c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		d. Others, please describe				
5.2.6	<b>Indicator:</b> For farms with a cumulative PTI $\geq 6$ in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [105] is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles <b>Requirement:</b> Yes, within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017) <b>Applicability:</b> All farms with a cumulative PTI $\geq 6$ in the most recent production cycle	a. Review PTI scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTI $\geq 6$ in the most recent production cycle. If yes, proceed to 5.2.6b; if no, Indicator 5.2.6 does not apply.	Calculations for last complete cycle (2012G) PTI 24,5 and present cycle (2017G) PTI 2,52.	Compliant		
		b. Using results from 5.2.5 and the weight of fish treated (kg), calculate parasiticide load in the most recent production cycle [105].	Parasiticide load for last complete cycle (2012G) is 79 833 123 200. Parasiticide load for current cycle (2017G) is 5 931 606 400.			
		c. Calculate parasiticide load in the two previous production cycles as above (5.2.6b) and compute the average. Calculate the percent difference in parasiticide load between current cycle and average of two previous cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.	Preliminary: Current cycle is 99,99% less than last complete cycle. Full cycle will be provided at SA1.			
		d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI).	Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.			
		e. Others, please describe				
5.2.7	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments [106] <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	Compliant		
		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 5.2.9).	No antibiotics used prophylactic the recent cycles			
		d. Others, please describe				
5.2.8	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO [107]) <b>Requirement:</b> None [108] <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [107].	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5th revision, October 2016. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used.	Compliant		
		b. If the farm has <u>not</u> used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit.	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5th revision, October 2016. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used.			
		c. If the farm has used antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit.	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5th revision, October 2016. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used.			
		d. If yes to 5.2.8c, request an exemption from the CAB to certify only a portion of the farm. Prior to the audit, provide the CAB with records sufficient to establish details of treatment, which pens were treated, and how the farm will ensure full traceability and separation of treated fish through and post- harvest.	WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5th revision, October 2016. List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used.			
		e. Others, please describe				
5.2.9	<b>Indicator:</b> Number of treatments [109] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle <b>Requirement:</b> $\leq 3$ <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	0
		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			
		c. Others, please describe				
	<b>Indicator:</b> If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle,	a. Use results from 5.2.9b to show whether more than one antibiotic treatment was used in the most recent production cycle. If not, then the requirement of 5.2.10 does not apply. If yes, then proceed to 5.2.10b.	No antibiotics used			

5.2.10	<p>demonstration that the antibiotic load [110] is at least 15% less than the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>b. Calculate antibiotic load (antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotic used in kg) for most recent production cycle and for the two previous production cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No antibiotics used</p> <p>No antibiotics used</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017.</p>	N/A	No antibiotics used	
5.2.11	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers [112] of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [112] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutants used in production (see 4.4.3b).</p> <p>b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Procedure "Prosedyre for utarbeidelse av sporingsdokument på fisk (CV)" 10.01.2017 states therapeutants shall be listed in CV which follows sale of product.</p> <p>Seen FishTalk CV, e.g. for cage 1 with therapeutants used.</p>	Compliant		
<b>Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments</b>						
5.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. In addition to recording all therapeutic treatments (5.2.1a), keep a record of all cases where the farm uses two successive medicinal treatments.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p> <p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p> <p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p> <p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p>	N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	
5.3.2	<p><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</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p> <p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p>	N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.	
<b>Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]</b>						
5.4.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class [114]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100% [115]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [115]</p>	<p>a. Keep records of the start and end dates of periods when the site is fully fallow after harvest.</p> <p>b. Provide evidence of stocking dates (purchase receipts, delivery records) to show that there were no gaps &gt; 6 months for smolt inputs for the current production cycle.</p> <p>-</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Operation plan 2017 approved by Directorate of Fisheries 12.01.2017, Dypeide planned release 01.01.-31.07.2017, planned following 15.06.-31.12.2018.</p> <p>Stocking period 11.01.-28.05.2017</p> <p>Stocking period 11.01.-28.05.2017</p>	Compliant		
5.4.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, [116] the farm has: 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM</p>	<p>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 [116]. The accepted level of significance (for example, <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) should be agreed between farm and CAB.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluation according to "Dødfiskveileder" and procedure "Prosedyre for håndtering av dødfisk, svimere og ensilasje" 08.02.2017, states daily mortality inspection, for fish &lt;500 gram notification in system Intelix if mortality is &gt;0,5 % (notification to Norwegian Food Safety Authority if &gt;7 days), for fish &gt;500 gram notification in system Intelix if mortality is &gt;0,25 % (notification to Norwegian Food Safety Authority if &gt;7 days). No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.</p> <p>Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected for the most recent production cycle. No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.</p>	N/A	No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.	

	3. Promptly [118] made findings publicly available  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.			
		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 [117] on the farm and within the ABM; and 3) Promptly (within one month) make findings publicly available.	No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.			
		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).	No UIA detected nor suspected at farm.			
		f. Others, please describe				
5.4.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of compliance [119] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [120]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	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 (relevant diseases in list are Pancreas Disease and Infectious salmon anemia virus). Email to site managers 15.03.2017 with link to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	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.	Link to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (relevant diseases in list are Pancreas Disease and Infectious salmon anemia virus). EU veterinary regulations are basis for the regulations in Norway.			
		-				
		d. Others, please describe				
5.4.4	<b>Indicator:</b> If an OIE-notifiable disease [121] is confirmed on the farm, evidence that: 1. the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected 2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease 4. the farm promptly [123] made findings publicly available  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	Fish health/veterinary services (internal/Vesterålen Fiskehelsetjeneste) has the responsibility to inform governments if notifiable diseases occur, according to VHP	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: 1) immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected; 2) immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3) enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease; and 4) promptly (within one month) made findings publicly available.	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
		d. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
		-	No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases.			
		f. Others, please describe				
PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]						
6.1.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes	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.	The Freedom of Association is stated in mail labour law. Workers have fully implemented right of Freedom of association. Employer makes no interference to decisions of workers. 50% of employees organised.	Compliant		
		b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits "acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control or employers' organizations."	Worker representative of TU was elected during meeting of employees in 2017-03. Kim Andre Nango - Worker representative for region. Gunnar Berntsen - Safety representative for region, Adrian Kjellmann - Safety representative at site land base.			

	<b>Applicability:</b> All	<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>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>TU representative have meetings with management for coordination. The workers are visited case by case. The rest of the time open channel by phone and e-mail. If there is request visits to sites will be organised without obstacles.</p> <p>Interview has confirmed information. The TU representative has possibility to visit farms. Management is encouraging to be organised.</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	<p>a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The job contracts do not specifically states the right of freedom of association but it has reference to labour law and Tariff agreement. Both of documents state that right.</p> <p>Employer has created WEB based Personal handbook and Ethical guidelines (last revision 2015-12-14) those documents have stated the right of association. The e-mail notification is sent 2 times a year to employees about ethical guidelines and Personal handbook. Employees should sign/confirm electronically or manually (at the sites) that they have read the documents.</p> <p>Interview confirms communication. All workers confirmed free possibilities to be organised.</p>	Compliant		
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	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.</p> <p>c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Trade union representative confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations to the right of Freedom of associations.</p> <p>Collective bargaining is implemented via consultations and Tariff agreement with Trade unions.</p> <p>Now in power Tariff agreement for period 2016 end 2018.</p>	Compliant		
<b>Criterion 6.2 Child labor</b>						
6.2.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Number of incidences of child [125] labor [126] <b>Requirement:</b> None <b>Applicability:</b> All except as noted in [125]	<p>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 125); 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.</p> <p>b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).</p> <p>c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Requirements of standard applies</p> <p>At the audit time none of young workers are employed.</p> <p>The age records are in place</p>	Compliant		
6.2.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of young workers [127] that are protected [128] <b>Requirement:</b> 100% <b>Applicability:</b> All	<p>a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies &amp; training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.</p> <p>b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.</p> <p>c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.</p> <p>d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.</p>	<p>The procedure for Young workers ID 147 rev. 12, 2017-05-30 is developed. Personal training to be done for each young worker indicating allowed and forbidden works.</p> <p>Identification process in place.</p> <p>Time sheets are maintained. Young workers were employed in summer 2016. No young workers employed during the audit.</p> <p>Young workers were employed in summer 2017. No young workers employed during the audit. (Working 7,5 hours per day.)  NC evidence: The evidence of extended work in time sheets over allowed limits.</p>	Minor	<p>Young workers were worked 7 days in a row.  Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.</p>	

		<p>e. Young workers are not exposed to hazards [129] and do not perform hazardous work [130]. Work on floating cages in poor weather conditions shall be considered hazardous.</p> <p>f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Personal risk assessment to be done for young workers indicating forbidden works as per procedure for Young workers ID 147 with risk evaluation template ID 371. The assessment of young workers of last period is available.</p> <p>Site was inspected. No interviews were conducted as no young workers are employed during the audit.</p>			
<b>Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor</b>						
6.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labor</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no 'pay to work' schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs).</p> <p>b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.</p> <p>c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.</p> <p>d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.</p> <p>e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.</p> <p>f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Contracts are understood. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted. Trainings are paid by the company without obligations from workers to compensate if they are leaving the company.</p> <p>After shift workers are free to leave</p> <p>No cases identified.</p> <p>No cases identified.</p> <p>No cases identified.</p> <p>Interview has confirmed information. Payroll records are maintained.</p>	Compliant		
<b>Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]</b>						
6.4.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.</p> <p>c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Ethical guidelines (last revision 2015-12-14) and Whistle blowing procedure (2014-05-27).</p> <p>Whistle blowing procedure (2014-05-27) is implemented. No discrimination cases reported. The complaints are managed according Conflict management procedure ID 429 last rev. 2017-02-25.</p> <p>The equal access to job opportunities is provided. The equal pay principle is followed. The job vacancies are published on intranet. The Tariff agreement defines local salary grades and payment condition equal for all employees to get same salary for the same job and taking into consideration experience.</p> <p>The training for managers was held on 2016-April. Site managers 2016-06-16. Site workers were trained in May 2016 and 2017-09-05</p>	Compliant		
6.4.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of incidences of discrimination</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No cases identified.</p> <p>The rights of employees are respected. During interview no discrimination cases reported</p>	Compliant		
<b>Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety</b>						
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Documentation is developed and is available in working places.</p>			

6.5.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [135] and policies on a yearly basis  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> All	b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	Employees know emergency response procedures. The training records are kept on site.	Minor	No Safety drills organised at site over last 12 month. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	
		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.	Employees are trained and annual refreshment trainings 40h in 2017-01. Safety (fire) drill was organised (2017 winter). The results of safety drills were documented but with very low details and was conducted on Land base only. NC evidence: Manager's and worker interviews, emergency preparedness records indicate dising safety drills.			
		d. Others, please describe				
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 procedure for risk assessment No 366 is introduced in 2017-03-17. List maintained, reference to risk analyses on ITELEX. Last revision of risks took place in 2017-04-04.	Minor	First aid kits on site are with outdated components. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	
		b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.	PPE is provided. NC evidence: Inspection of First Aid kits on-site.			
		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 training in proper use of PPE use is done.			
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms PPE management.			
		e. Others, please describe				
6.5.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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).	List maintained, reference to risk analyses on ITELEX. Last revision if risks took place in 2017-04-04.	Minor	The temporary employee have not been introduced with results of risk assessment of 2017-04-04. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	
		b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).	Employees are trained and annual refreshment trainings are organised during risk analysis. Training records are maintained. Last evaluation of the H&S risks and the training for employees took place 2017-04-04. The safe job analysis is done prior to all major works on the site with definitions of risks and their management measures. NC evidence: Interview with employees.			
		c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.	Monthly H&S committee meetings are discussing the need to update the procedures based on practices or OHS incidents accidents. Minutes of meetings are maintained. The site manager has possibility to suggest changes to procedure.			
		d. Others, please describe				
6.5.4	<b>Indicator:</b> 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.	Company level electronic database INTELEX is used to report for all H&S and environmental accidents and near accidents. Monthly H&S report is generated. Sites have monthly discussions on H&S accidents, incidents and near misses form site and the report.	Minor	Temporary employee is not included into the process of providing/discussing H&S incidents, near misses related information. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	
		b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations.	Company level electronic database INTELEX is managed with records for all H&S and environmental accidents and near accidents and their investigation.			
		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 plans are managed by INTELEX.			
		d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.	The analysis is understood and improvements are implemented. NC evidence: Interview with employees.			
		e. Others, please describe				
6.5.5	<b>Indicator:</b> 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.	Insurance is provided. Temporary employees are provided with accident insurance.	Compliant		
		b. Others, please describe				

6.5.6	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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 diving activities procedure is in use (rev. 2016-06-29). The records of diving activities maintained on site.	Compliant		
		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.			
		c. Others, please describe				
		Criterion 6.6 Wages				
6.6.1	<b>Indicator:</b> The percentage of workers whose basic wage [136] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [137]  <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.	Documents are available at the company. The Tariff agreement is the minimum salary.	Compliant		
		b. Employer's records (e.g. payroll) confirm that worker's wages for a standard work week (≤ 48 hours) always meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. If there is no legal minimum wage, the employer's records must show how the current wage meets or exceeds industry standard. If wages are based on piece-rate or pay-per-production, the employer's records must show how workers can reasonably attain (within regular working hours) wages that meet or exceed the legal minimum wage.	Wages meet legal minimum wage according Tariff agreement and contracts with local trade unions.			
		c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The information is available per employee. Documentary evidence is in place.			
		d. Others, please describe				
6.6.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [138]  <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.	The assessment of cost of living were conducted.	Compliant		
		b. Employer has calculated the basic needs wage for farm workers and has compared it to the basic (i.e. current) wage for their farm workers.	The calculations and comparison are done. The company wages are above BNW. The calculation needs more details.			
		c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	Wages exceed basic needs wage.			
		d. Others, please describe				
6.6.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [139]  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.	The contracts of employees has appendix defining the bonus application. The bonuses are defined in Bonus 2016 document.	Compliant		
		b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.	The clearly understood by workers.			
		c. Employer renders wages and benefits in a way that is convenient for the worker (e.g. cash, check, or electronic payment methods). Workers do not have to travel to collect benefits nor do they receive promissory notes, coupons or merchandise in lieu of payment.	Wages are transferred to personal bank accounts			
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview has confirmed information about wages			
		e. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting						
6.7.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of workers who have contracts [141]  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.	Contracts available, records maintained.	Compliant		
		b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.	No evidences			
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms legal employment by contracts.			
		d. Others, please describe				
		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.	The Ethical and corporate responsibility policy has statements of evaluation of suppliers and subcontractors. Procedure for Classification of suppliers ID 644 rev.3 2016-06-13 is used for dividing to critical or non-critical suppliers.			



6.7.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.	Supplier qualification procedure ID316 applies. The evaluation criteria is defined in procedure of classification of suppliers and sub-contractors. The suppliers evaluation matrix was created.	Compliant		
		c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.	The reference to Ethical guidelines for suppliers was sent to suppliers and subcontractors.			
		d. Others, please describe				
		Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution				
6.8.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.	Procedure of Conflict resolution (2015-02-18) defines ways of communication of conflicts. Whistle blowing procedure is developed, which is included in Personnel handbook. Conflict management procedure ID 429 last rev. 2017-02-25 is defined.	Compliant		
		b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access.	Workers are familiar with procedures for conflict resolution.			
		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.	The interviews are confirming the information above.			
		d. Others, please describe				
6.8.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [142] within a 90-day timeframe  <b>Requirement:</b> 100%  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised.	The system of handling of grievances, complaints and labour conflicts is in place and effective as show examples from other farms. No cases identified at the farm.	Compliant		
		b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed.	The system of handling of grievances, complaints and labour conflicts is in place. Documentation is maintained. No cases identified at the farm.			
		c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe.	No cases identified at the farm.			
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices						
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.	The employer does not use excessive or abusive disciplinary actions. No cases of improper disciplinary behaviour, no warnings were issued.	Compliant		
		b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors.	No cases identified.			
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.	Interview has confirmed no cases of improper disciplinary behaviour.			
		d. Others, please describe				
6.9.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [143]  <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 [143].	Disciplinary policy is defined in Personal handbook. The verbal and written disciplinary warnings may be used in case of misbehaviour during the work.	Compliant		
		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.	Company has the working disciplinary system. Workers confirmed understanding and fairness of disciplinary policy. Documentation is maintained.			
		c. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime						
6.10.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [145]  <b>Requirement:</b> None  <b>Applicability:</b> All	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.	The time scheme 1:1 is used. (7 days x 10 hours and 7 days-off). It is approved by ASC. The OT limits are defined by Labour law and Tariff agreement.	Compliant		
		b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law.	Records/time sheets are in place. Workers are registering working hours daily into Capitex system. Site manager approves. Working hours are within allowed limits.			
		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).	The work in shifts is applied and agreed by workers.			
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	Interview has confirmed scheme 1:1 use.			
		e. Others, please describe				
		a. Payment records (e.g. payslips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours.	Overtime for workers is paid at premium rate as could be seen in payslips.			



6.10.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Overtime is limited, voluntary [146], paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All except as noted in [146]	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. <b>d. Others, please describe</b>	The procedure for working hours was developed (2016-08-15). The timesheets are in place.  Interviews have confirmed voluntary overtime.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.11 Education and training						
6.11.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g., courses, certificates and degrees) <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.  b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).  c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company. <b>d. Others, please describe</b>	Company encourages the workers to participate in additional training based on Work environment policy. The Tariff agreement define the support that company would provide for employees.  Training records maintained on site.  Interview confirms that company supports education initiatives.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility						
6.12.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Demonstration of company-level [148] 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 labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.  b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located.  c. The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covers all company operations relating to salmonid production in the region (i.e. all smolt production facilities, grow-out facilities and processing plants).  d. The site that is applying for certification provides auditors with access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above). <b>e. Others, please describe</b>	Company level policies are available and are in line with requirements of the standard.  Policies are approved.  The policies cover all company operations.  The access is provided.	Compliant		
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN						
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement						
7.1.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of regular and meaningful [149] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).  b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.  c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.  d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3).  e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.  f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above. <b>g. Others, please describe</b>	The invitation was sent in 2017-09-27 in local newspaper and 2017-09-26 by e-mail to Øksnes commune and other interested parties. The meeting was organised on 2017-10-04.  Consultations have included main points required by the standard.  The participants from local community have participated in consultation. They were invited to contribute to agenda.  Consultations have included main points required by the standard. Potential health risks of therapeutic treatments were mentioned during consultation meeting. The risks related to external environment and people were well defined.  The invitation and minutes of meeting are available.  No interview were used with stakeholders.	Compliant		
7.1.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Presence and evidence of an effective [150] 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.  b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder describing corrective actions).  c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).  d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above. <b>e. Others, please describe</b>	The complaints could be delivered via company e-mail, company workers or whistle blowing channel.  No complaints related to farm.  No complaints related to farm received.  No interview were used with stakeholders	Compliant		

7.1.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice [151] 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 anaesthetic baths is not regarded a therapeutant)	The signs are available.	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).	Signs at site are used.			
		c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1)	Communications for potential health risks took place during the consultation meeting. See 7.1.1 d) The risks related to external environment and			
		d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.	No interview were used with stakeholders			
		e. Others, please describe				
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories						
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 [152]	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 [152]). If not then the requirements of 7.2.1 do not apply.	The application to have permission to operate covered identification and hearing of indigenous groups. The Sammi group of reindeer owners present in the area but has no local government in Nordfold kommune.	Compliant		
		b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.	The national/local laws and regulations are known by the company management and responsible employees.			
		c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR - farm confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved in the vicinity of the farm.			
		d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.			
		e. Others, please describe				
7.2.2	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [152]  <b>Applicability:</b> All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	
		b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.			
		c. Others, please describe				
7.2.3	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [153] 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 [152]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	
		b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) reached a protocol agreement with the indigenous community and this fact is documented; or 2) continued engagement in an active process [153] to reach a protocol agreement with the indigenous community.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.			
		c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.			
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 7.3 Access to resources						
7.3.1	<b>Indicator:</b> Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [154] without community approval  <b>Requirement:</b> None  <b>Applicability:</b> All	a. Resources that are vital [155] to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under Indicator 7.3.2).	The resources that are vital for community are known by the site. It was communicated during the application to get the licence to start the sites.	Compliant		
		b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.	The community approval for resources was done during operation application processing to start the sites.			
		c. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has not restricted access to vital resources without prior community approval.	No interview were used with stakeholders			
		d. Others, please describe				
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.	It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.	Compliant		
		b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.	No interview were used with stakeholders			
		c. Others, please describe				
INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION						
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT						
				Internal supplier, Forsan		
Standards related to Principle 1						

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).	Semiclosed system. Submitted to ASC 26.10.2017	Compliant		
		b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.	Discharge license from Fylkesmannen i Nordland, 19.04.2016, for 12 200 000 smolt / 1 600 ton feed, recipient surveys required. Letter from Fylkesmannen i Nordland, 04.11.2016, postponed demand for cleansing until 01.04.2018. License from Nordland Fylkeskommune, 13.05.2016, for 12 200 000 smolt / 1 600 ton feed.			
		c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	Inspection by Norwegian Food Safety Authority 14.03.2017 resulted in 0 non-conformities.			
		-	Records show no indication of noncompliance			
		e. Others, please describe				
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.	Internal supplier. Company level policies are available and are in line with requirements of the standard.	Compliant		
		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)	Inspections relating to labour conditions/issues has not been held last two years			
		c. Others, please describe				
Standards related to Principle 2						
8.3	<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  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	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.	Risk assessment for environment 29.08.2017 includes recipient, waste, noise, feed, chemicals, habitat, littoral zone, fauna, escape, water source, etc. MOM-B survey 16.10.2017 by Akvaplan NIVA with status 1.	Compliant		
		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.	Biodiversity plan 2017 includes habitat, noise, dust, feed, fuel, fresh water, chemicals, feed waste, faeces, waste, energy and goals for 2017 (escape, environmental status, feed use, etc.).			
		c. Others, please describe				
8.4	<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)  <b>Requirement:</b> 5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the SAD standards, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months.	01.11.2016 - 31.10.2017: Used feed: 862 449 kg (BioMar and Polarfeed).	Compliant		12,2
		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).	Calculated average approx. 1,79 %.			
		c. Using the equation from Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a and b, calculate the total amount of phosphorus added as feed during the last 12 months of smolt production.	01.11.2016 - 31.10.2017: P from feed: 15 716 kg			
		d. Obtain from smolt suppliers records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months.	01.11.2016 - 31.10.2017: Produced biomass: 952 431 kg			
		e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1.	01.11.2016 - 31.10.2017: P-retention: 4 095,45 kg			
		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.	01.11.2016 - 31.10.2017: Delivered mud: 0 liter P in mud: 0 kg			
		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 discharged: 11 620,5 kg P discharged: 12,20 kg/ton biomass produced VR accepted by ASC 05.09.2014			
		h. Others, please describe				
Standards related to Principle 3						
	<b>Indicator:</b> If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall	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.			
		b. Provide the farm with documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard. (See definition of area under 3.2.1 ).	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.			

8.5	have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication [156] of the SAD standards  <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [157]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers except as noted in [157]	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.  e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.  f. Others, please describe	Salmo salar is native to region.  Salmo salar is native to region.	N/A	Salmo salar is native to region.	
8.6	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of escapees [158] in the most recent production cycle  <b>Requirement:</b> 300 fish [159]  <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers except as noted in [159]	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.  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.  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 [159]).  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 [159]. 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.  e. Others, please describe	No incident reported. Verified by Directorate of Fisheries escape incidents overview (www.fidir.no)  No incident reported. Verified by Directorate of Fisheries escape incidents overview (www.fidir.no)  Internal supplier, common quality system. Records in FishTalk/Intelex.  No incident reported. Verified by Directorate of Fisheries escape incidents overview (www.fidir.no)	Compliant		0
8.7	<b>Indicator:</b> Accuracy [160] 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.  b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.  c. Others, please describe	Counting performed at FW site (count fish by dose of vaccine), vaccination numbers used for stocking number at sea net cage.  Counting performed at FW site (count fish by dose of vaccine), vaccination numbers used for stocking number at sea net cage. Statement AquaScan 98-100 % accuracy on machines AquaScan Registration Unit CSF4000 used on wellboat for control counting.	Compliant		98 %
<b>Standards related to Principle 4</b>						
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.  b. Others, please describe	Environmental policy "Miljøpolitikk i Cermaq Norway" regarding environmental status and considerations, laws and regulations, sustainability, etc. signed Cermaq Norway - Knut Ellekjær 30.08.2017. Procedure for waste handling "Prosedyre for avfallsbehandling" 03.06.2016 states waste burning not allowed, relevant wastes listed and disposal. Waste plan dated 12.06.2017 includes household waste, feed bags, equipment, special waste and electric waste to IRIS Østbø, ensilage to Scanbio.	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)	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year.  b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kJ) during the last year.  c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year.	Records OK  Total 2016 Energy scope 1: 771 948 272 kJ Energy scope 2: 12 198 189 600 kJ Total: 12 970 137 872  Total 2016 Produced biomass: 100,6 ton	Compliant		128935502

	<p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Total 2016 Energy efficiency: 128 935 502 kJ/ton biomass (2016 was the first year with production and some of the energy has been used in building process).</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Records OK</p>			
		<p>f. Others, please describe</p>				
8.10	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [161]) emissions [162] at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment (See Appendix V, subsection 1)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility.</p>	<p>Records OK</p>	Compliant		101937
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Total 2016G Produced biomass: 100,6 ton CO2 scope 1: 54 499 kg CO2 scope 2: 47 437kg CO2 total: 101 937 kg</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Total 2016G Produced biomass: 100,6 ton CO2 scope 1: 54 499 kg CO2 scope 2: 47 437kg CO2 total: 101 937 kg</p>			
		<p>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.</p>	<p>CO2 used</p>			
		<p>e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually.</p>	<p>Emission factors Scope 1: 70,60 kg CO2-e/GJ for diesel oil (SSB), 71,88 kg CO2-e/GJ for fuel oil (SSB), 64,09 kg CO2-e/GJ for propane (EIA). Scope 2: 3,89 kg CO2-e/GJ for electricity (IEA)</p>			
		<p>f. Others, please describe</p>				
Standards related to Principle 5						
8.11	<p><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</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites.</p>	<p>Veterinary Health Plan 04.08.2017 signed Karl F. Ottem includes biosecurity, health, infection control, diseases, water quality, screening, surveillance, sampling, welfare, vaccine (Alpha Ject Micro 6), treatments, list of treatments with dosage, withdrawal period, MRL Procedure "Prosedyre for helsekontroll i Cermaq Norway" 19.06.2016 states minimum 12 routine visits per year.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.</p>	<p>Veterinary Health Plan 04.08.2017 signed Karl F. Ottem.</p>			
		<p>c. Others, please describe</p>				
8.12	<p><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 [163]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Maintain a list of diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region, developed by farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.</p>	<p>Listed in Veterinary Health Plan 04.08.2017 signed Karl F. Ottem.</p>	Compliant		100
		<p>b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.</p>	<p>Listed in Veterinary Health Plan 04.08.2017 signed Karl F. Ottem.</p>			
		<p>c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received.</p>	<p>Internal supplier. Vaccine (Alpha Ject Micro 6) described in Veterinary Health Plan 04.08.2017 and showed in FishTalk CV, e.g. cage 9 Svartfjell (Alpha Ject Micro 6), cage 1 Langøyhovden (Alpha Ject Micro 6) and cage 1 Dypeide (Alpha Ject Micro 6).</p>			
		<p>d. Demonstrate, using the lists from 8.12a-c above, that all salmon on the farm received vaccination against all selected diseases known to present a significant risk in the regions for which an effective vaccine exists.</p>	<p>100% vaccinated according to national legislation.</p>			
		<p>e. Others, please describe</p>				
8.13	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of smolt groups [164] 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>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>List of diseases in VHP, testing for diseases is risk based. Visits by veterinarian/fish health biolog according to plan in VHP.</p>	Compliant		
		<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>Visits by veterinarian/fish health biolog according to plan in VHP, e.g. visit 04.05.2017 by Tiril Slettjord, start feeding A shows nefrokalsinosis and gill infection, treatment with Pycezee in hatchery.</p>			
		<p>c. Others, please describe</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>Treatments done are all under responsible veterinarian's prescriptions and registered in Admincontrol/Fishtalk.</p> <p>Records of chemical and therapeutant use in FishTalk, e.g. FishTalk CV group 1702 treated with Benzoak 28.04.2017.</p>	Compliant		
8.15	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [165] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [166]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [166].</p>	<p>Internal supplier.</p> <p>Internal document "Sammendrag av forbudte stoffer" includes:</p> <p>Prohibited substances in EU incl. UK and France according to EU official journal.</p> <p>Prohibited substances in Norway according to lovdata.no.</p> <p>Prohibited/allowed substances in Canada according to CFIA Aquaculture Therapeutant Residue Monitoring list.</p> <p>Prohibited/allowed substances in Japan, positive list system for Agricultural chemical residues in food, <a href="http://www.ffcr.or.jp">www.ffcr.or.jp</a></p> <p>Link to "Green book", MRL and approved substances in USA.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.</p>	Internal supplier.			
		<p>c. Compare therapeutant records from smolt supplier (8.14) to the list (8.15a) and confirm that no therapeutants appearing on the list (8.15a) were used on the smolt purchased by the farm.</p>	No banned treatments used.			
		d. Others, please describe				
8.16	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 3</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a).</p>	No antibiotics used. Seen CV with all treatments identified.	Compliant		0
		<p>b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.</p>	No antibiotics used. Seen CV with all treatments identified.			
		c. Others, please describe				
8.17	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [167]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None [168]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [167].</p>	<p>Internal supplier.</p> <p>WHO Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5th revision, October 2016.</p> <p>List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used.</p>	Compliant		
		<p>b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.</p>	Internal supplier.			
		<p>c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm.</p>	No antibiotics used. Seen CV with all treatments identified.			
		d. Others, please describe				
8.18	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of compliance [169] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [170]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>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).</p>	Link to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code in documents.	Compliant		
		<p>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.</p>	Link to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code in documents.			
		<p>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.</p>	Link to OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code in documents.			
		d. Others, please describe				
Standards related to Principle 6						
8.19	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>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.</p>	The internal Smolt supplier used: company documents apply.	Compliant		
		<p>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.</p>	Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used.			
		c. Others, please describe				

Standards related to Principle 7						
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	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community. b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements. c. Others, please describe	The invitation was sent 2017-09-28 by e-mail to Steigen commune and other interested parties. The meeting was organised on 2017-10-30. Consultations have included main points required by the standard.	Compliant		
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	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations. b. Others, please describe	Internal Smolt supplier used. Company procedures are used. See Principle 7.1.2.	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. 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. c. Others, please describe	It was communicated during the application processing to start the sites. No indigenous groups or aboriginal people are present in neighbourhood. No traditional and indigenous groups are involved. It was communicated during the application processing to start the sites. No traditional and indigenous groups are involved. No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	
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. b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities. c. Others, please describe	It was communicated during the application processing to start the sites. No indigenous groups or aboriginal people are present in neighbourhood. Based on 8.2.2 a) the requirements of 8.2.3. do not apply. No consultation is applicable. No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.	
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT						
8.24	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids <b>Requirement:</b> None <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids. b. Request smolt suppliers to identify all water bodies in which they operate net pens for producing smolt and from which facilities they sell to the client. c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results. d. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
8.25	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Take steps to ensure that by June 13, 2017 the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens. b. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
8.26	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body has been established by a reliable entity [171] within the past five years [172, and total biomass in the water body is within the limits established by that study (see Appendix VIII-5 for minimum requirements) <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. For the water body(s) where the supplier produces smolt for the client (see 8.24b), obtain a copy of the most recent assessment of assimilative capacity. b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability. c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5. d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a). e. If the study in 8.26a is more than two years old and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since completion, request evidence that an updated assessment study has been done. f. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
8.27	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) <b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 20 µg/l [174] <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements of Appendix VIII-6. b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations. c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station. d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body.	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	



		e. Confirm that the average value for TP over the last 12 months did not exceed 20 ug/l at any of the sampling stations nor at the reference station. f. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only.			
8.28	<b>Indicator:</b> Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimetres above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) <b>Requirement:</b> ≥ 50% <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a). b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months. c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation. d. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
8.29	<b>Indicator:</b> Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable). b. If the trophic status of the waterbody has not been classified (see 8.29a), obtain evidence from the supplier to show how the supplier determined trophic status based on the concentration of TP. c. As applicable, review results from 8.29b to verify that the supplier accurately assigned a trophic status to the water body in accordance with the table in Appendix VIII-7 and the observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months. d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported for all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change. e. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
8.30	<b>Indicator:</b> Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) <b>Requirement:</b> 25% <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable. b. Compare the baseline TP concentration (result from 8.30a) to the average observed TP concentration over the past 12 months (result from 8.27e). c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration. d. Others, please describe	No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only. No net-pens, tanks only.	N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.	
8.31	<b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water body <b>Requirement:</b> None	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water bodies where the supplier operates. b. Others, please describe	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 [177]:						
8.32	<b>Indicator:</b> Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) <b>Requirement:</b> Yes [177] <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. d. Others, please describe	No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater	N/A	No discharge to freshwater	
8.33	<b>Indicator:</b> Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2) <b>Requirement:</b> 60% [178,179] <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 at least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2). d. Others, please describe	No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater	N/A	No discharge to freshwater	
8.34	<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	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. d. Others, please describe	No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater	N/A	No discharge to freshwater	
8.35	<b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) <b>Requirement:</b> Yes <b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2. b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly. c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months. d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2. e. Others, please describe	No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater No discharge to freshwater	N/A	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 implemented	Deadline for NC close-out	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
IA-2017-1	2.1.1	Minor	Redox potential at stations outside AZE not >0: C4 -0,2 mV. MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass) last production cycle. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01. Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.	09.11.2017	Open		Root cause for Dypeide is accounted for, in separate document ("Justification and corrective strategies for minor non-conformances in environmental factors regarding farm sites Langøyhovden and Dypeide" M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS 18.01.2018).	Root cause for Dypeide is accounted for, in separate document ("Justification and corrective strategies for minor non-conformances in environmental factors regarding farm sites Langøyhovden and Dypeide" M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS 18.01.2018). New ASC/MOM C is scheduled with Akvaplan Niva at top biomass.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-2	2.1.2	Minor	MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass) last production cycle. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01. Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.	09.11.2017	Open		Root cause for Dypeide is accounted for, in separate document ("Justification and corrective strategies for minor non-conformances in environmental factors regarding farm sites Langøyhovden and Dypeide" M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS 18.01.2018).	Root cause for Dypeide is accounted for, in separate document ("Justification and corrective strategies for minor non-conformances in environmental factors regarding farm sites Langøyhovden and Dypeide" M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS 18.01.2018). New ASC/MOM C is scheduled with Akvaplan Niva at top biomass.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-3	2.1.3	Minor	Number of macrofaunal taxa within AZE not ≥2 highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species: C1 2 highly abundant species, where 1 is not a pollution indicator specie. MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass) last production cycle. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	MOM-C and ASC report by Akvaplan NIVA 29.07.2017 (field work 04.07.2017), report 8985.01. Olex map with 6 sampling points, adapted to site specific bathymetric, production, current, etc. (reference stations: Cu1 and Cu2, stations outside AZE: C2, C3 and C4, station inside AZE: C1.	09.11.2017	Open		Root cause for Dypeide is accounted for, in separate document ("Justification and corrective strategies for minor non-conformances in environmental factors regarding farm sites Langøyhovden and Dypeide" M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS 18.01.2018).	Root cause for Dypeide is accounted for, in separate document ("Justification and corrective strategies for minor non-conformances in environmental factors regarding farm sites Langøyhovden and Dypeide" M.W.S. - Cermaq Norway AS 18.01.2018). New ASC/MOM C is scheduled with Akvaplan Niva at top biomass.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-4	2.2.1	Minor	Not seen oxygen records for ≥ 6 months and not seen written justification for any missed samples. Seen record for the period week 25 to 38 in 2017. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	Nortek "Realfish" continuous logging	09.11.2017	Open		Oxy-box had been purchased, but were not calibrated at the time fish was stocked at site. Calibration is done by external company, and it took long time than expected.	Oxy-boxes are currently in place an logging, and site will be compliant at periodic revision.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-5	2.2.2	Minor	Not seen oxygen records for ≥ 6 months. Seen record for the period week 25 to 38 in 2017. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	All above limits. Not seen record cover	09.11.2017	Open		Oxy-box had been purchased, but were not calibrated at the time fish was stocked at site. Calibration is done by external company, and it took long time than expected.	Oxy-boxes are currently in place an logging, and site will be compliant at periodic revision.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-6	2.3.1	Minor	Not seen record of percentage of fines in feed from last 3 months. Seen 4 samples in October. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	Procedure "Prosedyre for førmottak og lagring" 01.06.2017 describes monthly sampling and testing at feed reception. In the period 14.10. - 30.10.2017 feed samples showed fines 0,00 - 0,08% (4 samples in October).	09.11.2017	Open		Miscommunication within the organisation led to sieves and scales being ordered to late. The equipment arrived at HQ in late august, and was distributed to each sites afterwards.	The sites have now started logging according to procedure, and will be compliant at the time of periodic revision.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-7	3.1.4	Minor	Sea lice data missing for week 2, 3, 5 and 6, not seen justification. Jan Petter Kosmo 23.01.2018: Closed. The 2 weeks with missing lice counting are justified (due to technical issues).	Procedure "Prosedyre for lusetelling" 03.03.2017 states lice count every 7 day if water temperature is over 4 degrees Celsius and every 14 day if water temperature is below 4 degrees Celsius, lice counting at 20 fish per cage (counting in all cages), etc. Weekly internal meetings regarding lice, e.g. 02.11.17, lice status per site (includes Svartfjell, Langøyhovden and Dypeide), treatment, effect, etc.	09.11.2017	Closed		Justification in separate document, see "Statement regarding minor non-conformances for farm site Dypeide" 18.01.2018 A.E. - Cermaq Norway AS.	Justification in separate document, see "Statement regarding minor non-conformances for farm site Dypeide" 18.01.2018 A.E. - Cermaq Norway AS.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 23.01.2018: Closed. The 2 weeks with missing lice counting are justified (due to technical issues).					
IA-2017-8	4.7.1	Minor	Copper-based treatment are used on nets. According to procedure "Prosedyre for kontroll etterstyr og renhold av net" 19.12.2016 copper treated nets shall not be washed at sea, but taken up and washed at land. Not seen evidence of washing of nets at land. Jan Petter Kosmo 23.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019. Seen statement 18.09.2017 and invoice 30.11.2017 from Bøteriet AS.	According to procedure "Prosedyre for kontroll etterstyr og renhold av net" 19.12.2016 copper treated nets shall not be washed at sea, but taken up and washed at land. Not seen evidence of washing of nets at land.	09.11.2017	Open		Nets are changed and transported to Bøteriet in Steigen. Receipt missing at time of audit.	Dypeide have changed 5 nets. Due to low temperatures in sea, algae and sea weed growth have been minimal. Nets are scheduled to be replaced with large nets, and treated at facility i late april, early may. Receipt from treatment facility have been requested from previous treatments. Will be sent to auditor when received.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 23.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019. Seen statement 18.09.2017 and invoice 30.11.2017 from Bøteriet AS.					
IA-2017-9	4.7.3	Minor	MOM-C not performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass) last production cycle. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	Copper-based treatment are used on nets.	09.11.2017	Open		Due to changes in Cermaq ASC schedule, site was moved forward in schedule and did not have the opportunity to perform ASC/MOM C assesment at max biomass ahead of audit. While last generation were at peak biomass, the site was not scheduled for ASC certification during fall 2017	New ASC/MOM C is scheduled with Akvaplan Niva at top biomass.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-10	5.1.7	Minor	In interview site staff were not aware of actual target for reduced mortality. Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	Veterinary Health Plan dated 21.03.2017 for Dypeide signed Karl F. Ottem includes goal of maximum 6,5% mortality per generation.	09.11.2017	Open		Staff was inexperienced with participating in audit and interview. This led to difficulties remember the specific target.	Site manager has repeated mortality target with employees. Cermaq will prepare staff more carefully for audits in the future to make them more comfortable and confident, as staff has expressed nervousness in participating in these settings.	SA1	Jan Petter Kosmo 22.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-11	6.2.2	Minor	Young workers were worked 7 days in a row. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	The procedure for Young workers ID 147 rev. 12, 2017-05-30 is developed. Personal training to be done for each young worker indicating allowed and forbidden works.	09.11.2017	Open		Young workers were worked 6 days in a row, due to ambiguity in procedure. Now corrected.	Procedure updated, see attachment 2.	SA1	Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-12	6.5.1	Minor	No Safety drills organised at site over last 12 month. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	Documentation is developed and is available in working places.	09.11.2017	Open		All workers shall participate in safety drill, annually. Due special circumstances in daily operations and staff on sick leave, safety drill had to be postponed.	Safety drill is scheduled for 30th of January. Drill report will be available after completion.	SA1	Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					

IA-2017-13	6.5.2	Minor	First aid kits on site are with outdated components. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	The procedure for risk assessment No	09.11.2017	Open		During inspection, only components had been checked. The date on first aid kits components had been overlooked during inspection.	First aid kits were delivered to local pharmacy for update before christmas. All first aid kits are returned and confirmed by site manager. Staff has been instructed to also check date on product during inspection.	SA1	Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-14	6.5.3	Minor	The temporary employee have not been introduced with results of risk assessment of 2017-04-04. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	List maintained, reference to risk analyses on ITELEX. Last revision if risks took place in 2017-04-04.	09.11.2017	Open		Temporary employee had her first week on the job, and had not yet gotten been through the risk assessment at the time of audit.	Temporary employee had experienced staff with her at all time, and were not allowed to operate or handle equipment that involves risk on her own during this week. Site manager has presented and educated temp. employee on the risk assessment.	SA1	Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					
IA-2017-15	6.5.4	Minor	Temporary employee is not included into the process of providing/discussing H&S incidents, near misses related information. Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.	Company level electronic database INTELEX is used to report for all H&S and environmental accidents and near accidents. Monthly H&S report is generated. Sites have monthly discussions on H&S accidents, incidents and near misses form site and the report.	09.11.2017	Open		Temporary employee had her first week on the job, and had not yet been informed on company management system.	Cermaq uses Intellex for reporting HS- and other internal incidents where all staff have access and opportunity to report new incidents and review previous incidents. This also includes temp. employees.	SA1	Darius Pamakstys 26.01.2018: Accepted, will be followed up in SA1-2019.					

## 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.		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 SalmonStandard 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.		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 SalmonStandard audit. Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). Only transport from one seasite to the slaughterhouse at the time.
10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.		Wellboat services are subcontracted. Only one, approved wellboat company is used during transhipments of salmon between the site and waiting 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 waiting cages from salmon from other farm/sites is also prevented by biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the harvesting/processing plant used. There are slaughtered fish from only one waiting cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept in electronic system FishTalk and in hard copies.
10.4	Any other opportunities where certified product could potentially be mixed, substituted, or mislabelled with non-certified product before the point where product		No other possibility for mixing products.
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 ova 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 own freshwater sites and external suppliers, and corresponding documentation of production sites and suppliers. Digital information is handled in FishTalk/Intelex for on-growing phase in seawater and for freshwater stage.	

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.	
10.6.3 The point from which chain of custody is required to begin.	<p>Products are authorised to enter an ASC Chain of Custody certification at the point where the fish is moved from the wellboat/live fish carrier and delivered direct to the harvest/processing plant. From this point the ASC Salmon Standard certificate stops and the ASC CoC certificate takes over.</p> <p>The harvest plants is ASC CoC certified (ref. to <a href="http://www.asc-aqua.org">www.asc-aqua.org</a> where updated information can be found):</p> <p>Cermaq Alsvåg AS (Alsvåg, NORWAY), certificate code ASC-C-00952 .</p> <p>Cermaq Norway AS, avd. slakteri Skutvik (Skutvik, NORWAY), certificate code ASC-C-00951.</p>
10.6.4 Is a separate chain of custody certificate required for the producer?	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, 7 and 8.

For the rest of the principles, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, full compliance was not found, although most of these were mainly compliant.

The audit hence resulted in 15 Minor category Non-Conformities. Reference is made to ASC Farm certification and Accreditation Requirement 17.4.2 and 17.4.3. As the fish were not at harvest size during the audit, harvest was not overseen by the auditor. Harvest is performed by the company. 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. 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).

Dypeide site capability to consistently meet the objectives of the ASC Salmon Standard is expected for the future. The unit of certification has a limited number of Minor NCs. Corrective actions for closing or acceptance of Minor Non conformities, subject to corrective action plan for the non conformities are presented and approved by DNV GL.

123 In cases where Biodiversity Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA) or Participatory Social Impact Assessment (PSIA) **is available**, it shall be added in full to the audit report. IF these documents

Not applicable.

### 13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)

**Yes.**

**Compliant.** Considered compliant and recommended certified now after satisfactory closure and a corrective action plan for Minor non-conformances is implemented by the client and approved by DNV GL.

- **Final certification decision has been taken in this final report after completion of stakeholder period.**
- **Final certification decision has been taken by DNV GL and the applicant is 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 05.02.2018 - 05.02.2021.
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	
13.4.1 The date of issue and date of expiry of the certificate.	Certificate validity 05.02.2018 - 05.02.2021.
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	2018 - Specific date not decided at this stage.
14.1.2 Planned site	Dypeide
14.2 Next audit type	
14.2.1 Surveillance 1	SA1 - 2018
14.2.2 Surveillance 2	
14.2.3 Re-certification	
14.2.4 Other (specify type)	

# ASC – Aquaculture Stewardship Council

## Request for interpretation or variance

### I CAB Request

1.1 NAME OF CAB	1.2 DATE OF SUBMISSION	1.3 CAB CONTACT PERSON	1.4 EMAIL ADDRESS OF CAB CONTACT PERSON		
DNV GL - Business Assurance	05.09.2014	Kim-Andre Karlsen / Guro Meldre Pedersen	<a href="mailto:kim.andre.karlsen@dnvgl.com">kim.andre.karlsen@dnvgl.com</a> <a href="mailto:guro.meldre.pedersen@dnvgl.com">guro.meldre.pedersen@dnvgl.com</a>		
<b>1.5 ASC DOCUMENT REFERENCE</b>					
ASC Salmon Standard Version 1.0 June 2012. Principle 8, Criterion 8.4 Maximum total amount of phosphorus.					
<b>1.6 BACKGROUND (PROVIDE FULL EXPLANATION OF THE ISSUE)</b>					
<p>Requirement 8.4 of the ASC salmon standard sets a limit to how much phosphorus is discharged from the farm per unit smolt produced. The requirement is set at 5 kg/mt for the first three years from date of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard, dropping to 4 kg/mt thereafter. This requirement falls under section 8 (Requirements for smolt production) that contains the full suite of principles, criteria, indicators and requirements for responsible salmon farming at freshwater smolt sites. Under the rationale for the development of this requirement it is stated that nutrient discharge into the freshwater environment is one topic of concern when evaluating the impacts of smolt production. Phosphorus is used as a reference for water quality in the freshwater environment.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="261 1043 1422 1189"> <tr> <td>8.4 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)</td><td>5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period</td></tr> </table> <p>Several sites across Norway have been audited according to the ASC salmon standard. Compliance with requirement 8.4 has not been possible and minor NC has been identified as P levels in wastewater are above the limit of 5 kg/mt. In this VR we argue that such limit should be applicable only when wastewater from smolt facilities is discharged into a freshwater environment but not when wastewater is discharged directly into a marine environment which is the case of smolt facilities in Norway. Phosphorus has been clearly identified as a key growth-limiting nutrient in freshwater environment (Schindler 1977, OECD 1982) and therefore limiting its release into freshwater is an important action to limit eutrophication. The responses of freshwater environments to nutrient enrichment are well documented for most regions in the world allowing the possibility to set limits to phosphorus release. However, knowledge on marine coastal eutrophication is limited and the controls of eutrophication in freshwater and coastal marine ecosystems have been recognized as different (Smith, 2003). In fact, in coastal marine environments, nitrogen (N) has been recognized as the major cause of eutrophication (Howarth and Marino, 2006).</p> <p>As noted on page 23 of the ASC salmon standard the SAD technical group has recognized that the effects of nutrient loading into coastal environments still need to be established and therefore no specific limits on N or P release into the marine environment have been set: “The SAD technical working group on nutrient loading identified the potential link between nutrients around salmon farms and harmful algal blooms as one that had yet to be established but around which there remained some uncertainty and for which there was an intuitive concern around the effect of the cumulative anthropogenic nutrient load into coastal waters. The group noted a shortage of field studies to validate hypotheses from lab-based work.”</p> <p>Howarth RW and Marino R (2006). Nitrogen as the limiting nutrient for eutrophication in coastal marine ecosystems: evolving views over three decades. <i>Limnol. Oceanogr.</i>, 51, 364–376</p> <p>OECD (1982): Eutrophication of waters: Monitoring, assessment and control. Organisation for Economic and Cooperative Development, Paris, France</p> <p>Schindler DW (1977): Evolution of phosphorus limitation in lakes. <i>Science</i> 195, 260-262</p>				8.4 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)	5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period
8.4 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)	5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period				

# ASC – Aquaculture Stewardship Council

## Request for interpretation or variance

### 1.7 RECOMMENDED ACTION / DECISION

DNV GL recommends that ASC approves this VR request for the upcoming ASC Audit at Marine Harvest Site Skipningsdalen 22.09 - 26.09.2014 in Norway, and to apply the limits set under requirement 8.4 to smolt facilities that discharge wastewater into freshwater only.

### II ASC Determination

2.1 STATUS	2.2 DATE OF THE ASC DETERMINATION
[X] Closed	15 September 2014
2.3 ASC DETERMINATION ON VARIANCE REQUEST	
Approved	
2.4 ASC INTERPRETATION	
<p>Although the ASC has a different view on the availability of studies on the subject, we do agree with the fact that in the current version of the ASC Salmon standard discharging in a marine environment is not addressed in a binding manner.</p> <p>FYI: The ASC Standards will be reviewed periodically (at a minimum once per 5 years) and the criteria/requirement for this issue may change.</p>	



## FORM 1 - Request for Interpretation or Variance - ASC

This form is for the submission of requests by CABs to the ASC to request interpretations of the ASC normative requirements and/or requests for variance from specific normative requirements.

### I - CAB Request

1.1 Name of CAB	1.2 Date of Submission	1.3 CAB Contact Person	1.4 Email Address of CAB Contact Person
Food Certification Scotland International	17/07/15	Matthew James	Matthew.James@acoura.com
<b>1.5 ASC Document Reference</b>			
<p><b>Criteria 5.2.5</b></p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> PTI score <math>\leq 13</math></p> <p><b>Indicator Compliance Criteria</b></p>			
<b>1.6 Background (Provide full explanation of the issue)</b>			
<p>The PTI score is aimed at reducing the amount of sealice medication used on a site in order to keep well within safe limits that will not harm the environment and sensitive wild species.</p> <p>With reference to the in-feed therapeutant emamectin benzoate (EMBZ), within the Scottish regulatory framework, SEPA have modelled a Maximum Treatment Quantity (MTQ) allowed within a 7 day period for each site. This defines a single treatment of a whole site at maximum standing biomass using a standard recommended dose of EMBZ.</p> <p>Therefore if 1x MTQ represents a single standard dose of a whole site at full biomass, it follows that an amount of product used to treat a site at half biomass should count 50% of this, and a simple ratio of Treatment Quantity (TQ) : MTQ should be used to determine a fraction of a treatment. This encourages farms to use Slice at times when the biomass on a site is lower, and therefore discharge less therapeutant into the environment.</p> <p>Calculation Example from real treatment data: Slice used shortly after smolt input with a TQ of 12% of MTQ and again later in the cycle with a TQ of 23% of MTQ and for a 3<sup>rd</sup> time at 88% of MTQ. Total amount of EMBZ discharged = 1.0766kg</p> <p>Proposed PTI calculation:</p> $4 \times 0.8 \times 1 \times 1 \times 0.12 = 0.384$ $4 \times 0.8 \times 2 \times 1 \times 0.23 = 1.472$ $4 \times 0.8 \times 2 \times 1 \times 0.88 = 5.2$ <p>Total = 7.056</p> <p>This is far more desirable than using the product in the second half of the cycle when the farm will already consistently be at maximum biomass and a full MTQ amount will be used on each occasion, discharging 2.625kg of EMBZ during the cycle, more than double the amount in the example above.</p> <p>PTI calculation:</p> $4 \times 0.8 \times 1 \times 1 \times 1 = 3.2$ $4 \times 0.8 \times 2 \times 1 \times 1 = 6.4$ $4 \times 0.8 \times 2 \times 1 \times 1 = 6.4$ <p>Total = 16</p>			

Therefore using a fraction of the PTI element for each treatment at lower biomasses encourages more efficient use of the product. It is also well known that good sealice control is required especially at the outset of a cycle to prevent a significant population of sealice from gaining momentum. Slice is certainly most effective when used to prevent a settlement from becoming established in the first place and the PTI scoring should reward a farm for using the product early and penalise a farm for using it later.

#### 1.7 Recommended Action/Decision

To use TQ:MTQ to determine a fraction of a Slice (EMBZ) treatment and apply this fraction in determining the overall PTI score.

## II - ASC Determination

2.1 Status	2.2 Date of the ASC Determination
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed	20/08/2015
2.3 ASC Determination of Variance Request	
The ASC committee agrees to approve the VR therefore ASC grants the VR.	
2.4 ASC Interpretation	
<p>This is an innovative approach for the sea lice management and we support that ASC standards should help to encourage innovation to solve problems. Therefore under the condition of publicizing this fact (more than just the requirement to have the VR on our website), we approve this VR. We have already asked the farm to allow us to make their findings public in one of our public updates - thus encouraging other farms to follow their example.</p> <p>(Two documents regarding the sea lice management were received from Marine Harvest Scotland (by Catarina) on 20/08/2015 - Saved under the farm file)</p>	

# ASC – Aquaculture Stewardship Council

## Request for interpretation or variance

### I CAB Request

1.1 NAME OF CAB	1.2 DATE OF SUBMISSION	1.3 CAB CONTACT PERSON	1.4 EMAIL ADDRESS OF CAB CONTACT PERSON
DNV GL Business Assurance Norway AS	8. April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kim Andre Karlsen</li> <li>Guro Meldre Pedersen</li> <li>Sander Buijs</li> </ul>	<a href="mailto:Kim.Andre.Karlsen@dnvgl.com">Kim.Andre.Karlsen@dnvgl.com</a> <a href="mailto:Guro.Meldre.Pedersen@dnvgl.com">Guro.Meldre.Pedersen@dnvgl.com</a> <a href="mailto:Sander.Buijs@dnvgl.com">Sander.Buijs@dnvgl.com</a>
<b>1.5 ASC DOCUMENT REFERENCE</b>			
<p>ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements v1 Annex C – Aquaculture Audit Report Requirements C2: Audit and surveillance reports shall be written in English and in the most common language spoken in the areas where the aquaculture operation is located.</p> <p>ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements v2 Annex C – Aquaculture Audit Report Requirements C1. Audit reports shall be written in English and in the most common language spoken in the areas where the operation is located.</p> <p>Audit notification: 17.2.4.2 The notice shall be in the local language(s) and English.</p>			
<b>1.6 BACKGROUND (PROVIDE FULL EXPLANATION OF THE ISSUE)</b>			
<p>The translation of audit reports is a significant cost to the ASC farm certification process and implementation of CAR v2 should take a pragmatic approach adapted to the stakeholders' normal language competences in the area where the candidate site for ASC farm certification is situated.</p> <p>With the transfer to ASC CAR v2, DNV GL will implement the standard audit report template as required. The general public competence in the English language is high in Scandinavia. DNV GL therefore seeks a variation to the above ASC CAR paragraphs for audits conducted at operations located in Scandinavia to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allow the Audit report in its entirety to be published only in the English version.</li> <li>- Allow the Audit notification to be published only in the English version.</li> </ul> <p>This variation should not in any way jeopardize the integrity of the ASC programme or the access for stakeholders to relevant information. Any requests from stakeholders to make details of information available in the local language will be fulfilled.</p> <p>Experience with other schemes including extended stakeholder involvement and broader public engagement than ASC farm, such as MSC Fisheries, has demonstrated that publishing of reports in only the English language has not been an obstacle to stakeholder dialogue or comments.</p>			
<b>1.7 Recommended action / decision</b>			
DNV GL recommends a variation to the above ASC CAR clauses to allow Audit notifications and Audit reports for audits at operations located in Scandinavia to be published only in English.			

# ASC – Aquaculture Stewardship Council

## Request for interpretation or variance

### II ASC Determination

2.1 STATUS	2.2 DATE OF THE ASC DETERMINATION
X <input type="checkbox"/> Closed	24/08/2016
2.3 ASC DETERMINATION ON VARIANCE REQUEST	
This VR is approved.	
2.4 ASC INTERPRETATION	
<p>It is a key requirement under the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements v1.0 and v2.0 to have audit reports available in both English and the local language.</p> <p>Given the fact that all Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark, Norway) are rated as “very high” (resp. position 1,3,4) in the English Proficiency Index (<a href="http://www.ef.nl/epi/">http://www.ef.nl/epi/</a>) it can safely be assumed that English understanding is sufficient in order to understand the content of an ASC audit report. Based on this, this VR is approved.</p>	