Form 3 - Public Disclosure Form

This form shall be submitted by the CAB no less than thirty (30) calendar 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	10.03.2017
PDF 1.3 CAB Contact Person	
PDF 1.3.1 Name of Contact Person	Odd H. Johannessen
PDF 1.3.2 Position in the CAB's organisation	Lead Auditor
PDF 1.3.3 Mailing address	

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

PDF 1.3.4	Email address	odd.johannessen@dnvgl.com
PDF 1.3.5	Phone number	0047-96 91 70 70
PDF 1.3.6	Other	

PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client

PDF 1.4.1	Name of Contact Person	Silje Ramsvatn
PDF 1.4.2	Position in the client's organisation	Environmental Coordinator, Cermaq Norway AS
PDF 1.4.3	Mailing address	
PDF 1.4.4	Email address	silje.ramsvatn@cermaq.com
PFD 1.4.5	Phone number	0047-23 68 55 33
PDF 1.4.6	Other	Website: www.cermaqnorway.com

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
10821 Tuvan	70°05.479N / 22°42.577Ø	Cermaq Norway AS, 10821 Tuvan, 9540 Talvik , Norway	Initial Audit	29.05.17-09.06.17

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 Salmon Standard	V 1.0

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

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in-person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted
Mattilsynet	Food Safety Authorities	Written notifications with request for submissions	Preaudit and preliminary report publication	Written notifications
Finnmark Fylkeskommune	Reginonal authority	Written notifications with request for submissions	Preaudit and preliminary report publication	Written notifications

Kystverket	Coastal/Maritime authority	Written notifications with request for submissions	Preaudit and preliminary report publication	Written notifications
Fiskeridirektoratet	Fisheries authority	Written notifications with request for submissions	Preaudit and preliminary report publication	Written notifications
Fylkesmannen i Finnmark	Reginonal authority	Written notifications with request for submissions	Preaudit and preliminary report publication	Written notifications
Reinbeitedistrikt 26 Lakkonarga	Local interest organisation	Written notifications with request for submissions	Preaudit and preliminary report publication	Written notifications
All listed will be contacted if they respond in writing to the written notifications sent. All listed will be contacted if they respond in writing to the written notifications sent to them at audit notification 6 weeks prior to the audit and at the start of the Draft Stage Report public consultation period.				

PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed:	07.01.2017
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit:	29.05.2017
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s):	29.05.17-09.06.17
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/Decision:	Pending final certification decision in final report.

PDF 1.10 Audit Team

	Column1	Name	ASC Registration Referenc
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor	Odd H. Johannessen	
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts		
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor	Darius Pamakstys	

ASC Audit Report - Opening

General Requirements

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

C2 Audit reports may contain confidential annexes for commercially sensitive information.

C2.1 The CAB shall agree the content of any commercially sensitive information with the applicant, which can still be accessible by the ASC and the appointed accreditation body upon request as stipulated in the certification contract.

C2.2 The public report shall contain a clear overview of the items which are in the confidential annexes.

C2.3 Except for the annexes that contain commercially sensitive information all audit reports will be public.

C3 The CAB is solely responsible for the content of all reports, including the content of any confidential annexes.

C4 Reporting Deadlines* for certification and re-certification audit reports

C4.1 Within thirty (30) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a draft report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.

C4.2 Within five (5) days the ASC should post the draft report to the ASC website.

C4.3 The CAB shall allow stakeholders and interested parties to comment on the report for fifteen (15) days.

C4.4 Within twenty (20) days of the close of comments, the CAB shall submit the final report to the ASC in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.

C4.5 Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.

C4.6 Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducable results.

C5 Reporting Deadlines* for surveillance audit reports

C5.1 Within ninety (90) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a final report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.

C5.2 Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.

C5.3 Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducable results.

1 Title Page

1.1 Name of Applicant	Cermaq Norway AS 10821 Tuvan

1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report]	Final Stage Public ASC Salmon Certification Report
1.3 CAB name	Det Norske Vertias Germanische Loyd (DNVGL)
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Odd H. Johannessen
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Mr. Darius Pamakstys, Social Accountability related priciples and indicators. Reports technical reviews by Mr. Jorge Rios.
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Mr. Mats Snåre. Environmental Coordinator Cermaq Norway AS
1.7 Date	29.08.2017

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) "Nytek" NS9415 (Norwegian Standard 9415) are technical certifications of Marine fish farms with Requirements for design, dimensioning, production, installation and operation.4) MTB is Maximum Allowed Biomass. 5) FHP is Fish Health Plan. 6) GG is GLOBALG.A.P. IFA (Integrated Farm Assurance. 7) GGN is GLOBALG.A.P. unique registration number. 8) ODDJO is acronym for Odd H. Johannessen (lead auditor). E459) VHP is Veterinary Helath Plan. 10) UIA is Unidentifiable Infectious Agent. 11) UTA is Unidentifiable Transmissable Agent. 12) TU is Trade Union. 13) PPE is Personal Protective Equipment. 14) H&S is Health and Safety 15) OHS is Occupational Health and Safety. 16) BNW is Basic Need Wages. 17) DP is Darius Pamakstys, Social Auditor, 18) IMR is Institute of Marine Research, 19) BPR is Biocidal Products Regulaton, 20) MRL is Maximum Residue Limits, 21) INTELEX is internal QM system

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	Initial audit for certification after ASC Salmon Standard V1.0
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	Production/ongrowing of Atlantic Salmon (Salmo salar) from smolt to harvest size fish in floating circular cages. Automatic feeders (Poro) are used for each cage. Landbase neraby is housing storage of feed, accomodations, technical and control rooms.
4.3	Type of unit of certification (*select only one type of unit of certification in the list)*	Single farm
4.4	Type of audit (*select all the types of audit that apply in the list)*	Initial

4.5	A summary of the major findings	Reference is made to report section II Audit template and IV Audit Report - Closing for NCs found during audit
4.6	The Audit determination	The Audit determination at Final report stage: Compliant. 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. • Final certification decision has been taken in this Final Report after completion of stakeholder period. • Certification decision is made by DNV GL and the applicant is certified and can claim ASC Aquaculture certification status.

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1	CAB Name	Det Norske Veritas Germanische Loyd (DNV GL)
5.2	CAB Mailing Address	DNV GL - Business Assurance Veritasveien 1 1322 Høvik Norway
5.3	Email Address	Lead Auditor Odd H. Johannessen (odd.johannessen@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 intial audit)* / changes, if any (*for surveillance and recertification audits)*	10821 Tuvan is a single site, conventional floating-cage salmon farm. The production cages are 5 circular floating plastic rings with the dimension 120 m circumference. The site has no barge, but is served from a landbase nearby. Automatic feeders (Poro) are used for each cage. All installations are certified after "NS-9415 NYTEK" regulations standard. Smolts supplied by internal and external suppliers. Public registers with details on location etc. in www.Fiskeridirektoratet.no/akvakulturregisteret
6.3	Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	Global G.A.P. IFA, ISO 9001-2008, ISO 14000-2004, OHSAS 18001 - 2007, ISO 22000-2005 (all held on company level)
6.4	Other certification(s) obtained before this audit	As above
6.5	Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the current year	Production in 2017 is estimated to be 1 662 ton. Harvest in 2017 - estimated to 2 115 ton.
6.6	Actual annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the previous year *(mandatory for surveillance and recertification*	Production in 2016 was 899 ton.
6.7	Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification *(select one or more in the list)*	cage
6.8	Number of employees working at the unit of certification	4 permanent employees, incl. site manager which is shared with site Rivabukt. There is also one temporary worker on site.

7 Scope

7.1	The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Salmon Standard V1.0, June 2012.
7.2	The species produced at the applicant farm	Atlantic Salmon *(Salmo salar),* only.
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.	The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including 10821 Tuvan staff, typically a combination of document reviews and staff interviews. Demonstrations of equipment and processes took place, relevant to the scope of the audit, according to the ASC Salmon Standard v1.0 and following guidelines in the ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.0. No sub-sites are operated by the farm and the complete farm is included in the scope of certification. No handling of fish related to harvest is conducted on the farm. ongrowing, only. Live fish for harvest is transported to harvest plants by subcontracted live fish carriers (se 7.4 below for details).

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.	Only approved live-fish carriers (Subcontractor; Norsk Fisketransport AS) are 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/ harvesting from other salmon farms/sites. The possibility for mixture of salmon in waiting cages from salmon from other farm/sites is also prevented by biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the harvesting/processing plant used. There are slaughtered fish from only one waiting cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept both in electronic system Fish Talk and Maritech system for Harvest/Post-harvest operations and in hard copies. Post-harvest operations performed at; Cermaq Norway Slakteri F-430, Havneveien 36, 9600 Hammerfest. ASC-C-00687, Exp. date 04.06.18 . Ref. to www.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found.).
7.5	Description of the receiving water body(ies).	The farm is located im the municipality of Alta. GPS-coordinates 70°05.479N / 22°42.577E. Site receiving water-body is Langfjorden and Altafjorden. Regional water-body authority is Finnmark Fylkeskommune. This is a coastal water area. Categorised as a coastal fjord, of Euhaline nature (>30‰S). Ecological quality is defined as good. Chemical condition is not defined in public documentation. Details @ www.vannportalen.no The site is under voluntary ABM system. There is other salmon farming activity in the area, including nearby farms. There are natural wild salmon populations in the area. Overview of salmon watercourses in the area are available in map tools from the Environment Agency / Salmon Registry: http://lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no/lakseregister/public/default.aspx

8 Audit Plan

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

Darius Pamakstys auditing Principle 6, 7 and section 8 (indicators 8.19 -8.23) date 06.06.2017-07.06.2017. Odd H. Johannessen, lead auditor, auditing remaning Principles dates 29.05.17-07.06.2017. Odd H. Johannessen Draft stage reporting 09.06.2017 to 13.06.2017
Jorge Rios, Technical Reviewer (e-mail address: jorge.rios.alveal@gmail.com)

Audit was finished 07.06.2017
Draft report was finished 13.06.2017.
Technical Review of report was finished 17.07.2017
Draft Report was published 19.07.2017
Final Report finished 14.08.2017
Technical review of Final Report finished 29.08.2017
Final report sent ASC 29.08.2017

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/ yyyyy			
Scope extention audit mm/ yyyy			

8.4 Audit plan as implemented including:

	Dates	Locations
8.4.1 Desk Reviews		

8.4.2	Onsite audits	29.05.2017-07.06.2017	Head office in Alta and site Tuvan
8.4.3	Stakeholder interviews and Community meetings		No reponse from notified stakeholders from preaudit notification
8.4.4	Draft report sent to client	13.06.2017	
8.4.5	Draft report sent to ASC	17.07.2017	
8.5.5	Final report sent to Client and ASC	29.08.2017	

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 W. Snåre, Environmental Coordinator
Rune S. Berg, H&S Coordinator
Magnus Åsli, QA Coordinator Finnmark
Liv Andrea Myklevoll, HR Coordinator
Jonny Opdahl, Production Manager
Jøran Erdal, Area Manager
Elisabeth Ann Myklebust, Veterinary
Marit Hansen, Production Manager - smolt
Werner Gerhardsen, Purchase Manager
Jacob Dahn, Site Manager

The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including 10821 Tuvan 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.

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
ASC Certification		25.07.17-11.08.17	Yes	Comments regarding L2 check. Clarification of info in some criteria, additional information required and correction of minor errors in report	Yes	All issuse were commented in our reply to ASC Certification, dated 11.08.17

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard Created by the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue					
Scope: species belonging to *the genus Salmo and Oncorhynchus*					
PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS			**10821 Tuvan**		
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations					
		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	**Audit evidence** 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanitory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	**Evaluation** (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	**Justification of classification of NC** Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
1.1.1	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws.	Electronic copies of laws, regulations and requirements with references to Lovdata with updates and electronic links in Intelex system. Goverened by internal procedures in QMS.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable.	Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 Finnmark County Authorities Permit ref 201502602-6 dt. 09.02.2016 Location id 10821, MTB 3 480. Discharge permit Finnmark Fylkesmannen dt 16.01.2012. Discharge permit for 3 480 MT.	Compliant	
		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).	NFSA inspection dt.24.11.2016. 1NC`s detected during inspections, Reply from Cermaq dated 05.12.16. NFSA have in letter dated 24.04.17 closed this NC based on reply from Cermaq.	Compliant	
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	Permit approval for location from Norwegian authorites. Fisheries directorate map "kart .fiskeridir.no" , map from "Naturbase"and map nasjonale laksefjorder shows now conflicts with national preservation areas and is within area designated for Aquaculture.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
1.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CABs will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public.	Authorised auditor report/statement for organisation number 961922976, dt 16.08.2016 Ernst &Young.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	Lovdata access to updated versions in QMS system	Compliant	
		c. Register with national or local authorities as an “aquaculture activity".	Brønnøysundregisteret registered for aquaculture activity organisation number 961922976. Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 Finnmark County Authorities Permit ref 201502602-6 dt. 09.02.2016 Location id 10821, MTB 3 480. Discharge permit Finnmark Fylkesmannen dt 16.01.2012. Discharge permit for 3 480 MT.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
1.1.3	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	Lovdata access to updated versions in QMS system	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).	Inspections at Cermaq Norway AS site Tuvan. See Criteria above	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
1.1.4		a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.	Brønnøysundregisteret registered for aquaculture activity organisation number 961922976. Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 Finnmark County Authorities Permit ref 201502602-6 dt. 09.02.2016 Location id 10821, MTB 3 480. Discharge permit Finnmark Fylkesmannen dt 16.01.2012. Discharge permit for 3 480 MT.	Compliant	

	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	Procedure for compliance ID 4.0.5. Compliance dated 06.06.16. As described in above permits. MOM-B sampling 15.03.16 according to Norwegian legislation and NS9410 dt.06.01.14 performed by Akvaplan Niva. Report nr. APN 8101.02. Site classification 2 - Good MOM-C sampling 24.02.2017, according to Norwegian legislation and NS9410 dt. 06.01.14 performed by Akvaplan Niva. Report nr. APN 8578.01. Discharge limited by biomass (MTB), monthly reports to Fisheries Directorate on feed and biomass status..	Compliant	
		c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	MTB reported to auhtorities/ Altinn end of month. Seen April 2017 report filed in Altinn.report sent 03.05.17. No indications of non compliance. Compliance and updates assured according to "Prosedyre for samsvarsvurdering" ID 405.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION					
Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]					
2.1.1	**Indicator:** Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification [3] to the CAB.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted) Modified MOM-C sampling 24.02.2017 according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Akvaplan Niva, Report nr. APN 8578.01.. Sampling 30.11.16 VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.	Compliant	
		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.	Mainly silt and clay, some rock	Compliant	
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	Option #1	Compliant	
		d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I-1 (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations).	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted) Modified MOM-C sampling 24.02.2017 according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Akvaplan Niva, Report nr. APN 8578.01.. Sampling 30.11.16 VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. **Sampling not done on maximum biomasse**	Minor	Sampling not done on maximum biomasse
		e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.	Redox stasjon sampling 2,3,5 (intermediate and remote zone), outside AZE. Redox Eh values ranging from 11 to 29mV.	Compliant	
		f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.		N/A	Redox potential. National regulations (NS 9410)
		g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. If site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		h. Others, please describe			
2.1.2		a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1).	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted) Modified MOM-C sampling 24.02.2017 according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Akvaplan Niva, Report nr. APN 8578.01.. Sampling 30.11.16 VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.	Compliant	
		b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement.	Opt #2 Shannon Wierner used.	Compliant	

	Indicator: Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25 **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).	Van Veen grab used according to site specific MOM-C (NS9410) **Sampling not done at maximum biomass**	Minor	Sampling not done at maximum biomass
		d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method.		N/A	Shannon-Wiener Index score used
		e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method.	Faunal sampling stasjons 2, 3, 5 (intermediate and remote zone), outside AZE. Faunal index score 2.69, 2.24, 3,90 **Faunal index score on Station 2 and 3 is below 3 (2,69 and 2,24 respectively)** Based on result from MOM B sampling this NC is classified as a Minor	Minor	Faunal index score on Station 2 and 3 is below 3 (2,69 and 2,24 respectively)
		f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.		N/A	Shannon-Wiener Index score used
		g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.		N/A	Shannon-Wiener Index score used
		h. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analyzed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results.	MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal). Independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.	Compliant	
		i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt.18.05.17	Compliant	
		j. Others, please describe			
2.1.3	**Indicator:** Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted) Modified MOM-C sampling 24.02.2017 according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Akvaplan Niva, Report nr. APN 8578.01.. Sampling 30.11.16 VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone.	Compliant	
		b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted) Modified MOM-C sampling 24.02.2017 according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Akvaplan Niva, Report nr. APN 8578.01.. Sampling 30.11.16 VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. **Sampling not done on maximum biomasse**	Minor	Sampling not done on maximum biomasse
		c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.	Sampling stasjon 1 and 4 within AZE. **Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species= 0 and 8 respectively** Based on result from MOM B sampling and the result from station 4, this NC is classified as a Minor	Minor	Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species= 1 on Station 1
		d. Retain documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained. If samples were analyzed by an independent lab, obtain copies of results.	MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal). Independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.	Compliant	
		e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt.18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
2.1.4	**Indicator:** Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modeling system **Requirement:** Yes, within three years of the publication [8] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015)	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.	Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted/NS9410. Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authortites and legislation requirement) survey developed and performed by Akvaplan Niva.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain records to show how the analysis (in 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modeling using a multi-parameter approach [7].	Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted/NS9410. Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authortites and legislation requirement) survey developed and performed by Akvaplan Niva.	Compliant	

	Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data.	Site-specific sampling regime (MOM-C hybrid - ASC adapted/NS9410. Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authortites and legislation requirement) survey developed and performed by Akvaplan Niva.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [12]					
2.2.1	**Indicator**: Weekly average percent saturation [13] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [14] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4 **Requirement:** ≥ 70% [15] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [15]	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.	Curves provided and approved in docs for whole prod. period. Autologged continuously with ITAS data . Data log from week 46-2016 up to week 20-2017	Compliant	
		b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.	No missed data	Compliant	
		c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.	All weeks are above 80% saturation	Compliant	
		d. If any weekly average DO values are < 70%, or approaching that level, monitor and record DO at a reference site and compare to on-farm levels (see Instructions).	All weeks are above 80% saturation	Compliant	
		e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.	Monitoring of oksygen and calibration routines verified on site. Good knowledge, instructions from equipment producer available. Autocalibration. Service done by ITAS Data	Compliant	
		f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
2.2.2	**Indicator**: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/liter DO **Requirement:** 5% **Applicability:** All	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/l DO.	All above limits.	Compliant	
		b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
2.2.3	**Indicator**: 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] **Requirement:** Yes [19] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [19]	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	EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for area Langfjorden. (ref. "vannportalen.no). Finnmark Fylkeskommune authority. Alta: Ecological conditions moderate -good Report from vannportalen.no dt. 29.05.17. http://vann.nett.no/water	Compliant	
		b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.	EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for area Langfjorden. (ref. "vannportalen.no). Finnmark Fylkeskommune authority. Alta: Ecological conditions moderate -good Report from vannportalen.no dt. 29.05.17. http://vann.nett.no/water	Compliant	
		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 Langfjorden. (ref. "vannportalen.no). Finnmark Fylkeskommune authority. Alta: Ecological conditions moderate -good Report from vannportalen.no dt. 29.05.17. http://vann.nett.no/water	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
2.2.4	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	See 2.2.3 Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for region/area
		b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.		N/A	See 2.2.3 Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for region/area
		c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.		N/A	See 2.2.3 Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives Water quality objectives for region/area
		d. Others, please describe			
2.2.5	**Indicator**: Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [21]) of the farm on a production cycle basis **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.	Data for production cylcle 16G: Biomass 2 279 MT Feed 2 426 MT BOD 620 MT O2 Data for last complete production cylcle 14G: Biomass 2 913 MT Feed 3 410 MT BOD 891 MT O2 Calculations from GAPI.	Compliant	
		b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt.18.05.17	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production					

2.3.1	**Indicator**: Percentage of fines [22] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [23] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) **Requirement:** < 1% by weight of the feed **Applicability:** 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.	Percentage of fines according to requirements. Registrations and calculations ranging from 0,0 to 0,096% in periode April and May 2017. Monthly testing according to internal QMS procedure "prosedyre fôrmottak og lagring" ID 260. Updated 06.03.16	Compliant	
		b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations.	Appropriate testing technology as per ASC	Compliant	
		c. Conduct test according to detailed methodology in Appendix I-2 and record results for the pooled sample for each quarter. For first audits, farms must have test results from the last 3 months.	Percentage of fines according to requirements. Registrations and calculations ranging from 0,0 to 0,096% in periode April and May 2017. Monthly testing according to internal QMS procedure "prosedyre fôrmottak og lagring" ID 260. Updated 06.03.16	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species					
2.4.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outlined in Appendix I-3 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	Impacts consequence assement performed according to Appendix I-3. "Biodiversity focused risk assessment for Langfjorden" dated 07.03.2017. Also "Environmental objects" dated 19.05.17 and Cermaq Group AS annual corporate level environmental and sustainability report 2015. It will be finished soon for 2016. Internal impacts consequence assement performed using data from reaserch institutes and reports also considered in local impact from site/company performed for 2017 (report referred above) Marginal impacts only. Ref also license permit and assessment as part of the regulatory permitting process. Site has Risk Assessment for environmental impact with developed actions for potential environmental and biodiversity risks from site. Also MOM-B and MOM-C according to requirements in national legislation.	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.	Impacts consequence assement performed according to Appendix I-3. "Biodiversity focused risk assessment for Langfjorden" dated 07.03.2017. Also "Environmental objects" dated 19.05.17 and Cermaq Group AS annual corporate level environmental and sustainability report 2015. It will be finished soon for 2016. Internal impacts consequence assement performed using data from reaserch institutes and reports also considered in local impact from site/company performed for 2017 (report referred above) Marginal impacts only. Ref also license permit and assessment as part of the regulatory permitting process. Site has Risk Assessment for environmental impact with developed actions for potential environmental and biodiversity risks from site. Also MOM-B and MOM-C according to requirements in national legislation.	Compliant	
		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.	Impacts consequence assement performed according to Appendix I-3. "Biodiversity focused risk assessment for Langfjorden" dated 07.03.2017. Also "Environmental objects" dated 19.05.17 and Cermaq Group AS annual corporate level environmental and sustainability report 2015. It will be finished soon for 2016. Internal impacts consequence assement performed using data from reaserch institutes and reports also considered in local impact from site/company performed for 2017 (report referred above) Marginal impacts only. Ref also license permit and assessment as part of the regulatory permitting process. Site has Risk Assessment for environmental impact with developed actions for potential environmental and biodiversity risks from site. Also MOM-B and MOM-C according to requirements in national legislation.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
2.4.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [24] or High Conservation Value Areas [25] (HCVAs)	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).	Fiskeridirektoratet.no map (Directorate of Fisheries) and DN Naturbase (Directorate for Environment) map with all known protected areas defined. - site is not in conflict with protected areas - HCVAs or CAs. Also considered in Impacts consequence assement performed according to Appendix I-3.	Compliant	
		b. If the farm is <u>not</u> sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Area as defined above, prepare a declaration attesting to this fact. In this case, the requirements of 2.4.2c-d do not apply.	Statement Cermaq Norway AS dt 28.04.17 on not operating in HCVAs. Cermaq Group AS annual corporate level environmental and sustainability report 2015 also refers to policy and approach for HCVA.	Compliant	

	Requirement: None [26] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [26]	c. If the farm is 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.		N/A	Not within HCVAs
		d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA and the exceptions provided for Indicator 2.4.2 do not apply, then the farm does not comply with the requirement and is ineligible for ASC certification.		N/A	Not within HCVAs
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]					
2.5.1	**Indicator**: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used **Requirement:** 0, within three years of the date of publication [28] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015) **Applicability:** All	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.	Written statement dated 13.03.2017 and signed by site manager seen during autidt	Compliant	
		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).		N/A	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used
				N/A	Verified not in use
		d. Others, please describe			
2.5.2	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** ≤ 40% **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2015	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.		N/A	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used. Ref statment 13.03.17 on deviced not used.
		b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle.		N/A	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used
		-		N/A	Verified not in use
		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).	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
2.5.3	**Indicator**: Number of mortalities [30] of endangered or red-listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.	Birdnets located above the net cages are only predator control devices used.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.	Records verified on site. There has been 9 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period.	Compliant	
		c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.	Records verified on site. There has been 7 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period. None of them are registered as red-listed, but there is some uncertainty with respect to identifying the species. The farm workers need more training in verifying species on all incidents. A document has now been sent out to all Cermaq sites informing about changes in rutines regarding bird identification (document attached). The document includes instructions to proper species identification and instructing sites to document birds with photos and consulting environmental coordinator in cases where they are uncertain	Compliant	
		d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1)	Red list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area from "Norsk Rødliste for arter-2015" - from Artsdatabanken".	Compliant	
		-	No mortalities; Red list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area registered on site.	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
2.5.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [32] against a predator:	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.	There has been 7 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period and 1 incident the last 6 months. None of these have been an action to deliberately kill an animal	Compliant	

	predator. 1. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action 2. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager 3. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority **Requirement:** Yes [33] **Applicability:** All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [33]	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.	There has been 7 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period and 1 incident the last 6 months. None of these have been an action to deliberately kill an animal	Compliant	
		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].	There has been 7 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period and 1 incident the last 6 months. None of these have been an action to deliberately kill an animal	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
2.5.5	**Indicator**: Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	List of 30.05.17 for cycle show 1 incident. Results published in corporate website www.cermaq.com: ASC-reports	Compliant	
		b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).	List of 30.05.17 for cycle show 1 incident. Results published in corporate website www.cermaq.com: ASC-reports	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
2.5.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior two years **Requirement:** < 9 lethal incidents [36], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals **Applicability:** 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.	There has been 7 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period and 1 incident the last 6 months. None of these have been an action to deliberately kill an animal	Compliant	
		b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.	There has been 7 incidents with seagulls registered dead in bird nets over the last 12-month period and 1 incident the last 6 months. None of these have been an action to deliberately kill an animal. No marine mammals are registered dead	Compliant	
		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 in email dt. 31.05.17	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
2.5.7	**Indicator**: In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that an assessment of the risk of lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	There is an updated risk assessment. Last update was 04.04.17	Compliant	
		b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.7a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents.	They have started to replace all bird nets to new nets which are proven to be more suitable as birdnets. This has resulted in a reduction in incidents	Compliant	
		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]					
3.1.1	**Indicator**: Participation in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme for managing disease and resistance to treatments that includes coordination of stocking, fallowing, therapeutic treatments and information-sharing. Detailed requirements are in Appendix II-1. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in	a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme.	Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 ABM a requirement in national legislation. Records and overview over ABM and ref to "Samordnet plan for kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus 2016-2017" dt. 25.11.16 in Finnmark county as defined by NFSA and companys in ABM. Weekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. Also regular meetings between participants where ABM issues are discussed 100% of farms included. Routines and procedures for notification included in ABM related to treatments and diseases according to legislation from NFSA. The fjord will fallow for more than 2 months in 2018	Compliant	
		b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including: - coordination of stocking; - fallowing; - therapeutic treatments; and - information sharing.	Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 ABM a requirement in national legislation. Records and overview over ABM and ref to "Samordnet plan for kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus 2016-2017" dt. 25.11.16 in Finnmark county as defined by NFSA and companys in ABM. Weekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. Also regular meetings between participants where ABM issues are discussed 100% of farms included. Routines and procedures for notification included in ABM related to treatments and diseases according to legislation from NFSA. The fjord will fallow for more than 2 months in 2018	Compliant	

	that release no water as noted in [38]	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.	Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 ABM a requirement in national legislation. Records and overview over ABM and ref to "Samordnet plan for kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus 2016-2017" dt. 25.11.16 in Finnmark county as defined by NFSA and companys in ABM. Weekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. Also regular meetings between participants where ABM issues are discussed 100% of farms included. Routines and procedures for notification included in ABM related to treatments and diseases according to legislation from NFSA. The fjord will fallow for more than 2 months in 2018	Compliant	
		d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
3.1.2	**Indicator**: A demonstrated commitment [40] to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	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.	Commitment documented thrue Cermaq ASs participations in several projects with NGOs, academics and governments: 1. Varpa project - Ruseprosjektet 2016, with Norwegian Authorites. 2. A semiclosed seacage research project, with NOFIMA and UIN. 3. Cooperation with HI, SINTEF, modelling of sea lice and infection pattern (Ctrl Aqua). 4. Sinmod. 5. GSI member. 6. ClimeFish project - modelling of climate changes etc. In cooperation with Univ. of Tromsø. EU- financed project 7. Marine surveillance, Coop. with Blue Planet, AlkvaplanNiva. Financed by fish farmers in Nordland county 8. Competance cluster within fish farming and wild salmon management, Municipality of Alta /Western Finnmark)	Compliant	
		b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either: - providing researchers with access to farm-level data; - granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way.	For all projects described in 3.1.2.a company has provided non-financial support for research activities. In some of them financial support is also given.	Compliant	
		c. When the farm and/or its operating company denies a request to collaborate on a research project, ensure that there is a written justification for rejecting the proposal.	Evaluated by technical team. Denied projects not known by staff in audit.	Compliant	
		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.	Documents available in email communication and electronic project folders. Budgets for one of the projects seen during audit: 8. Competance cluster within fish farming and wild salmon management, Municipality of Alta /Western Finnmark)	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
3.1.3	**Indicator**: Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II-2 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Keep records to show that a maximum sea lice load has been set for: - the entire ABM; and - the individual farm.	Approved operating plan for 2017-2018 from Fisheries Directorate dt.17.01.17 ABM a requirement in national legislation. Records and overview over ABM and ref to "Samordnet plan for kontroll og bekjempelse av lakselus 2016-2017" dt. 25.11.16 in Finnmark county as defined by NFSA and companys in ABM. Weekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. Also regular meetings between participants where ABM issues are discussed 100% of farms included. Routines and procedures for notification included in ABM related to treatments and diseases according to legislation from NFSA. The fjord will fallow for more than 2 months in 2018	Compliant	
		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).	Weekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. All information is available for the public on barentswatch.no. Also regular meetings between participants where ABM issues are discussed 100% of farms included. Monitoring of wild salmon is not allowed	Compliant	

		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.	Routines and procedures for notification included in ABM related to treatments and diseases according to legislation from NFSA. The fjord will fallow dor more than 2 months spring 2018. A new lice regulationwas in effect from May 2017	Compliant	
		d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17. Figures asre also available on internet: cermaq.no	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
3.1.4	**Indicator**: Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	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).	"Luseforskriften" dt. 13.03.17, defined treatments period before week 21-26 for area before sensitive periods. Sensitive periods in area for wild salmon migtration considered and defined to week 21 - 26 in "Procedure for coordinated control and reduction of sea lice" (Updated 04.04.17) and Procedure for counting of sea lice, updated 03.03.17	Compliant	
		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.	Sea lice load testing reported to AltInn/NFSA weekly. No deviations registered, min. 20 fish per cage per week. (exemption for periods with temperatues below 04 degrees C - testing 20 fish in 100% of cages, period 2 weeks).	Compliant	
		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.	Sea lice load testing reported to AltInn/NFSA weekly. No deviations registered, min. 20 fish per cage per week. (exemption for periods with temperatues below 04 degrees C - testing 20 fish in 100% of cages, period 2 weeks). Procedure for counting of lice in QMS . See also 3.1.4.a and b	Compliant	
		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.	To Altinn and directly to "Lusenettverket". NFSA publishes in public reports when data is processed. System implemented to make information easily publicly available Available also on barentswatch.no Results published in corporte web-site https://www.cermaq.com/wps/wcm/connect/cermaq/cermaq/our-sustainable-choice/asc-dashboard/ Testing results from week 21-2017 published on website.	Compliant	
		e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.	To Altinn and directly to "Lusenettverket". NFSA publishes in public reports when data is processed. System implemented to make information easily publicly available Available also on barentswatch.no Results published in corporte web-site https://www.cermaq.com/wps/wcm/connect/cermaq/cermaq/our-sustainable-choice/asc-dashboard/ Testing results from week 21-2017 published on website.	Compliant	
		f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
3.1.5	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	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.	*S. salar* and *S. trutta* and *Salvelinsus alpinus* naturally occurring in area. There are several small rivers and one major river with migrating salmonids in the area	Compliant	
		b. For species listed in 3.1.5a, compile best available information on migration routes, migration timing (range of months for juvenile outmigration and returning salmon), life history timing for coastal resident salmonids, and stock productivity over time in major waterways within 50 km of the farm.	Migratory routes as defined in web site "environmental statistics"(miljøstatatus.no) on salmonid carrying rivers, and Lakseregisteret from Miljødirektoratt. Also map from DN with rivers identified. According to lakseregsiteret.no the situation for salmonid species is defined as yellow (moderate or reduced) to green (good or attention needed) In general the situation is better for salmon, than for trout and arctic char	Compliant	
		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.	Intensified sealice monitoring period . Sensitive periods in area for wild salmon migtration considered and defined to week 21-26	Compliant	
		-	Sufficient awarness and also participation in related scientific projects by Cermaq staff	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
3.1.6		a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.	*S. salar* and *S. trutta* and *Salvelinsus alpinus* naturally occurring in area	Compliant	

	Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Artic char, with results made publicly available. See requirements in Appendix III-1. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.	Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law. Governmental monitoring and reporting	Compliant	
		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.	Havforskingsinstituttet report 2016 Risk Assessment for Norway, fish farming report 2b-2016, where sealice issues are covered. IMR report on wild stock sealice situation "lakselusinfeksjon på vill laksefisk lanngs norskekysten i 2016. and IMR/Vet Institute and NINA (Norw. Institure for Wildlife Research) report on measuring environmental effects on wild salmon,	Compliant	
		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 published and generally available. Govermental reports publicly available	Compliant	
		e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI.	Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law. Public reports regarding this issue is easily publicly available.	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
3.1.7	**Indicator**: 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. **Requirement:** 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish **Applicability:** All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.	*S. salar and S. truttaand Salvelinsus alpinus* naturally occurring in area.	Compliant	
		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.	Migratory routes as defined in web site "environmental statistics" (miljøstatatus.no) on salmonid carrying rivers, and Lakseregisteret from Miljødirektoratet. Also map from DN with rivers identified. According to lakseregsiteret.no the situation for salmonid species is defined as yellow (moderate or reduced) to green (good or attention needed) In general the situation is better for salmon, than for trout and arctic char. Sensitive periods is week 21-26	Compliant	
		c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2.	Records of weekly testing for sealice in Sensitive periods for migration defined from week 21-26 for area. Figures 2017 shows results of 0,0-0,1 mature females per salmon. For all stadiums the result is approx. 0.02 lice. Last counting was week no. 21. Treatment was therefore not an object. Result is compliant to ASC requirement of <0,1 mature females per salmon.	Compliant	
		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).		N/A	Continous wild fish sealice monitoring not possible, as describe above in conclict with national legislation. Monitoring done by govermental research instituttes. Direct feedback loop hence impossible to obtain.
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species					
3.2.1	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially produced in the area by the date of publication of the SAD standard **Requirement:** Yes [47] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [47]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		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).		N/A	*S. 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.		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		d. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b or 3.2.1c, provide documented evidence that the production system is closed to the natural environment and for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce [47]; and 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).		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		-		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		f. Others, please describe			

3.2.2	**Indicator**: 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] **Requirement:** Yes, within five years of publication of the SAD standard [50,51] **Applicability:** All	a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI).	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		c. If yes to 3.2.2b, provide evidence of scientific research completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction. Alternatively, the farm may request an exemption to 3.2.2c (see below).		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		d. If applicable, submit to the CAB a request for exemption that shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified in instruction box above.		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.		N/A	*S. salar* native to region
		f. Others, please describe			
3.2.3	**Indicator**: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.	They use lump fish as cleaning fish on all sites in Langfjorden. All lump fish are farmed at Mørkvedbukta AS, Bodø	Compliant	
		b. Maintain records (e.g. invoices) to show the species name and origin of all fish used by the farm for purposes of sea lice control.	Document , signed by transporter and farm. Delivery og lump fish from company Mørkvedbukta AS, confirming delivery to Tuvan seen on site.	Compliant	
		c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.	Lumpfish is native to the area	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species					
3.3.1	**Indicator**: Use of transgenic [53] salmon by the farm **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.	Statement dt. 23.03.2017, from genetics provider AquaGen breeding stock, stating that only conventional breeding and genetics are applied. Declaration dated 06.04.2017, signed by AQ manager, stating that there is no use of trancgenic salmon	Compliant	
		b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	Statement dt. 23.03.2017, from genetics provider AquaGen breeding stock, stating that only conventional breeding and genetics are applied. Records on paper and in FishTalk Declaration dated 06.04.2017, signed by AQ manager, stating that there is no use of trancgenic salmon	Compliant	
		c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.	Statement dt. 23.03.2017, from genetics provider AquaGen breeding stock, stating that only conventional breeding and genetics are applied. Declaration dated 06.04.2017, signed by AQ manager, stating that there is no use of trancgenic salmon	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]					
3.4.1	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [56] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 [57] **Applicability:** 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 for the last prodcution cycles. Documented in production and recording system Fishtalk with reports. Environmental company/site reports for 2015 states 0 escapes. Cross-checked and verified with the estimate of unexplained loss, maintenance records for nets, site infrastucture certificate according to NYTEK/NS9415. (Certificate APN-003 by Akvaplan Niva expiry date 18.12.17).	Compliant	
		b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle.	No escapes registered for the last three prodcution cycles. Documented in production and recording system FishTalk with reports. Environmental company/site reports for 2015 states 0 escapes.	Compliant	
		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]).	Documented in production and recording system FishTalk with reports. Environmental company/site reports for 2015 states 0 escapes. Documents are and will be available for at least 10 years.	Compliant	
		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.	Fisheries directorate reports to d.d. (www. Fishdir.no) shows no escapes from site.	Compliant	

		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 in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
3.4.2	**Indicator**: Accuracy [58] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers **Requirement:** ≥ 98% **Applicability:** 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, Counters Aquascan and WingTech are used. Final check at stocking with well boat. Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered. Statement from Aquascan and WingTech of 98-100% accuracy.	Compliant	
		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. This gives the most accurate number	Compliant	
		c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).	Live fish carrier procedure/manual on scanner calibration page 15 available . Equipment used (Aquascan CSF 4000) according to requirements when stocking and any grading spiltting/counting operations are performed by wellboat on site. Continous checking during operations. Equipment used according to requirements from producer when stocking and any grading spiltting/counting operations are performed by wellboat on site. Manuals and instructions for equipment at wellboat and FW site. Fish numers during vaccination, harvesting/packing are used to establish greater accuracy with respect to calculating possible unexplained loss during production	Compliant	
		-	Statement from AquaScan of 98-100% accuracy. Statement dated 21.04.16 from AquaScan. Requires accuracy also confirmed from WingTech	Compliant	
		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 in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
3.4.3	**Indicator**: Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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 Fishtalk	Compliant	
		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.	2014G: 3,0% This is more than limit set by ASC. Most of the mortality was early during production when fish were small. Loss may therefor be difficult to calculate. No NC since this is first audit Accumulated mortality for present generation (16G) is 11,29%	Compliant	
		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.	System implemented to make EUL value information easily publicaly available on corporate webpage www.cermaq.com	Compliant	
		d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		-			
		f. Others, please describe			
3.4.4		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.	Contingeny plan for escape documented in QMS. Dated 01.12.2016. Site spesific and central Risk assessments. Assessment included escape prevention section. Nets idividually tagged. Nets registered in "Infor EAM." Demonstrated with stretch tests and certificates available for nets used at site. External training courses in escape prevention for all site staff in March 2017. Escape prevention plan with details of actions and steps to be taken to alert if incident occurs posted on site. Good awarness at interview.	Compliant	

	Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and reporting of risk events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors, reporting and follow up of escape events); and worker training on escape prevention and counting technologies **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - net strength testing; - appropriate net mesh size; - net traceability; - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies.	The Escape Prevention Plan and accompanying documents covers the following areas: - net strength testing; - appropriate net mesh size; - net traceability; - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. Diving inspection after all net operations. Nets registered in "Infor EAM" with certificates and services available for nets used at site. Norwegian standard NS9415. (Certificate APN-003 by Akvaplan Niva expiry date 18.12.17).	Compliant	
		c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies.		N/A	Open system
		d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.	Procedures established and implemented. Records in site logs on routine checks and training activities in competency matrix. Production parameters recorded in Fishtalk. "Infor EAM" for records and documentation of nets, e.g net certified in seacage no.4 -smolt net SY-1144, EcoNet produced by AkvaGroup AS in July 2015 Certified 18.06.12. Nets put into sea in 2015. Expected life span is 14 years. Strecht testing every 4th year Site structure and construction components certified according to NS9415. All structures NYTEK certified Norwegian standard NS9415. (Certificate APN-003 by Akvaplan Niva expiry date 18.12.17).	Compliant	
		e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.	Escape prevention training internal/external for sitemanagers and ohter members of site staff. Annual revision of escape prevention plan, Risk Assesments and contingency plans. Escape prevention training and excersise 14.-16.03.17 for all workers. Training every third year	Compliant	
		-	Implementation confirmed e.g net strenght and net certificate for nets documented in "Infor Log" and internal net register. Awareness verified on site visit/interviews	Compliant	
		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	**Indicator**: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [62]. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records.	Feed suppliers: EWOS (www.ewos.com) Records of purchase: 1 875 320 kg used, recorded in Fish Talk for 16G	Compliant	
		b. Inform each feed supplier in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to production of salmon feeds and send them a copy of the ASC Salmon Standard.	Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to EWOS dt.18.06.15	Compliant	
		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.	Audited by DNV GL GG CFM dt 26. 06.16, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.1 Dec13. Certifcate GGN CoC 4050373825744 , valid to 24.06.17	Compliant	
		d. For each feed producer, determine whether the farm will use method #1 or method #2 (see Instructions above) to show compliance of feed producers. Inform the CAB in writing.	Method #2 Massbalance	Compliant	
		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].	Statement from Cargill/EWOS on complete traceability and compliance with the ASC standard 03.03.2017.	Compliant	
		-	Statement and certificate for feed supplier verified.	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]					

4.2.1	**Indicator**: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1) **Requirement:** < 1.35 **Applicability:** All	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.	Feed suppliers: EWOS (www.ewos.com) Records of purchase: 1 875 320 kg used, recorded in Fish Talk for 16G. Statement from EWOS on complete traceability and raw material (marine and others) sources dt. 03.03.17. And detailed raw material (marine and others) sources and fraction in diets on site level. Fish meal source is Blue whiting (45,5%), Herring trimmings (21,2%), Sprat (6,4%), White fish trimmings (12,9%)	Compliant	
		b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.	Feed suppliers: EWOS (www.ewos.com) Records of purchase: 1 875 320 kg used, recorded in Fish Talk for 16G. Statement from EWOS on complete traceability and raw material (marine and others) sources dt. 03.03.17. And detailed raw material (marine and others) sources and fraction in diets on site level. fraction in diets on site level. Trimmings accounted for and excluded from calculation. Trimmings fraction in Meal= 37,5% in 2016 and 44,4% in 2015. In oil: 22.2% in 2015 and 28% in 2016 of marine Raw materials	Compliant	
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).	Feed suppliers: EWOS (www.ewos.com) Calculated according to ASC. Records of purchase: 1 875 320 kg used, recorded in Fish Talk for 16G. eFCR accumulated for period is 1,15. eFCR for previous complete production cyclus 14 G: 1,21	Compliant	
		d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.	Accumulated FFDRm 16G: 0.53 FFDRm 14G complete cyclus: 0.31	Compliant	
		e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
4.2.2	**Indicator**: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1), OR Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [64] (calculated according to Appendix IV-2) **Requirement:** FFDRo < 2.95 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.	Feed suppliers: EWOS (www.ewos.com) Records of purchase: 1 875 320 kg used, recorded in Fish Talk for 16G. Statement from EWOS on complete traceability and raw material (marine and others) sources dt. 03.03.17. And detailed raw material (marine and others) sources and fraction in diets on site level.	Compliant	
		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.	Feed suppliers: EWOS (www.ewos.com) Records of purchase: 1 875 320 kg used, recorded in Fish Talk for 16G. Statement from EWOS on complete traceability and raw material (marine and others) sources dt. 03.03.17. And detailed raw material (marine and others) sources and fraction in diets on site level. fraction in diets on site level. Trimmings accounted for and excluded from calculation. Trimmings fraction in Meal= 37,5% in 2016 and 44,4% in 2015. In oil: 22.2% in 2015 and 28% in 2016 of marine Raw materials	Compliant	
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	Option 1	Compliant	
		d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.	Calculated according to ASC Accumulated FFDRo 16G: 1,49 FFDRo 14G complete cyclus: 1,68	Compliant	
		e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2.		N/A	Option 1 is used
		f. Submit FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials					

4.3.1	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** < 5 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All	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.	Code of conduct feed suppliers 2017 from Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy, dated 18.01.17 (ISEAL scheme fisheries). On sustainability policy, requiring feed raw material from sutainable sourcing,	Compliant	
		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	Code of conduct feed suppliers 2017 from Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy, dated 18.01.17 (ISEAL scheme fisheries). On sustainability policy, requiring feed raw material from sutainable sourcing,	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	June 2017- but Origin of fish meal and oil origin on feedbatches used, per site, presented.
		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.		N/A	June 2017 Origin of fish meal and oil origin on feedbatches used, per site, presented.
		e. Others, please describe			
4.3.2	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score [68] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived **Requirement:** All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 8 **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2017	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).	Fish source score verifed and found above limits. All individual scores >6, BM scores > 8 according to Fish source score. In EWOS statement " ASC feed declaration and information " dt. 03.03.17 Trimmings accounted for and excluded from calculation. Trimmings fraction in Meal= 37,5% in 2016 and 44,4% in 2015 In oil: 22.2% in 2015 and 28% in 2016 of marine Raw materials Fish meal source is Blue whiting (45,5%), Herring trimmings (21,2%), Sprat (6,4%), White fish trimmings (12,9%) Fish oil source is Menhaden (16,5%), Herring trimmings (15,8%), Peruvian anchoveta (13,9%), Sprat (13,2% and 6,4%), Pilchard (7,0%), Mackrel trimmings (6,8%), Capelin (6,0%) and Blue whiting (5,5%)	Compliant	
		b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 8.	EWOS statement " ASC feed declaration and information " dt. 03.03.17 with details of raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASC s requirement for this indicator. Correspondence verified. Individual score >6 and Biomass score >8.	Compliant	
		c. If the species is not on the website it means that a FishSource assessment is not available. Client can then take one or both of the following actions: 1. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as a priority for assessment. 2. Contract a qualified independent third party to conduct the assessment using the FishSource methodology and provide the assessment and details on the third party qualifications to the CAB for review.		N/A	No independent assessment
		-		N/A	All have scores
		e. Others, please describe			
4.3.3	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2017	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.	Audited by DNV GL GG CFM dt 26. 06.16, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.1 Dec13. Certifcate GGN CoC 4050373825744 , valid to 24.06.17 EWOS statement with details of raw material sources in specific feeds. (2017 audits in weeks no. 16, 17, 18) EWOS statement with details of raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASC s requirement for this indicator.	Compliant	
		b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).	Audited by DNV GL GG CFM dt 26. 06.16, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.1 Dec13. Certifcate GGN CoC 4050373825744 , valid to 24.06.17 EWOS statement with details of raw material sources in specific feeds. (2017 audits in weeks no. 16, 17, 18) EWOS statement with details of raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASC s requirement for this indicator.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			

4.3.4	**Indicator**: 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] **Requirement:** None [72] **Applicability:** All except as noted in [72]	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.	Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with referance to CF supplier`s feed serial number and percentege of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. EWOS statement dated 03.03.17, with details of fisheries and raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASC s requirement for this indicator. See also information in 4.2.1.a/4.3.2.a	Compliant	
		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.	EWOS statement " ASC feed declaration and information " dt. 03.03.17	Compliant	
		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).	EWOS statement " ASC feed declaration and information " dt. 03.03.17 with details of fisheries and raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASC s requirement to this indicator. Not from vulnerable fisheries	Compliant	
		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].	Not from vulnerable fisheries	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed					
4.4.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums [75] and local laws [76] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a)	Regular commercial contact info and websites for EWOS.	Compliant	
		b. Obtain from each feed manufacturer a copy of the manufacturer's responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients showing how the company complies with recognized crop moratoriums and local laws.	Cargill/EWOS statement " Documentations and information on feed delivered in accordance with ASC " dt. 03.03.17 on responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients.	Compliant	
		c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.	Audited by DNV GL GG CFM dt 26. 06.16, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.1 Dec13. Certifcate GGN CoC 4050373825744 , valid to 24.06.17 EWOS statement with details of raw material sources in specific feeds.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
4.4.2	**Indicator**: Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77] **Requirement:** 100%, within five years of the publication [78] of the SAD standards **Applicability:** All, after June 13, 2017	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.	Annual Cermaq Group report 2015 on sustainability policy, requiring feed raw material from sutainable sourcing, (ISEAL scheme fisheries). Code of conduct feed suppliers for Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy. dated 18.01.17	Compliant	
		b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent)	Annual Cermaq Group report 2015 on sustainability policy, requiring feed raw material from sutainable sourcing, (ISEAL scheme fisheries). Code of conduct feed suppliers for Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy. dated 18.01.17	Compliant	
		c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b).	Feed suppliers informed of relevant ASC requirements in mail to EWOS first time dt.18.06.15. Also Code of Coduct Feed Suppliers Dated 18.01.17 also sent to EWOS	Compliant	
		d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed.	EWOS: Statement "Traceability, responsible sourcing and origin of soy in EWOS CFM" (being from Pro-Terra and RTRS) dt. 03.03.17.	Compliant	
		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]	NA before June 13, 2017. The statment from EWOS dated 03.03.17 states that all soy bought is certified by RTRS	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
4.4.3	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [81] **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of soya and other plant raw materials in feed and whether it is transgenic.	Cargill/EWOS statement " Documentations and information on feed delivered in accordance with ASC " dt. 03.03.17 on responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients. No transgenic materials used	Compliant	
		b. Disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure. For first audits, farm records of disclosures must cover > 6 months.	Code of conduct feed suppliers for Cermaq Group with statement of intent and policy of GMO non acceptance in the feed. Latest dated 18.01.17 Statement of non GMO use and fish CV is provided from sales department/QA department to customers e.g example verified of information provided to french customer, dated June 2016, August 2016 and 24.04.17	Compliant	
		c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production					

4.5.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [83] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a policy stating the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the farm's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation.	Environmental policy for Cermaq Norway AS wtih referance to other relevant internal docs and reports. Policy and vision and defined in Annual Sustainability report from Cermaq Group report on corporate level, considering stakeholders , variuos environmental specters . All nonbiological waste handled by Wefas AS, except for nets which are returned to producer Mørenot AS.. Waste handling plan for site and "Procedure for waste handling". Procedure 163, dated 22.09.16., Procedure for handling of hazardous waste, ID 291dated 06.03.16	Compliant	
		b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean.	All nonbiological waste handled by Wefas AS, except for nets which are returned to producer Mørenot AS. Waste handling plan for site and "Procedure for waste handling". They have a declaration dated 06.04.17 stating that Cermaq Norway AS does not dump any non-biological waste to the sea. Waste handling plan states how all non-biological waste shall be handled. Nothing is dumped into the ocean	Compliant	
		c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.	Residual/domestic waste delivered to Wefas AS. Mørenot AS retrieve decommisioned nets and ropes. Feeding tubes, old cages are retrieved by Finnmark Ressursselskap (Finnmark Recource Company). Handling as residual waste for recycling. Waste handling plan for site and "procedure for waste handling" defines sort of waste and contractor for handling and disposal.	Compliant	
		d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.	Documented retrical of oil polluted material (filters etc.), light bulbs, spill oil. Invoice dated 08.08.16 from Finnmark Gjenvinning. Invoice from Wefas dated 31.08.16, Household waste from Ytre Koven Invoice from Wefas dated 31.12.16, Household waste from landbase	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
4.5.2	**Indicator**: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. (see also 4.5.1c)	Residual/domestic waste delivered to Wefas AS. Mørenot AS retrieve decommisioned nets and ropes. Feeding tubes, old cages are retrieved by Finnmark Ressursselskap (Finnmark Recource Company). Handling as residual waste for recycling. Waste handling plan for site and "procedure for waste handling" defines sort of waste and contractor for handling and disposal.	Compliant	
		b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)	Residual/domestic waste delivered to Wefas AS. Mørenot AS retrieve decommisioned nets and ropes. Feeding tubes, old cages are retrieved by Finnmark Ressursselskap (Finnmark Recource Company). Handling as residual waste for recycling. Waste handling plan for site and "procedure for waste handling" defines sort of waste and contractor for handling and disposal.	Compliant	
		c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken..	No infractions identified.	Compliant	
		d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.	Documented retrical of oil polluted material (filters etc.), light bulbs, spill oil. Invoice dated 08.08.16 from Finnmark Gjenvinning. Invoice from Wefas dated 31.08.16, Household waste from Ytre Koven Invoice from Wefas dated 31.12.16, Household waste from landbase They have records showing the amount of waste disposed from each site every year. This is updated every summer. Re. also procedures referred above: 163 and 291	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]					
4.6.1	**Indicator**: Presence of an energy use assessment verifying the energy consumption on the farm and representing the whole life cycle at sea, as outlined in Appendix V- 1	a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.	Records and calcultion OK	Compliant	
		b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last production cycle.	14G: 1 816 868 975 kJ 16G: 3 022 141 176 kJ so far in 16G	Compliant	
		c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle.	2 913 MT biomass produced during last complete production cyclus 14G.	Compliant	

	Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle **Applicability:** All	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.	14G: 623 711 KJ/Mt	Compliant	
		e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.	Assessed against company objectives. Scope 1 Diesel, and Scope 2 purchased el used.	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
4.6.2	**Indicator**: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [85]) emissions [86] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm.	Farm records of GHG assessment.	Compliant	
		b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	Farm records of GHG are done continuesly for a month period. Record for 2016: Scope 1: 32 887 kg CO2e , Scope 2: 3 401 kg CO2e = Total Scope 1+2 = 36 288 kg CO2e	Compliant	
		c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors.	Farm records of GHG assessment. Scope 1 diesel from diesel/gasoline workboat, truck, generator and scope 2 is purchased electricity and service boat diesel consumption.	Compliant	
		d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO_2 gases to CO_2 equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	All calculated to CO_2e	Compliant	
		e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.	Calculaitons and asessment provided by CO2 focus. Data from IEA 2013, SSB 2013, EIA 2011, IPCC 2006.	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
4.6.3	**Indicator**: Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [87] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2 **Requirement:** Yes, within three years of the publication [88] of the SAD standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015) **Applicability:** All, after June 13, 2015	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed).	EWOS Factor is. 1 563 kg/tonn for 14G from sustainability evaluation of fish feed production in EWOS. Attachment to Statement from EWOS dt. 03.03.17 on complete traceability and raw material (marine and others) sources .	Compliant	
		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.	Feed usage 14 G cycle, 3 411 mt. EWOS Factor is 1 563 kg/tonn for 14G 5 330 000 kg CO2E	Compliant	
		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.	EWOS Factor is 1 563 kg/tonn for 14G 5 330 000 kg CO2E	Compliant	
		d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [89,90]					
4.7.1	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper-treated nets [91], evidence that nets are not cleaned [92] or treated in situ in the marine environment	a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping.	There are procedures for claning and treatment of nets on site: ID 315, dated 19.06.16. Requested info found in procedure. In addition there are procedures for claning and treatment of Econet nets on site: ID 470, dated 19.06.16.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets.	They use Econet on this site. These nets are not treated with anti foulant	Compliant	
		c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets.	They use Econet on this site. These nets are not treated with anti foulant	Compliant	

	Requirement: Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	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.		N/A	Anti fouling is not used on this site
		e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
4.7.2	**Indicator**: For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment [93] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land.	Procedure for control, and cleaning of nets (ID315). Nets are not washed in sea. Washed by Mørenot, Hammerfest. No discharge of Cu-waste to sea. Samples of CU in wash water are taken every month. Low concentrations dissolved in wash water	Compliant	
		b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place.		N/A	Anti fouling is not used on this site
		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.		N/A	Anti fouling is not used on this site
		d. Others, please describe			
4.7.3	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	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.	They use Econet on this site. These nets are not treated with anti foulant	Compliant	
		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.	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)	Compliant	
		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.	Re. Criteria 2.1, MOM C sampling	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
4.7.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that copper levels [94] are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight OR in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89] and excluding those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3	a. Inform the CAB whether: 1) farm is exempt from Indicator 4.7.4 (as per 4.7.3a), or 2) Farm has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment.	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)	Compliant	
		b. Provide evidence from measurements taken in 4.7.3b that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight.		N/A	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)
		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).		N/A	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)
		d. Analyze results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body.		N/A	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)
		e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC 18.05.17	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
4.7.5	**Indicator**: Evidence that the type of biocides used in net antifouling are approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Identify all biocides used by the farm in net antifouling.	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)	Compliant	
		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.	Econets are used on this site. No antifoulants is used on these types of net. The MOM C sampling show that CU-levels varies between 16.2 and 33.8 on all samling sites (outside AZE)	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER					
Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [95]					

5.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	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.	Site specific Fish Health Plan for Martnesvika in QMS with links to relevant procedures. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. Internal veterinary services, responsible veterinarian, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt. 30.08.16 by Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [96].	Approved and signed by veterinarian dt. 30.08.16 by Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		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 6 Vet visits annually. System for weekly scheduled meetings covering e.g fish health issues. Visits verified in veterinary log 03.05.16 to 09.03.17, for site, ie. 10 visits with documented reports so far. Some mortality on lump fish and partly also on salmon	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].	Fish health manager and Fish healt biologist Karl Fredrik Ottem, Veterinarian Elisabeth Ann Myklebust, Fish health Biologist Tirill H. Slettjord (Nordland county), Fish Health Biologist Endre Karlsen	Compliant	
		c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.	Documentation (authorization) from Norw. authorities seen during audit for fish health manager and Fish healt biologist Karl Fredrik Ottem , Veterinarian Elisabeth Ann Myklebust, Fish health Biologist Tirill H. Slettjord, Fish Health Biologist Endre Karlsen	Compliant	
		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 registrations in Fishtalk reports for daily removal of mortalities. They have a Guide for dead fish removal dated 05.01.16 by K.F. Ottem. All mortalitys to silage. Scanbio AS on silage collection. Contract signed dt 28.10.16. "Procedure for handling of dead fish, moribund fish and silage" in QMS system (ID 289, dated 08.02.17).	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.	Compliant	
		c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.	No exceptional mortalities.	Compliant	
		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).	100 % off Mortality categorised for 14G and 16G, documented in Fishtalk: 16G present cycle accumulated; Total mortality 11,29 % d.d . Virus 2,31% + Unspecified 0 % = Virus + Unspecified = 2,31 %. 14G complete production cyclus:, Total mortality 18,87 %. (Virus+Unspecified 6,37%) .	Compliant	
		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 mortalitys are diagnoesed and post-mortem analyses are done on a statistically relevant number of fish (ref unspecifed numbers above). Lab analyses routinely. Re. Procedure for handling of mortalities (ID 289, V16)	Compliant	
		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).	Mortality samples sendt to Veterinary Institutt, Labora, Pharmaq Analytic or Patogen Analyse for analyze. Mortality samples sendt to CICC Cermaq for analyze if required.	Compliant	
		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 Fishtalk, all mortalitys are categorised.	Compliant	
		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 Fishtalk production system where mortalitys are recorded and categorised. Data for 14G, and 16G seen on site	Compliant	
		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 in email dt.05.04.17	Compliant	

		g. Others, please describe			
5.1.5	**Indicator**: Maximum viral disease-related mortality [100] on farm during the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 10% **Applicability:** All	a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease.	100 % off Mortality categorised for 14G and 16G, documented in Fishtalk: 16G present cycle accumulated; Total mortality 11,29 % d.d . Virus 2,31% + Unspecified 0 % = Virus + Unspecified = 2,31 %. 14G complete production cyclus:, Total mortality 18,87 %. (Virus+Unspecified 6,37%) .	Compliant	
		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.	100 % off Mortality categorised for 14G and 16G, documented in Fishtalk: 16G present cycle accumulated; Total mortality 11,29 % d.d . Virus 2,31% + Unspecified 0 % = Virus + Unspecified = 2,31 %. 14G complete production cyclus:, Total mortality 18,87 %. (Virus+Unspecified 6,37%) .	Compliant	
		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).	Submitted to ASC in email dt.18.05.17	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.1.6	**Indicator**: Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6% **Requirement:** ≤ 40% of total mortalities **Applicability:** 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.	Below 6%,	Compliant	
		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.	Below 6%,	Compliant	
		c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.1.7	**Indicator**: A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.	Mortality rate reduction programme (Corporate level for Finnmark on <10% morts pr.generation). Mortality reduction programs also part of managment review for Cermaq Norway and Cermaq Group. Specified in FHP, on site level with concrete objectives for actions to reduce to less than 10 % 12 months rolling.	Compliant	
		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.	Mortality rate reduction programme (Corporate level for Finnmark on <10% morts pr.generation). Mortality reduction programs also part of managment review for Cermaq Norway and Cermaq Group. Specified in FHP, on site level with concrete objectives for actions to reduce to less than 10 % 12 months rolling.	Compliant	
		c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.	Confirmed during interviews	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]					

5.2.1	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	Allowed usage defined in FHP. The only treatments done are use of anaesthetics and lice treatments, all under responsible veterinarian prescriptions. Registered in Fishtalk/fish CV. Dates for usage, quantity and dosage, withdrawal periods defined and regsitered in Fishtalk Batch no. and Prescription no. are registered in FishTalk. Example of prescr. 160824eam, dated 24.08.17 seen on site. Treatment started 14.09.16	Compliant	
		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.	Allowed usage defined in FHP. Overvie of all useage for 14 G and 16G seen in FishTalk on site. Only lice treaments were registered done on 16G, except for anesthetics. On 14G there were lice treatments with Emamectine (04.09.14), BetaMax (22.09.15), AlphaMax (12.10.15), Azazure (12.10.15) and Hydrogeneperoxide (12.11.15)	Compliant	
		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).	Information submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17, except for information on lice treatment on production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle which was sent in email dated 31.05.17	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.2.2	**Indicator**: 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] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	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].	Listed in "Forskrift om grenseverdier for legemidler i næringsmidler" "Norwegian requlation/NFSA. Substances banned in marked" In FHP "overview MRL for EU, USA, Japan, China, Australia and Russia". Statement dt. 03.07.15 - "Medicines and antibiotics allowed by Cermaq Norway". Approved and used substances are referred in FHP (dated 30.08.2016). Doc. dated 19.11.2016 with overviw of banned substances. List for USA and Japan only permitted substances	Compliant	
		b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles.	According to internal proc. "Prosedyre for produktkontroll" compulsory testing if fish has been treated. NFSA OK program. NIFES report (Monitoring programme for pharmaceuticls, illegal substances, contaminants in farmed fish 2014" states no banned residuals. Also Internal Cermaq MRL sampling report Eurofins dt. 21.03.17, Florfenicol, not detected. Samples from Skinnstakkvika. compliance to regulation. Also Internal Cermaq MRL sampling report Eurofins dt. 11.05.16 and 23.05.16 from Rivabukt, Emamectin, Azamethafos and pyrethoids, PCB, CDDs heavy metal not detected. Compliant to regulation.	Compliant	
		-	Compliance verified and in accordance with requirements and also in accordance with reports and usage recorded in production system Fishtalk.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.2.3	**Indicator**: Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain prescription for all therapeutant use in advance of application from the farm veterinarian (or equivalent, see [96] for definition of veterinarian).	All medication are prescribed by the veterinarian. On Tuvan only Benzoak (anesthetic) and Ememectine (lice treatment) have been used during 16G. Prescr. no. referred under 5.2.1	Compliant	
		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.	100% of treatment events are prescribed by a veterinarian Original presciption in site folder and regsitered in Fishtalk with witholding periods defined in prescription and in Fishtalk.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
5.2.4	**Indicator**: Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a).	In Fishtalk, automatically notified/blocked according to degreedays witholdingtime stated in prescription. According to FHMP/VHP on withholding periods defined in Fishtalk and specific presecription.	Compliant	
		b. Compile and maintain documentation on legally-required withholding periods for all treatments used on-farm. Withholding period is the time interval after the withdrawal of a drug from the treatment of the salmon before the salmon can be harvested for use as food.	Documented in Fishtalk, automatically notified/blocked according to degreedays witholdingtime stated in prescription. Last treatments: BetaMax (22.09.15), AlphaMax (12.10.15), Azazure (12.10.15) and Hydrogeneperoxide (12.11.15). First harvest 12.10.15. Withholding period for BetaMax (20 daydegrees) AlphaMax (5 daydegrees), Azazure (10 daydegrees) and Hydrogeneperoxide (0 daydegrees)	Compliant	

	Applicability: All	c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.	Documented in Fishtalk, automatically notified/blocked according to degreedays witholdingtime stated in prescription. Last treatments: BetaMax (22.09.15), AlphaMax (12.10.15), Azazure (12.10.15) and Hydrogeneperoxide (12.11.15). First harvest 12.10.15. Withholding period for BetaMax (20 daydegrees) AlphaMax (5 daydegrees), Azazure (10 daydegrees) and Hydrogeneperoxide (0 daydegrees)	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.2.5	**Indicator**: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII **Requirement:** PTI score ≤ 13 **Applicability:** 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 verified. There have been 4 lice treatments on Tuvan, incl. one wich is combined and one hydrogeneperoxide	Compliant	
		b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score.	PTI Score: 13,2 VR 97 dated, 20.08.15 used for calulation of first treatment with Emamectine. This NC is set to a minor since one of the tratments is a combined treatment with two substances (AlpaMax and Azazure). Each of these substances has been calulated individually. If only one had been used the PTI would have been 8,4. It must also be noted the it was an extraordinary event and that the PTI score is far below that level today (3,2 for 16G) The third lice treatment was done with a combination of two chemoterapeutants. The PTI for both have been calculated in full. If only one chemoterapeutant had been used the PTI would have been 8.4. We have calculated to show maximum PTI. The situation for the 14G was exceptional, and for the 16G the site is back to a normal situation where the PTI so far is 0,47	Compliant	
		c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Submitted to ASC in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.2.6	**Indicator**: For farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [105] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles **Requirement:** Yes, within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle	a. Review PTI scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle. If yes, proceed to 5.2.6b; if no, Indicator 5.2.6 does not apply.	PTI score: above 6	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].	PTI score: above 6 The two previous generations, 10G and 12 G were slaughetered before normal harvest size. PTI for these two generations were 3,2	Compliant	
		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.	PTI score: above 6 The two previous generations, 10G and 12 G were slaughetered before normal harvest size. PTI for these two generations were 3,2	Compliant	
		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 in email dt. 18.05.17	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
5.2.7	**Indicator**: Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments [106] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles.	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles	Compliant	
		b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3)	Overview seen in FishTalk. Lice treatments on 14G and 16 G as described above	Compliant	
		c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.9).	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.2.8	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO [107]) **Requirement:** None [108] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [107].	Valid WHO list 5th edition demonstrated	Compliant	
		b. If the farm has not used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit.	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk
		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.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk

		e. Others, please describe			
5.2.9	**Indicator**: Number of treatments [109] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk
		c. Others, please describe			
5.2.10	**Indicator**: If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load [110] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles **Requirement:** Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All	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.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk
		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.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk
		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.		N/A	There has been no use of antibiotics on this site the last few cycles. Verified in FishTalk
		d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.	Data submitted to ASC 18.05.17	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
5.2.11	**Indicator**: Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers [112] of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	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).	The CV is sent to customers. Fish has not been harvested from this site since spring 2016. Example of info to customer seen: Example from Komagnes shown during audit, dated 06.02.17, Email to customer	Compliant	
		b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.	Internal Procedure in QMS Traceability procedure defines information flow within the company. There is a procedure, ID 484, updated 18.01.17 making of tracability document for fish (CV) . Example of info to customer seen: Example from Komagnes shown during audit, dated 06.02.17, Email to customer	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments					
5.3.1	**Indicator**: Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	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.		N/A	Procedure defined if resistance occur " Prosedyre for bekjempelse av lus ved nedsatt følsomhet mot legemidler". No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.
		b. Whenever the farm uses two successive treatments, keep records showing how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.		N/A	Procedure defined if resistance occur " Prosedyre for bekjempelse av lus ved nedsatt følsomhet mot legemidler". No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.
		c. For any result of 5.3.1b that did not produce the expected effect, ensure that a bio-assay analysis of resistance is conducted.		N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.
		d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.		N/A	No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.
		e. Others, please describe			
5.3.2	**Indicator**: When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Review results of bio-assay tests (5.3.1d) for evidence that resistance has formed. If yes, proceed to 5.3.2b. If no, then Indicator 5.3.2 is not applicable.		N/A	Procedure defined if resistance occur " Prosedyre for bekjempelse av lus ved nedsatt følsomhet mot legemidler". No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.
		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.		N/A	Procedure defined if resistance occur " Prosedyre for bekjempelse av lus ved nedsatt følsomhet mot legemidler". No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.
		c. Others, please describe			
Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]					
5.4.1	**Indicator**: Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-	a. Keep records of the start and end dates of periods when the site is fully fallow after harvest.	Last date of harvest of 14G from site was 08.02.2016. Stocking of 16G between 03.05.16 and 20.05.16, it. approx. 3 months between harvest and restocking	Compliant	

	year class [114] **Requirement:** 100% [115] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [115]	b. Provide evidence of stocking dates (purchase receipts, delivery records) to show that there were no gaps > 6 months for smolt inputs for the current production cycle.	In Fish Talk and stocking/harvest reports. First stocking date 16G: 03.05.16 Last stocking date 16G: 20.05.16	Compliant	
		-	Ova CVs, Smolt CVs, smolts health cerificates, all information available in Fishtalk.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.4.2	**Indicator**: 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 3. Promptly [118] made findings publicly available **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, show evidence that the farm promptly evaluated each to determine whether it was a statistically significant increase over background mortality rate on a monthly basis [116]. The accepted level of significance (for example, $p < 0.05$) should be agreed between farm and CAB.	Procedure ID 289, V16 updated 08.02.17: Handling of mortalities, moribund fish and silage. Continuos evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring. Mortality has decreased significantly so far from 13G	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	Continuos evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring.
		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.		N/A	Continuos evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring.
		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.		N/A	Continuos evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring.
		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).		N/A	No UIA detected nor suspected at farm. Submitted to ASC 18.05.17
		f. Others, please describe			
5.4.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [119] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [120] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	OIE AAHC presented and awareness.demonstrated. Current 2016 version of list presented.	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.	Internal procedure in QMS on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Described in FHP, Notification of diseases: Contingency plan Cermaq, Infectious diseases, ID 16" Contingency Plan Mass mortality, ID 14. OIE AHC practices basis for NFSA regulations	Compliant	
		-	Confirmed during interviews	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
5.4.4	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	Internal procedure in QMS on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Described in FHP, Notification of diseases: Contingency plan Cermaq, Infectious diseases, ID 16" Contingency Plan Mass mortality, ID 14. OIE AHC practices basis for NFSA regulations	Compliant	
		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 an 5.4.4d do not apply.		NA	No occurance 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.		NA	No occurance 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).		NA	No occurance of OIE-notifiable diseases.
		-		NA	No occurance 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	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Workers have the freedom to join any trade union, free of any form of interference from employers or competing organizations set up or backed by the employer. Farms shall prepare documentation to demonstrate to the auditor that domestic regulation fully meets these criteria.	50% of employees organised. The right of Freedom of association is ensured by company management by creating environment to for activities of trade union.	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 or employers’ organizations."	Worker representative of TU was elected during meeting of employees in 2017-03. Kim Andre Nango - Worker representative for region. Jorgen Beldo - Safety representative for region, Adrian Kjellmann - Safety representative at site land base.	Compliant	
		c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.	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.	Compliant	
		d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview has confirmed information. The TU representative has possibility to visit farms. Management is encouraging to be organised.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
6.1.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association.	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.	Compliant	
		b. Employer communicates that workers are free to form organizations to advocate for and protect work rights (e.g. farm policies on Freedom of Association; see 6.12.1).	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 red the documents.	Compliant	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms communication. All workers confirmed free possibilities to be organised.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.1.3	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Local trade union, or where none exists a reputable civil-society organization, confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees’ freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.	No outstanding cases related to site available during audit.	Compliant	
		b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.	Collective bargaining is implemented via consultations and Tariff agreement with Trade unions.	Compliant	
		c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).	Now in power Tariff agreement for period 2016 end 2018.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.2 Child labor					
6.2.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of child [125] labor [126] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All except as noted in [125]	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.	Requirements of standard applies	Compliant	
		b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).	At the audit time none of young workers are employed.	Compliant	
		c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.	The age records are in place	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.2.2		a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.	The procedure for young workers rev. 11, 2016-11-22 is developed. Personal training to be done for each young worker indicating allowed and forbidden works.	Compliant	

		b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.	Identification process in place.	Compliant	
	Indicator: Percentage of young workers [127] that are protected [128] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.	Time sheets are maintained. Young workers were employed in summer 2016. (They are working 7,5 hours per day but due to distance they are staying at the site whole working day with a shift. They are paid for 10 hours). No young workers employed during the audit.	Compliant	
		d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.	Young workers were employed in summer 2016. No young workers employed during the audit. (Working 7,5 hours per day. They are paid for 10 hours. The work 5 days per week.)	Compliant	
		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.	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.	Compliant	
		f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.	Site was inspected. No interviews were conducted as no young workers are employed.	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor					
6.3.1		a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no 'pay to work' schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs).	Contracts are understood. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted. Trainings are paid by the company without obligations from workers to compensate if they are leaving the company.	Compliant	
	Indicator: Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labor **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.	After shift workers are free to leave	Compliant	
		c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.	No cases identified.	Compliant	
		d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.	No cases identified.	Compliant	
		e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.	No cases identified.	Compliant	
		f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview has confirmed information. Payroll records are maintained.	Compliant	
		g. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]					
6.4.1		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.	Ethical guidelines (last revision 2015-12-14) and Whistle blowing procedure (2014-05-27).	Compliant	
	Indicator: Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.	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.	Compliant	
		c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.	The equal access to job opportunities 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.	Compliant	
		d. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective.	The training for managers was held on 2016-April. Site managers 2016-06-16. Site workers were trained on 07 and 28 of November 2016.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
6.4.2		a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.	No cases identified.	Compliant	
	Indicator: Number of incidences of discrimination **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	b. Be advised that worker testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.	The rights of employees are respected. During interview no discrimination cases reported	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety					

6.5.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [135] and policies on a yearly basis **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has documented practices, procedures (including emergency response procedures) and policies to protect employees from workplace hazards and to minimize risk of accident or injury. The information shall be available to employees.	Documentation is developed and is available in working places.	Compliant	
		b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	Employees know emergency respond procedures. Safety (fire and evacuation) drill was organised 2016-10.20. The results of safety drills were documented but with very low details.	Compliant	
		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 drill was organised (2017 winter). The results of safety drills were documented but with very low details. Fire drill was conducted 2016-10.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.5.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals).	List maintained, reference to risk analyses on INTELEX. Last revision of risks took place in 2017-04-04.	Compliant	
		b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.	PPE is provided.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms PPE management.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
6.5.3	**Indicator:** Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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 INTELEX. Last revision if risks took place in 2017-04-04.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.5.4	**Indicator:** Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.	Company level electronic database INTELEX is managed with records for all H&S and environmental accidents and near accidents. Monthly discussions on H&S incidents are taken at site.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			

6.5.5	**Indicator:** Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance (accident or injury) for 100% of worker costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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	**Indicator:** Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.6 Wages					
6.6.1	**Indicator:** The percentage of workers whose basic wage [136] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [137] **Requirement:** 0 (None) **Applicability:** 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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.6.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [138] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and the use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages. Includes review of any national basic needs wage recommendations from credible sources such as national universities or government.	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.	Compliant	
		c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	Wages exceed basic needs wage.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.6.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [139] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	Compliant	
		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	Compliant	
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview has confirmed information about wages	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting					
6.7.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers who have contracts [141] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** 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	Compliant	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Interview confirms legal employment by contracts.	Compliant	

	Applicability: All	d. Others, please describe			
6.7.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible practices and policies.	Procedure for Classification of suppliers is used for approval of suppliers and sub-contractors (2016-02) The questionnaire is updated.	Compliant	
		b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.	The criteria is defined in procedure of approval of suppliers and sub-contractors (2016-02-02). The suppliers evaluation matrix was created. CEQN-2016.	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.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution					
6.8.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.	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.	Compliant	
		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.	There was group complaint about work force shortage during summer vacation period. It was solved by organising administration - workers meeting and solutions for both sides.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.8.2	**Indicator:** Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [142] within a 90-day timeframe **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** 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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices					
6.9.1	**Indicator:** Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity.	The disciplinary verbal and written warnings may be used in case of misbehaviour during the work. No cases of improper disciplinary behaviour.	Compliant	
		b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors.	No cases identified.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
6.9.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [143] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.	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.	No cases identified at the farm. Company has the working disciplinary system. Workers confirmed understanding and fairness of disciplinary policy.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime					
6.10.1		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	

	Indicator: Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [145] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		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.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
6.10.2	**Indicator:** Overtime is limited, voluntary [146], paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except as noted in [146]	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.	Compliant	
		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).	The procedure for working hours was developed (2016-08-15). The timesheets are in place.	Compliant	
		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.	Interviews have confirmed voluntary overtime.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.11 Education and training					
6.11.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g., courses, certificates and degrees) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers. Company provides incentives (e.g. subsidies for tuition or textbooks, time off prior to exams, flexibility in work schedule) that encourage workers to participate in educational initiatives. Note that such offers may be contingent on workers committing to stay with the company for a pre-arranged time.	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.	Compliant	
		b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).	Training records maintained on site.	Compliant	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	Interview confirms that company supports education initiatives.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility					
6.12.1	**Indicator:** Demonstration of company-level [148] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.	Company level policies are available and are in line with requirements of the standard.	Compliant	
		b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located.	Policies are approved.	Compliant	
		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).	The policies cover all company operations.	Compliant	
		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).	The access is provided.	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN					
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement			*Alta kommune*		
7.1.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of regular and meaningful [149] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).	The invitation was sent in 2017-03-09 to Alta commune and other interested parties. The meeting was organised on 2017-04-19.	Compliant	
		b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.	Consultations have included main points required by the standard.	Compliant	
		c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.	The participants from local community have participated in consultation. They were invited to contribute to agenda.	Compliant	
		d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3).	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 is not well defined.	Compliant	
		e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.	The invitation and minutes of meeting are available.	Compliant	

		f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.		N/A	The extensive communication was completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.
		g. Others, please describe			
7.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence and evidence of an effective [150] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations.	The complaints could be delivered via company e-mail, company workers or whistle blowing channel.	Compliant	
		b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder describing corrective actions).	No complaints related to farm.	Compliant	
		c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).	No complaints related to farm received.	Compliant	
		d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complaintants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.		N/A	The extensive communication was completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.
		e. Others, please describe			
7.1.3	**Indicator:** 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (use of aneastatic 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.	Compliant	
		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 people is not well defined.	Compliant	
		d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.		N/A	The extensive communication was completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.
		e. Others, please describe			
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories					
7.2.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [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 raindeer owners present in the area but has no local government in Alta 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.	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	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.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		e. Others, please describe			
7.2.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes [152] **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.2. do not apply.
		b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		c. Others, please describe			
7.2.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of a	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm.		N/A	Based on 7.2.1 a) requirements of 7.2.3. do not apply.

	protocol agreement, or an active process [153] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	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.		N/A	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.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		d. Others, please describe			
Criterion 7.3 Access to resources					
7.3.1	**Indicator:** Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [154] without community approval **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** 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.	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	The extensive communication was completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.
		d. Others, please describe			
7.3.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	The extensive communication was completed during initial certification stage. No inquiries received. The interview was not organised due to logistics and time limitations.
		c. Others, please describe			
INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION A farm seeking certification must have documentation from all of its smolt suppliers to demonstrate compliance with the following standards. The requirements are, in general, a subset of the standards in Principles 1 through 7, focusing on the impacts that are most relevant for smolt facilities. In addition, specific standards are applied to open systems (net pens), and to closed and semi-closed systems (recirculation and flow-through).					
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT			**INT 13191 Dyping**		
Standards related to Principle 1			**Audit evidence** 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanitory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	**Evaluation** (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	**Justification of classification of NC** Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
8.1	**Indicator**: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Identify all of the farm's smolt suppliers. For each supplier, identify the type of smolt production system used (e.g. open, semi or closed systems) and submit this information to ASC (Appendix VI).	Semiclosed system. Submitted ASC. Confirmed by ASC in mail 17.05.17	Compliant	
		b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.	Water abstraction permit from NVE Fylkesmannen Nordland discharge permit dt. 18.03.04. Production limited to 250 tons feed used Dir. of Fisheries: date d 03.01.07	Compliant	
		c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	Fylkesmannen inspection 02.05.16. 04 NCs given. NC's confirmed closed in email from County auth. dated 18.07.16 and 06.04.17 NFSA inspection 14.01.16. NO NCs. Dir. of fisheries had inspetion: 30.03.17. 2 rec. given	Compliant	

		-	Fiskeridirektoratet permit and Recipient survey (MOM-B) performed by AkvaplanNiva AS 10.10.16. Result category 1 Verry good	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
8.2	**Indicator**: Compliance with labor laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labor laws and regulations.	Internal suppliers statement related to relevant parts of ASC std. Dt 24.03.17 Internal inspections (Safe workers representative) performed twice every year. In additii\on they are GG certified (GRASP)	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 been held 02.06.2016 by Safe work Auhorities, dated 10.06.16, after an accident on site. No a lethal accident and worker is back in business. 1 NC after inspection. NC closed by Safe work Auhorities 26.07.16	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 2					
8.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains the same components as the assessment for grow-out facilities under 2.4.1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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.	(MOM-B) performed by AkvaplanNiva AS 10.10.16. Result category 1 Verry good Site Risk assessment 10.03.17. Impact assessment in license application and in Plan for Environment and Biodiversity Environmental risks with contingency plans and references to relevant public regulations and national legislation.	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.	In site specific " Plan for environmental objects" Cermaq Norway AS covering impacts defined in indicator above. Annual revision of plan. Last 22.05.17. , Evaluation of hatcery impact on biodiv. dated 04.04.17 Risk assessment dated 10.03.2017	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.4	**Indicator**: Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1) **Requirement:** 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 **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months.	Production reports and records in Fish Talk 177 461 kg feed for period 01.04.16 to 30.04.17.	Compliant	
		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).	Biomar feed used. Declaration per feed type and particle size frorm feed supplier. (Values for different feed types ranging from 1.14 to 2.0%phosphorus content	Compliant	
		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.	Calculated: 2 620 kg total amount of phosphorus added as feed.	Compliant	
		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.	Records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced are available. 195 579 kg biomass production.	Compliant	
		e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1.	841 kg phosphorus in fish biomass produced. Calculations are correct.	Compliant	
		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.	Sludge have not been removed	Compliant	
		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.	9,1 kg phosphorus released per MT produced Reference is made to VR 39 on phosphoru release to sea confirmed by ASC. See www.asc-aqua.org for VR 39 determination by ASC dt.15.09.14	Compliant	
		h. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 3					
8.5		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.		N/A	S. salar native to region.

	Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication [156] of the SAD standards **Requirement:** Yes [157] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers except as noted in [157]	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).		N/A	S. salar 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.		N/A	S. salar native to region.
		d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b or 8.5c, provide documented evidence for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.		N/A	S. salar native to region.
		e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.		N/A	S. salar native to region.
		f. Others, please describe			
8.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [158] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 fish [159] **Applicability:** 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.	No escaped according to internal statement. Internal Risk Assessment with instruction for registration and reporting. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)	Compliant	
		b. Using smolt supplier records from 8.6a, determine the total number of fish that escaped. Verify that there were fewer than 300 escapees from the smolt production facility in the most recent production cycle.	No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)	Compliant	
		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]).	Internal smolt supplier. All records in Fish Talk	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	Internal Risk Assessment/contingency plan with instruction for registration and reporting. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)
		e. Others, please describe			
8.7	**Indicator**: Accuracy [160] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish **Requirement:** ≥98% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records showing the accuracy of the counting technology used by smolt suppliers. Records must include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts.	Last secure point of counting in vaccination in FW site. AquascanScan electronic counting/registartion system documents presented. Decl +/- max98% accuracy . Verified by provider specsifications.	Compliant	
		b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	Last secure point of counting in vaccination in FW site. AquaScan electronic counting/registartion system documents presented. Decl +/- max 2%. Verified by provider specsifications. Accuracy verified during each vaccinationed batch.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 4					
8.8	**Indicator**: Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain a policy which states the supplier's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the supplier's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation.	Cermaq internal document " Waste management plan" ID V13, Doc. no. 164, 23.03.17 with authorised service provider Iris and Østbø on special waste, Public service on domestic, type of waste defined, domestic, special waste/chemicals, for recycling etc.Evaluation of environmental impacts.	Compliant	
		b. Others, please describe			
8.9	**Indicator**: Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year.	Records OK in excel documents.	Compliant	
		b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last year.	2016 consumption of scope 1=99 730 325 KJ and scope 2=purchased electricity = 3 418 372 800 KJ. Tot Scope 1+2 = 3 518 130 125	Compliant	

	the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection 1 for guidance and required components of the records and assessment) **Requirement:** Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year.	2016: 507 720 kg BM produced	Compliant	
		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.	2016: 6 929 221 kJ/Mt BM produced	Compliant	
		e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a-e.	Records OK in excel. Continuous evaluation.	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
8.10	**Indicator**: 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) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility.	Records OK	Compliant	
		b. Confirm that, on at least an annual basis, the smolt supplier calculates all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	2016: Scope 1 on farm genereated energy= 7 035 Kg CO 2 (conv.factor is 2,53.2,67) Scope 2 emission (conv,factor 0,091) = 13 294 kg CO2. Total Scope 1+2 = 20 329 Kg CO2	Compliant	
		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.	2016: Scope 1 on farm genereated energy= 7 035 Kg CO 2 (conv.factor is 2,53.2,67) Scope 2 emission (conv,factor 0,091) = 13 294 kg CO2. Total Scope 1+2 = 20 329 Kg CO2	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	No Non-CO2 gases calculated, CO2 only
		e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually.	Calculaitons and asessment provided. Calculaitons and asessment provided by CO2 focus. Data from IEA 2013, SSB 2013, EIA 2011, IPCC 2006.	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 5					
8.11	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites.	Internal Fish Health Plan. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. External veterinary service Helgeland Havbruksstasjon, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt 21.05.16 Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.	Internal Fish Health Plan. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. External veterinary service Helgeland Havbruksstasjon, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt 21.05.16 Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.12	**Indicator**: Percentage of fish that are vaccinated for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists [163] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt	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.	Internal Fish Health Plan. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. External veterinary service Helgeland Havbruksstasjon, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt 21.05.16 Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.	In FHMP/VHP Ttype of disease and control monitoring strategies, vaccines/pathogens type/product name detailed in plan.	Compliant	
		c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received.	In smolt CV and Fish Talk with dates and type for smolts for site, 100% vaccination is also a legal requirement controlled by NFSA. Smolt CVs for site with ova /stripping/startfeeding dates. First stocking date 16G Aug./Sept.. (AJ Micro 6.2 vaccine) Smolt from yearclass 2016	Compliant	

	Producers	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.	100% vaccinated according to national legislation. Verified in smolt CV and Fishtalk. Verified towards registrations in FHP / CV / Fishtalk. All fish vaccinated with vaccine type AJ-micro-6.2 or AJ 6.2	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
8.13	**Indicator**: Percentage of smolt groups [164] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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.	Risk based testing regime.VHP and Veterinary visits: lists and documented according to local VHP predetermined sampling and visits regime defined in VHP plan. Sceeining programme incl. Broodfish.All internal smolt ISA and PD testing pre stocking.	Compliant	
		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).	Veterinary visits according to VHP, once per month.. Smolt group health certificate. Labora Report, tested for PD, HSMB, CMS, IPN and ILA 08.08.16 by Result Negative for all tests Health certificate/Smolt status report dated 08.08.16	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.14	**Indicator**: Detailed information, provided by the designated veterinarian, of all chemicals and therapeutants used during the smolt production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing and all disease and pathogens detected on the site **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	Therapeutant used, verified in fish CV also documented in FishTalk according to FHP - type, producer and batch. Prescription signed by responsible vetrinary / FHB/ Vaccines produced by Pharmaq. Therapeutant used and documented on fishgroup. Verified in CV seen during audit	Compliant	
		b. Others, please describe			
8.15	**Indicator**: 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] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [166].	List (allowed and banned substances) with market acceptance status and levels defined. Statment "medicines and antibiotics allowed by Cermaq Norway to use dt.08.12.2016, signed by Karl Fredrik Ottem. Positive identification of allowed therapeutants for US. Statment regarding malacite green og Nitrouraner dated 02.03.17	Compliant	
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	Internal supplier. List in VHP (allowed and banned substances) with market acceptance status and levels defined. Statment "medicines and antibiotics allowed by Cermaq Norway to use dt.15.03.2016, signed by Karl Fredrik Ottem	Compliant	
		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.	Vaccines in fish CV and Fish Talk - type and producer and batch. Ananesthetics and antiparasite treatment formalin, ok according to list. No AB used.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
8.16	**Indicator**: Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a).	No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed.	Compliant	
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.		N/A	No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed.
		c. Others, please describe			
8.17	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [167] **Requirement:** None [168]	a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [167].	This is an internal supplier. Information is found in VHP. It is the same veterinary health service for both Martnesvika and smolt supplier	Compliant	
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	List (allowed and banned substances - against WHO critical list. Communicated to smolt supplier in mail dt 27.07.15	Compliant	

	Requirement: None [168] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm.	No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed and compared to WHO critical list.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
8.18	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [169] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [170] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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).	Cermag Statment dt 24.03.17on ASC requirements regarding OIE AAHC for smolt deliveries, signed by smolt.responsible Marit Hansen. Internal smolt only	Compliant	
		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.	Cermag Statment dt 24.03.17on ASC requirements regarding OIE AAHC for smolt deliveries, signed by smolt.responsible Marit Hansen. Internal smolt only	Compliant	
		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.	Internal supplier	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 6					
8.19	**Indicator**: Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain copies of smolt supplier's company-level policies and procedures and a declaration of compliance with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	The internal Smolt supplier used: company documents apply.	Compliant	
		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.	Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 7					
8.20	**Indicator**: Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community.	The invitation was sent in 2017-02-13 The meeting was organised on 2017-03-21.	Compliant	
		b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements.	Consultations have included main points required by the standard.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.21	**Indicator**: Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.	Internal Smolt supplier used. Company procedures are used. See Principle 7.1.2.	Compliant	
		b. Others, please describe			
8.22	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people (see Indicator 7.2.1). If not then the requirements of 8.22 do not apply.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		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.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		c. Others, please describe			
8.23	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier.		N/A	Based on 8.2.2 a) the requirements of 8.2.3. do not apply.
		b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		c. Others, please describe			
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT In addition to the requirements above, if the smolt is produced in an open system, evidence shall be provided that the following are met:					

8.24	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only
		d. Others, please describe			
8.25	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body **Requirement:** Permitted until five years from publication of the SAD standards (i.e full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		b. Others, please describe			
8.26	**Indicator**: 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) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only
		c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		f. Others, please describe			
8.27	**Indicator**: Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≤ 20 µg/l [174] **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		f. Others, please describe			
8.28	**Indicator**: Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimeters above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≥ 50% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe		N/A	
8.29	**Indicator**: Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7)	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.

	baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		e. Others, please describe			
8.30	**Indicator**: Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** 25% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.31	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water body **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water bodies where the supplier operates.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Others, please describe			
	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS Additionally, if the smolt is produced in a closed or semi-closed system (flow through or recirculation) that discharges into freshwater, evidence shall be provided that the following are met [177]:				
8.32	**Indicator**: Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** Yes [177] **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.33	**Indicator**: Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** 60% [178,179] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. If a single DO reading (as reported in 8.33a) fell below 60%, obtain evidence that the smolt supplier performed daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for a least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.34	**Indicator**: Macro-invertebrate surveys downstream from the farm's effluent discharge demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.35	**Indicator**: Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		e. Others, please describe			

INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION A farm seeking certification must have documentation from all of its smolt suppliers to demonstrate compliance with the following standards. The requirements are, in general, a subset of the standards in Principles 1 through 7, focusing on the impacts that are most relevant for smolt facilities. In addition, specific standards are applied to open systems (net pens), and to closed and semi-closed systems (recirculation and flow-through).					
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT			**INT 13935 Holmvåg**		
Standards related to Principle 1			**Audit evidence** 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanitory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	**Evaluation** (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	**Justification of classification of NC** Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
8.1	**Indicator**: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Identify all of the farm's smolt suppliers. For each supplier, identify the type of smolt production system used (e.g. open, semi or closed systems) and submit this information to ASC (Appendix VI).	Semiclosed system. Submitted ASC. Confirmed by ASC in mail 17.05.17	Compliant	
		b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.	Nordland Fylkeskommune dt. 18.03.16 for Max 150 MT feed / 1.8 mill smolts. Additional cleaning requirements for discharge water. 50% of suspendet matter, 20% of organic matter. Recipient surveys defined in permit. Water abstraction permit from NVE Fylkesmannen Nordland discharge permit dt. 17.11.15. Dir. of Fisheries: date d 21.09.15, increase to 1.8 mill	Compliant	
		c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	Fylkesmannen inspection 14.04.16. 03 NCs given. NCs regarding discharge/feed usage. Confirmed closed in mail dt 28.07.16. NFSA inspection 07.04.16. NO NCs. 01 OBS. Dir. of fisheries had inspetion: 30.03.17. 1 rec. given	Compliant	
		-	Fiskeridirektoratet permit and Recipient survey (MOM-C) performed by Havbruksstjenesten AS 14.10.15. Result category 1-2 Very good/Good. .	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
8.2	**Indicator**: Compliance with labor laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labor laws and regulations.	Internal suppliers statement related to relevant parts of ASC std. Dt 24.03.17 Internal inspections (Safe workers representative) performed twice every year. In additii\on they are GG certified (GRASP) No external inspections relating to labour conditions/issues has been held recent years.	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)	No Inspections relating to labour conditions/issues has been held recent years.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 2					
8.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains the same components as the assessment for grow-out facilities under 2.4.1	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.	Recipient survey (MOM-C) performed by Havbruksstjenesten AS 14.10.15. Result category 1-2 Very good/Good. . Site Risk assessment 10.03.17. Impact assessment in license application and in Plan for Environment and Biodiversity Environmental risks with contingency plans and references to relevant public regulations and national legislation.	Compliant	

	Requirement: Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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.	In site specific " Plan for environmental objects" Cermaq Norway AS covering impacts defined in indicator above. Annual revision of plan. Last 22.05.17. , Evaluation of hatcery impact on biodiv. dated 04.04.17 Risk assessment dated 10.03.2017	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.4	**Indicator**: Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1) **Requirement:** 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 **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months.	Production reports and records in Fish Talk 129 182 kg feed for period 01.04.16 to 30.04.17.	Compliant	
		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).	Biomar, Europharma. Declaration per feed type and particle size frorm feed supplier. (Values for different feed types ranging from 1.14 to 2.0%phosphorus content	Compliant	
		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.	Calculated: 2 211 kg total amount of phosphorus added as feed.	Compliant	
		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.	Records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced are available. 124 442 kg biomass production.	Compliant	
		e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1.	535 kg phosphorus in fish biomass produced. Calculations are correct.	Compliant	
		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.	Sludge have been removed, but no calulation has been made. They try to do this, but so far they have no accurate figure have been obtained	Compliant	
		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.	13,5 kg phosphorus released per MT produced Reference is made to VR 39 on phosphoru release to sea confirmed by ASC. See www.asc-aqua.org for VR 39 determination by ASC dt.15.09.14	Compliant	
		h. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 3					
8.5	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication [156] of the SAD standards **Requirement:** Yes [157] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers except as noted in [157]	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.		N/A	S. salar 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).		N/A	S. salar 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.		N/A	S. salar native to region.
		d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b or 8.5c, provide documented evidence for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.		N/A	S. salar native to region.
		e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.		N/A	S. salar native to region.
		f. Others, please describe			
8.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [158] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 fish [159] **Applicability:** 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.	No escaped according to internal statement. Internal Risk Assessment with instruction for registration and reporting. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)	Compliant	
		b. Using smolt supplier records from 8.6a, determine the total number of fish that escaped. Verify that there were fewer than 300 escapees from the smolt production facility in the most recent production cycle.	No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)	Compliant	
		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]).	Internal smolt supplier. All records in Fish Talk	Compliant	

	[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.		N/A	Internal Risk Assessment/contingency plan with instruction for registration and reporting. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Directorate escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)
		e. Others, please describe			
8.7	**Indicator**: Accuracy [160] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish **Requirement:** ≥98% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records showing the accuracy of the counting technology used by smolt suppliers. Records must include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts.	Last secure point of counting in vaccination in FW site. AquascanScan electronic counting/registartion system documents presented. Decl +/- max98% accuracy . Verified by provider specsifications.	Compliant	
		b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	Last secure point of counting in vaccination in FW site. AquaScan electronic counting/registartion system documents presented. Decl +/- max 2%. Verified by provider specsifications. Accuracy verified during each vaccinationed batch.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 4					
8.8	**Indicator**: Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain a policy which states the supplier's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the supplier's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation.	Cermaq internal document " Waste management plan" ID V13, Doc. no. 164, 23.03.17 with authorised service provider Iris and Østbø on special waste, Public service on domestic, type of waste defined, domestic, special waste/chemicals, for recycling etc.Evaluation of environmental impacts.	Compliant	
		b. Others, please describe			
8.9	**Indicator**: Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection 1 for guidance and required components of the records and assessment) **Requirement:** Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year.	Records OK in excel documents.	Compliant	
		b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last year.	2016 consumption of scope 1=124 949 923 KJ and scope 2=purchased electricity = 6 509 404 800 KJ. Tot Scope 1+2 = 6 634 354 723	Compliant	
		c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year.	2016: 266 031 kg BM produced	Compliant	
		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.	2016: 24 912 057 kJ/Mt BM produced	Compliant	
		e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a-e.	Records OK in excel. Continuous evaluation.	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
8.10	**Indicator**: 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) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility.	Records OK	Compliant	
		b. Confirm that, on at least an annual basis, the smolt supplier calculates all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	2016: Scope 1 on farm genereated energy= 8 825 Kg CO 2 (conv.factor is 2,53.2,67) Scope 2 emission (conv,factor 0,091) = 25 314 kg CO2. Total Scope 1+2 = 34140 Kg CO2	Compliant	
		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.	2016: Scope 1 on farm genereated energy= 8 825 Kg CO 2 (conv.factor is 2,53.2,67) Scope 2 emission (conv,factor 0,091) = 25 314 kg CO2. Total Scope 1+2 = 34 140 Kg CO2	Compliant	
		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.		N/A	No Non-CO2 gases calculated, CO2 only

		e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually.	Calculaitons and asessment provided. Calculaitons and asessment provided by CO2 focus. Data from IEA 2013, SSB 2013, EIA 2011, IPCC 2006.	Compliant	
		f. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 5					
8.11	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites.	Internal Fish Health Plan. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. External veterinary service Helgeland Havbruksstasjon, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt 15.03.16 Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.	Internal Fish Health Plan. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. External veterinary service Helgeland Havbruksstasjon, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt 15.03.16 Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.12	**Indicator**: Percentage of fish that are vaccinated for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists [163] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Maintain a list of diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region, developed by farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.	Internal Fish Health Plan. Plan covers all aspect of relevant diseaes and parasite diagnostics and control measures. External veterinary service Helgeland Havbruksstasjon, Approved and signed by veterinarian dt 15.03.16 Karl Fredrik Ottem.	Compliant	
		b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.	In FHMP/VHP Ttype of disease and control monitoring strategies, vaccines/pathogens type/product name detailed in plan.	Compliant	
		c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received.	In smolt CV and Fish Talk with dates and type for smolts for site, 100% vaccination is also a legal requirement controlled by NFSA. Smolt CVs for site with ova /stripping/startfeeding dates. First stocking date 16G Aug./Sept.. (AJ Micro 6.2 vaccine) Smolt from yearclass 2016	Compliant	
		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.	100% vaccinated according to national legislation. Verified in smolt CV and Fishtalk. Verified towards registrations in FHP / CV / Fishtalk. All fish vaccinated with vaccine type AJ-micro-6.2 or AJ 6.2	Compliant	
		e. Others, please describe			
8.13	**Indicator**: Percentage of smolt groups [164] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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.	Risk based testing regime.VHP and Veterinary visits: lists and documented according to local VHP predetermined sampling and visits regime defined in VHP plan. Sceeining programme incl. Broodfish.All internal smolt ISA and PD testing pre stocking.	Compliant	
		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).	Veterinary visits according to VHP, once per month.. Smolt group health certificate. Labora Report, tested for PRV and ILA 08.06.16 by Result Negative for PRV and ILA (ISA). Health certificate dated 07.08.16 Smolt status report dated 05.08.16	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.14	**Indicator**: Detailed information, provided by the designated veterinarian, of all chemicals and therapeutants used during the smolt production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing and all disease and pathogens detected on the site **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	Therapeutant used, verified in fish CV also documented in FishTalk according to FHP - type, producer and batch. Prescription signed by responsible vetrinary / FHB/ Vaccines produced by Pharmaq. Therapeutant used and documented on fishgroup. Verified in CV seen during audit	Compliant	
		b. Others, please describe			

8.15	**Indicator**: 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] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [166].	List (allowed and banned substances) with market acceptance status and levels defined. Statment "medicines and antibiotics allowed by Cermaq Norway to use dt.08.12.2016, signed by Karl Fredrik Ottem. Positive identification of allowed therapeutants for US. Statment regarding malacite green og Nitrouraner dated 02.03.17	Compliant	
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	Internal supplier. List in VHP (allowed and banned substances) with market acceptance status and levels defined. Statment "medicines and antibiotics allowed by Cermaq Norway to use dt.15.03.2016, signed by Karl Fredrik Ottem	Compliant	
		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.	Vaccines in fish CV and Fish Talk - type and producer and batch. Ananesthetics and antiparasite treatment formalin, ok according to list. No AB used.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
8.16	**Indicator**: Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a).	No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed.	Compliant	
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.		N/A	No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed.
		c. Others, please describe			
8.17	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [167] **Requirement:** None [168] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [167].	This is an internal suppllier. Information is found in VHP. It is the same veterinary health service for both Martnesvika and smolt supplier	Compliant	
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	List (allowed and banned substances - against WHO critical list. Communicated to smolt supplier in mail dt 27.07.15	Compliant	
		c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm.	No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed and compared to WHO critical list.	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
8.18	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [169] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [170] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	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).	Cermag Statment dt 24.03.17on ASC requirements regarding OIE AAHC for smolt deliveries, signed by smolt.responsible Marit Hansen. Internal smolt only	Compliant	
		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.	Cermag Statment dt 24.03.17on ASC requirements regarding OIE AAHC for smolt deliveries, signed by smolt.responsible Marit Hansen. Internal smolt only	Compliant	
		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.	Internal supplier	Compliant	
		d. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 6					
8.19	**Indicator**: Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain copies of smolt supplier's company-level policies and procedures and a declaration of compliance with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	The internal Smolt supplier used: company documents apply.	Compliant	
		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.	Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
Standards related to Principle 7					
8.20	**Indicator**: Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community.	The invitation was sent in 2017-02-13 The meeting was organised on 2017-03-21.	Compliant	

	and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements.	Consultations have included main points required by the standard.	Compliant	
		c. Others, please describe			
8.21	**Indicator**: Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.	Internal Smolt supplier used. Company procedures are used. See Principle 7.1.2.	Compliant	
		b. Others, please describe			
8.22	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people (see Indicator 7.2.1). If not then the requirements of 8.22 do not apply.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		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.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		c. Others, please describe			
8.23	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier.		N/A	Based on 8.2.2 a) the requirements of 8.2.3. do not apply.
		b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.		N/A	No traditional and indigenous groups are involved.
		c. Others, please describe			
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT In addition to the requirements above, if the smolt is produced in an open system, evidence shall be provided that the following are met:					
8.24	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only
		d. Others, please describe			
8.25	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body **Requirement:** Permitted until five years from publication of the SAD standards (i.e full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		b. Others, please describe			
8.26	**Indicator**: 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) **Requirement:** Yes	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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only
		c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only

	Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only.
		f. Others, please describe			
8.27	**Indicator**: Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≤ 20 µg/l [174] **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		f. Others, please describe			
8.28	**Indicator**: Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimeters above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≥ 50% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe		N/A	
8.29	**Indicator**: Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		e. Others, please describe			
8.30	**Indicator**: Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** 25% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.31	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water body **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water bodies where the supplier operates.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Others, please describe			
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS Additionally, if the smolt is produced in a closed or semi-closed system (flow through or recirculation) that discharges into freshwater, evidence shall be provided that the following are met [177]:					
8.32	**Indicator**: Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** Yes [177] **Applicability:** 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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.

	Closed Production Systems	d. Others, please describe			
8.33	**Indicator**: Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** 60% [178,179] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation.		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. If a single DO reading (as reported in 8.33a) fell below 60%, obtain evidence that the smolt supplier performed daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for a least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2).		N/A	No net-pens, tanks only. Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.34	**Indicator**: Macro-invertebrate surveys downstream from the farm's effluent discharge demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		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.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Others, please describe			
8.35	**Indicator**: Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2.		N/A	Direct discharge to seawater from smolt plant.
		e. Others, please describe			

ASC Audit Report - Traceablity

10	Traceability Factor	Description of risk factor if present.	Describe any traceability, segregation, or other systems in place to manage the risk.
10.1	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, produced within the same operation.		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). Transport from one seasite to the slaughterhouse at the time, only.

10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.		Only approved wellboats (Norsk Fisketransport AS) 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/ harvesting from other salmon farms/sites. The possibility for mixture of salmon in waiting cages from salmon from other farm/sites is also prevented by biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the harvesting/processing plant used. There are slaughtered fish from only one waiting cage at a time in the harvest/processing plant Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept both in electronic system Fish Talk and Innova system for Harvest/Post-harvest operations 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 enters the chain of custody.		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 smolt to finished slaughtered fish. The company is certified according to GLOBALG.A.P in the whole production chain. All stages of fish live cycle within the scope of this certification standard are traceable. Documents describe a satisfactory control with incoming products, from own freshwater sites, and corresponding documentation of production site, suppliers lists and reception control, both in harvesting and processing. Digital information is handled in Fish Talk for all freshwater stages and on-growing phase in seawater. Subsequent harvest, processing and sales are handled in Innova/Maritech system. It comprises sufficient information of traceability from Broodstock and ova, via smolts to harvestable fish, purchases, invoices and suppliers registers. The harvest plants are; Cermaq Norway Slakteri F-430, Havneveien 36, 9600 Hammerfest. ASC-C-00687, Exp. date 04.06.18 . Ref. to www.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found.
10.6 Traceablity Determination:	
10.6.1 The traceability and segregation systems in the operation are sufficient to ensure all products identified and sold as certified by the operation originate from the unit of certification, or	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.	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. The harvest plants are; Cermaq Norway Slakteri F-430, Havneveien 36, 9600 Hammerfest. ASC-C-00687, Exp. date 04.06.18 . Ref. to www.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found. C12 As the scope of this ASC Salmon Standard audit is the complete farm, all salmon at the site is included in the scope of this audit, and the fact that the harvest plant has an ASC CoC certification, the risk associated to substitution and mixing of certified with not certified products is very limited or not existing at the site and before the point when the ASC CoC as specified is needed and takes over in the ASC Salmon/ASC CoC certification process.
10.6.4 Is a sepearate chain of custody certificate required for the producer?	No, not for the unit of certification (Tuvan farm). A separate ASC CoC certification is needed, as specified earlier in the report, for activities e.g Harvest, processing and trading of certified products performed after the ASC Salmon Standard certificate scope stops.

ASC Audit Report - Closing

11 Findings

11.1 A summary table that lists all non-conformities and observations

NC reference	NC Status	Clause Reference	Description of NC	Descriptions of actions
IA-2017-1	Open-Minor	2.1.1.d	Sampling not done at maximum biomass	ODDJO 14.08.17: Accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
IA-2017-2	Open-Minor	2.1.2.c	Sampling not done at maximum biomass	ODDJO 14.08.17: Accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
IA-2017-3	Open-Minor	2.1.2.e	Faunal index score on Station 2 and 3 is below 3	ODDJO 14.08.17: Accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
IA-2017-4	Open-Minor	2.1.3.b	Sampling not done at maximum biomass	ODDJO 14.08.17: Accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
IA-2017-5	Open-Minor	2.1.3.c	Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species= 1 on Station 1	ODDJO 14.08.17: Accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
IA-2017-6	Closed-Minor	2.5.3.c	The farm workers need more training in verifying species on all incidents	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Documentation seen. NC closed
IA-2017-7	Closed-Minor	5.2.5.b	PTI Score: 13,2	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Documentation seen. NC closed

11.2 A copy of the non-conformtity report form completed for each non-conformity and observation raised.

11.3 If any approved requests for variations or interpretations have been used, a full copy of the approved variation or interpretation form shall be appended to the report. If used in raing an NC, the ASC reference number (NCF 5) and a justitification for its use (NCF 6) shall be completed in the NC report form.

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 is listed below:
Principle 1; “Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations”.
Principle 3; “Protect the health and integrity of wild populations”.
Principle 4; “Use resources in an environmentally efficient and responsible manner”.
Principle 5; “Manage disease and parasites in an environmentally responsible manner”.
Principle 6; “Develop and operate farms in a social responsible manner”.
Principle 7; ”Be a good neighbour and conscientious citizen”. .
Principle 8; ” Standards for supplier of smolt”.
For the rest of the principles listed below:
Principle 2; “Conserve natural habitat local biodiversity and ecosystem function”.
Full compliance was not found, although most of these were mainly compliant.
Reference is made to ASC Farm certification and Accreditation Requirement 17.4.2 and 17.4.3. As the fish were not at harvest size during the audit, harvest was not overseen by the auditor. The audit was timed without including harvest activities to allow the farm to benefit from certification during the initially audited production cycle. The QMS system used related to harvest and procedures and methodology used for harvesting salmon at the site/company was assessed. Harvest is planned to be observed and assessed during relevant surveillance audit of the site/company.
VRs used during audit:
- VR nr.39 approved 15.09.2014 by ASC on phosphorus release from smolt producer. Rationale for use of VR 39 during audit is that as for accepted VR 39 the smolt producers effluent is seawater, and not freshwater.
-VR nr. 97 approved 20.08.2015 on Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII. Rationale for use of VR 97 is that the biomass on site was well below maximum allowed biomass and to encourage use of Emamectin at times of low biomass.
-VR nr.179 approved 24.08.2016 by ASC for audit reports in local language. Rationale for use of VR 179 during this audit is that Scandinavin countires are rated as "very high" in english Proficiency Index.
VR list and updated documentation for VR can be found on the ASC website: http://www.asc-aqua.org/ in addition to relevant VRs attched to this report.

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).	10821 Tuvan site's capability to consistently meet the objectives of the ASC Salmon Standard is expected for the future. At this final report stage the unit of certification has 5 Minor NC's. The relevant corrective actions plan has to be approved before certification is granted. Final certification decision has been taken in final report after completion of stakeholder period. Tuvan may be considered compliant and recommended certified only after satisfactory closure or a corrective action plan for Minor non-conformances is implemented by the client and approved by DNV GL.
12.3 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 are not in English, then a synopsis in English shall be added to the report as	Not applicable as MOM-B and MOM-C are benthic biodiversity surveys, only.

13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	Yes. The final certification decision has been taken after needed activities, as per ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements Version 1 March 2012. • Compliant and thus certified.
13.2 The Eligiblity Date (if applicable)	The Eligiblity Date will be the date of certification if/when certification is granted. Final certification decision will be taken in final report after completion of stakeholder period.

13,3	Is a separate coc certificte required for the producer? (yes/no)	No, not for the unit of certification (Tuvan). A separate ASC CoC certification is needed as specified earlier in the report for activities e.g slaughtering, processing and trading of certified products performed after the ASC Salmon Standard certificate scope stops.
13.4	If a certificate has been issued this section shall include:	
13.4.1	The date of issue and date of expiry of the certificate.	29.08.2017-29.08.2020
13.4.2	The scope of the certificate	Production of Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar).
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 spesified 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 www.dnvgl.com

14 Surveillence

14.1	Next planned Surveillance	
14.1.1	Planned date	2018 - Specific date not decided at this stage.
14.1.2	Planned site	10821 Tuvan
14.2	Next audit type	
14.2.1	Surveillence 1	S1 - 2018
14.2.2	Surveillance 2	
14.2.3	Re-certification	
14.2.4	Other (specify type)	

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-1**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	29.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	X
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	X
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	2.1.1.d
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	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).
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		Sampling not done at maximum biomass
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		MOM-C sampling has not been done at maximum biomass
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		None, Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)		

NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	There had not been peak biomass between the time when we started planning for ASC sertification and the audit. Therefore the ASC sampling regime had to be done at an earlier stage to have the data for the audit. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. This is a common situation for Initial audits, considering the time required to produce complete MOM-C reports.
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	We have contracted a new biosampling at time of peak biomass. This will be done during week 34, confirmation from production manager attached. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Agreement for new survey at maximum biomass documented and this survey to be reported before SA1 - 2018 documented.
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	In the future the ASC sampling will be taken at the same time as the Norwegian samling regime, at peak biomass. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	Yes/No
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	
NCF 30		Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-2**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	29.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	X
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	X
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	2.1.2.c
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		Sampling not done at maximum biomass
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		MOM-C sampling has not been done at maximum biomass
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		None, Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)		

NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	There had not been peak biomass between the time when we started planning for ASC sertification and the audit. Therefore the ASC sampling regime had to be done at an earlier stage to have the data for the audit. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. This is a common situation for Initial audits, considering the time required to produce complete MOM-C reports.
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	We have contracted a new biosampling at time of peak biomass. This will be done during week 34, confirmation from production manager attached. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Agreement for new survey at maximum biomass documented and this survey to be reported before SA1 - 2018 documented.
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	In the future the ASC sampling will be taken at the same time as the Norwegian samling regime, at peak biomass. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	Yes/No
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	
NCF 30		Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-3**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	29.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	X
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	X
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	2.1.2.e
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		Faunal index score on Station 3 and 5 is below 3
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		Evidence from MOM-C Report nr. APN 8578.01.
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		One typo. It's not station 5, it's station 2. Station 5 is compliant with index 3,90. It is supposed to be station 2 and 3 (TU2 and TU3) with SW-index of 2,69 and 2,24 respectively. (C-assessment attached) Mats W. Snåre 03.07.2017

NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Yes, this is an error in NC-report. The Audit template was correct
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Unfortunately there were not high enough shannon wiener index at two of the stations. Tuvan wasn't lacking species at the two stations. Station 2 had 7287 organisms distributed over 84 species. And station 3 had 5483 organisms distributed over 85 species. The low SW-index was due to a skewed distribution, not a lack of abundance. Mats W. Snåre - 03.07.17
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. Based on information in the MOM C report and results from MOM B sampling we find that this is an minor NC
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Tuvan will have approximately 9 months fallowing after current generation (October 2017 to July 2018). This should give plenty of time for the environment to restore properly between generations. Cermaq Norway also have continous focus on feeding strive to achieve better control with feed-spillage. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. Based on information in the MOM C report and results from MOM B sampling we find that this is an minor NC
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Tuvan will have approximately 9 months fallowing after current generation (October 2017 to July 2018). This should give plenty of time for the environment to restore properly between generations. Cermaq Norway also have continous focus on feeding strive to achieve better control with feed-spillage. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	Yes/No

NCF 29	Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	
NCF 30	Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-4**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	29.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	X
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	X
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	2.1.3.b
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method. (Following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1)
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		Sampling not done at maximum biomass
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		MOM-C sampling has not been done at maximum biomass
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		None, Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017

NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	There had not been peak biomass between the time when we started planning for ASC sertification and the audit. Therefore the ASC sampling regime had to be done at an earlier stage to have the data for the audit. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. This is a common situation for Initial audits, considering the time required to produce complete MOM-C reports.
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	We have contracted a new biosampling at time of peak biomass. This will be done during week 34, confirmation from production manager attached. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Agreement for new survey at maximum biomass documented and this survey to be reported before SA1 - 2018 documented.
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	In the future the ASC sampling will be taken at the same time as the Norwegian samling regime, at peak biomass. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Will be followed up during next audit
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	Yes/No
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	
NCF 30		Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-5**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	29.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	X
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	X
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	2.1.3.c
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species= 1 on Station 1
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		Evidence from MOM-C Report nr. APN 8578.01.
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		None. Mats W. Snåre - 04.07.2017

NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Unfortunately there were not enough non pollution indicator species at station 1. The bathymetric condition varied and grab held little sediments. This could be a contributing factor to low presence of species. Norwegian Standard opens for (NS 9410) classfication of the benthic environmental status in the "near-zone" to be based on the number of species assessed against dominance relationship in the benthic community. Station 1 (TU1) reached a environmental condition of "GOOD" according to this method. Report attached. Mats W. Snåre - 05.07.2017
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. Based on information in the MOM C report and results from MOM B sampling we find that this is an minor NC
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Tuvan will have approximately 9 months fallowing after current generation (October 2017 to July 2018). This should give plenty of time for the environment to restore properly between generations. Cermaq Norway also have continous focus on feeding strive to achieve better control with feed-spillage. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. Based on information in the MOM C report and results from MOM B sampling we find that this is an minor NC
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Tuvan will have approximately 9 months fallowing after current generation (October 2017 to July 2018). This should give plenty of time for the environment to restore properly between generations. Cermaq Norway also have continous focus on feeding strive to achieve better control with feed-spillage. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.17
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Will be followed up during next audit

NCF 26 Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until		
NCF 27	Justification for extention request		
NCF 28 CAB	Extention request approval		Yes/No
NCF 29	Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval		
NCF 30	Date on which the nonconformity was closed		

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-6**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	30.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	X
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	2.5.3.c
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		The farm workers need more training in verifying species on all incidents
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		Records reveals that species are not always registered with certainty
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		None. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017

NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	The farm workers have insufficient knowledge to identify various marine sea bird species. Mats W. Snåre 28.06.17
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	A document has been sent out to all Cermaq sites informing about changes in rutines regarding bird identification (document attached). The document includes instructions to proper species identification and instructing sites to document birds with photos and consulting environmental coordinator in cases where they are uncertain. Mats W. Snåre - 28.06.2017
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Documentation seen. Shoud be followed up on next audit. NC closed
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	A document has been sent out to all Cermaq sites informing about changes in rutines regarding bird identification (document attached). The document includes instructions to proper species identification and instructing sites to document birds with photos and consulting environmental coordinator in cases where they are uncertain. Mats W. Snåre 28.06.17
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Documentation seen. NC closed
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	Yes/No
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	

NCF 30	Date on which the nonconformity was closed	14.08.2017

Nonconfomity Report Form

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised.

Ref#	*Text to be provided by*			
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	**IA-2017-7**	
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Odd H. Johannessen	
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	31.05.2017	
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	IA-2017	
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpreation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been appoved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interperation log reference.		N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.		N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open	
NCF 7	CAB		Closed	X
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major	
NCF 9	CAB		Minor	
NCF 10	CAB		Observation	
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity		Sureveillance audit 2018 for closing.
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity		Minor nonconformity. To be closed before SA 2018. Subject to DNVGL approved corrective action plan.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document	ASC Salmon standard
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number	5.2.5.b
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement	Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII Requirement: PTI score ≤ 13
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity		PTI Score: 13,2
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected		Information from FarmControl and other documentation shown during audit
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)		None. Mats W. Snåre 07.07.2017

NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	PTI ended on a high value due to the use of a combination-treatment at the end of 14G Mats W. Snåre - 07.07.2017
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	See attched statement from fish health manager. Mats W. Snåre - 07.07.2017
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Analysis adequate. The statement has been read and we accept the arguments used. The third lice treatment was done with a combination of two chemoterapeutants. The PTI for both have been calculated in full. If only one chemoterapeutant had been used the PTI would have been 8.4. We have calculated to show maximum PTI. The situation for the 14G was exceptional, and for the 16G the site is back to a normal situation where the PTI so far is 0,47
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	See attched statement from fish health manager. Mats W. Snåre - 07.07.2017
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	ODDJO 14.08.17: Statement accepted. Documentation seen. NC closed
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	Yes/No
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	
NCF 30		Date on which the nonconformity was closed	14.08.2017

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	kim.andre.karlsen@dnvgl.com guro.meldre.pedersen@dnvgl.com

1.5 ASC DOCUMENT REFERENCE

ASC Salmon Standard Version 1.0 June 2012.
Principle 8, Criterion 8.4 Maximum total amount of phosphorus.

1.6 BACKGROUND (PROVIDE FULL EXPLANATION OF THE ISSUE)

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.

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

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).
As noted on page 23 of the ASC salmon standard the SAD technical group has recognized that the effects of nutrient loading into costal 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."

Howarth RW and Marino R (2006). Nitrogen as the limiting nutrient for eutrophication in coastal marine ecosystems: evolving views over three decades. Limnol. Oceanogr., 51, 364–376

OECD (1982): Eutrophication of waters: Monitoring, assessment and control. Organisation for Economic and Cooperative Development, Paris, France

Schindler DW (1977): Evolution of phosphorus limitation in lakes. Science 195, 260-262

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	
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. FYI: The ASC Standards will be reviewed periodically (at a minimum once per 5 years) and the criteria/requirement for this issue may change.	

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

1.5 ASC Document Reference

Criteria 5.2.5

Indicator: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII

Requirement: PTI score ≤ 13

Indicator Compliance Criteria

1.6 Background (Provide full explanation of the issue)

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.

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.

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.

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 3rd time at 88% of MTQ. Total amount of EMBZ discharged = 1.0766kg

Proposed PTI calculation:

4 x 0.8 x 1 x 1 x 0.12 = 0.384

4 x 0.8 x 2 x 1 x 0.23 = 1.472

4 x 0.8 x 2 x 1 x 0.88 = 5.2

Total = 7.056

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.

PTI calculation:

4 x 0.8 x 1 x 1 x 1 = 3.2

4 x 0.8 x 2 x 1 x 1 = 6.4

4 x 0.8 x 2 x 1 x 1 = 6.4

Total = 16

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
☒ 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	
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. (Two documents regarding the sea lice management were received from Marine Harvest Scotland (by Catarina) on 20/08/2015 - Saved under the farm file)	

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	• Kim Andre Karlsen • Guro Meldre Pedersen • Sander Buijs	Kim.Andre.Karlsen@dnvgl.com Guro.Meldre.Pedersen@dnvgl.com Sander.Buijs@dnvgl.com

1.5 ASC DOCUMENT REFERENCE

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.

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.

Audit notification: 17.2.4.2 The notice shall be in the local language(s) and English.

1.6 BACKGROUND (PROVIDE FULL EXPLANATION OF THE ISSUE)

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.

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:

- Allow the Audit report in its entirety to be published only in the English version.
- Allow the Audit notification to be published only in the English version.

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.

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.

1.7 Recommended action / decision

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☐Closed	24/08/2016
2.3 ASC DETERMINATION ON VARIANCE REQUEST	
This VR is approved.	
2.4 ASC INTERPRETATION	
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. 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 (http://www.ef.nl/epi/) 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.	