

Audit Announcement (Form 3)

Please note that all data entered in this audit announcement sheet will be automatically populated to the specific fields in the sheets of the audit report itself. SiteID(s) is/are provided by ASC in the confirmation email of the publication of this Form 3.

1. General, client/CAB information

1.1 Document Type	Final Report
1.2 Document language	English
1.3 Second document language	N/A
1.4 Unit of certification type	Single Site
1.4.1 Company name	Lingalås AS
1.4.2 UoC Name	Jibbersholmane
1.5 Country where UoC is located	Norway
1.6 ASQ Standard	Salmon
1.7 Standard version	1,3
1.8 Certification process is subject to CAR version	2,2
1.9 Name of the Conformity assessment body (CAB)	DNV GL Business Assurance Norway AS

Client contact person - from the UoC

1.15 First name	Paivi
1.16 Surname	Teivainen-Laedre
1.17 Position in the UoC (Job title)	Consultant
1.18 Email address	paivi.laedre@proactima.com
1.19 Phone number	90030650
1.20 Other means of contact e.g. Skype	www.lingalaks.no

2. Audit information

2.1	ASC standard principles covered by the audit			
	2.1.1	Principle 1	Covered	
	2.1.2	Principle 2	Covered	
	2.1.3	Principle 3	Covered	
	2.1.4	Principle 4	Covered	
	2.1.5	Principle 5	Covered	
	2.1.6	Principle 6	Covered	
	2.1.7	Principle 7	Covered	
	2.1.8	Principle 8	Covered	
	ASC standard principles			
2.2	Activities covered under the scope of the certification and under the scope of the audit.			
	Activities in the table apply to final product only.			
	Activity	Under scope of certification	Under Scope of this audit	Notes
	2.2.1	Stocking	Not Covered	
	2.2.2	Nursing	Not Covered	
	2.2.3	Growing Out	Covered	
	2.2.4	Transferring	Covered	
	2.2.5	Harvest	Covered	From cage to wellboat
	2.2.6	Vaccination	Covered	
	2.2.7	Fallowing	Covered	
	2.2.8	Transportation	Covered	
	2.2.9	Storage (if present at farm)	Not Covered	
	2.2.10	Processing (if present at farm)	Covered	
	2.2.11	Packing (if present at farm)	Covered	
	2.2.12	Other (Please describe)	Not Covered	Covered
2.3	Certification cycle			
	2			
	Recertification audit			
	No			
	The site does not have fish at the time of the audit			
2.7	Audit conducted (On-site/Remote):			
	On-site			

Please indicate the hours assigned to the different audit activities in the table below, separated by the hours spend on the activities by the environmental- and social auditor(s):

2.8	2.9	2.10
Time assigned to audit activities	Social Auditor(s)	Environmental auditor(s)
Off-site activities	3	17
On-site activities	3	17
Total man days	0,75	4,25

[illegible]

3. Site information

3.2	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.13	3.14	3.15	3.16	3.17	3.18
Site name	Ownership	Primary culture species	Cycle duration	Latitude (N, S) (00.000000)*	Longitude (E, W) (00.000000)*	Production system*	Number of production units	Start date of audit	End date of audit
Jibbersholmene	Owned	Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>)	Long-cycle species (6 months)	60,750169	4,885064	Cages - circular plastic	8	04 July 2022	08 July 2022

4. Stakeholder engagement

[illegible]

1. General, client/CAB information

- 1.1 Document Type
- 1.2 Document language
- 1.3 Second document language
- 1.4 Unit of certification type
- 1.4.1 Company name
- 1.4.2 UoC name
- 1.5 Country where UoC is located
- 1.6 ASC Standard
- 1.7 Standard version
- 1.8 Certification process is subject to CAR version

Final Report
English
N/A
Single Site
Lingalaks AS
Jibbersholmane
Norway
Salmon
1,3
2,2

- 1.9 Name of the Conformity assessment body (CAB)

DNV GL Business Assurance Norway AS

Client contact person - from the UoC

- 1.15 First name
- 1.16 Surname
- 1.17 Position in the UoC (Job title)
- 1.18 Email address
- 1.19 Phone number
- 1.20 Other means of contact e.g. Skype

Paivi Päivi
Teivainen-Lædre
Quality manager
paivi.laedre@lingalaks.no
90030650
www.lingalaks.no

2) Audit information

Date - Audit announcement published on ASC website	mandag 23. mai 2022	
Date - Draft report published on ASC website	fredag 19. august 2022	
Date - Final report submitted to ASC Audit ID ASC standard principles covered by the audit	tirsdag 4. oktober 2022	
	A0006208	
	Principle 1	Covered
	Principle 2	Covered
	Principle 3	Covered
	Principle 4	Covered
	Principle 5	Covered
	Principle 6	Covered
	Principle 7	Covered
	Principle 8	Covered

Activities covered under the scope of the certification and under the scope of the audit. <i>Activities in the table apply to final product only.</i>	Activity	Under scope of certification	Under Scope of this audit	Notes
	2.6.1 Stocking	Not Covered	Not Covered	
	2.6.2 Nursing	Not Covered	Not Covered	
	2.6.3 Growing Out	Covered	Covered	
	2.6.4 Transferring	Covered	Covered	
	2.6.5 Harvest	Covered	Covered	
	2.6.6 Vaccination	Covered	Covered	
	2.6.7 Fallowing	Covered	Covered	
	2.6.8 Transportation	Covered	Covered	
	2.6.9 Storage (if present at farm)	Not Covered	Covered	
	2.6.10 Processing (if present at farm)	Not Covered	Covered	
	2.6.11 Packing (if present at farm)	Not Covered	Covered	
	2.6.12 Other (Please describe)	Not Covered	Covered	

Certification cycle	2
Audit type	Recertification audit
Audit number in certification cycle	
Will harvesting be witnessed during audit?	No
If harvest is NOT witnessed, please justify:	The site do not have fish at the time of the audit
Audit conducted (On-site/Remote):	On-site

Please indicate the hours assigned to the different audit activities in the table below, separated by the hours spend on the activities by the environmental- and social auditor(s):

2.12.1	2.12.2	2.12.3
Time assigned to audit activities	Social Auditor(s)	Environmental auditor(s)
Off-site activities	3	17
On-site activities	3	17
Total man days	0,75	4,25

Audit team and other involved persons				
2.13	2.14	2.15	2.16	2.17
Surname	First name	Role	Expertise needed for the audit (required for technical experts only)	Person on-site or remote?
Gjefsen	Torgun	Audit team leader		On-site
Gjefsen	Torgun	Social Auditor		On-site

3. Site information

List all sites here, that are included in the certificate.

GIS, polygon data and map on site level validated by auditor?

Yes

S.1	S.2	S.3	S.4	S.5	S.13	S.14	S.15	S.16	S.17	S.18	S.19	S.20	S.21	S.22	S.22.1	S.22.2	S.23	S.23.1	S.24	S.25	S.26	S.26.1	S.27	S.28	S.29	S.30	S.31	S.32
Site ID - provided by ASC with publication confirmation of audit announcement	Site name	Ownership	Primary culture species	Secondary species (choose multiple species as relevant)	Latitude (N, S) (00.000000)*	Longitude (E, W) (00.000000)*	Production system	Number of production units	Production type	Production method	Date of inclusion into the UoC (for scope extension/group/multi-site)	Start date of audit	End date of audit	First date of juvenile stocking for the current production cycle	Estimated Number of months post audit to peak biomass/ first harvest	Status at the time of the current audit	List of other certificates (choose multiple options as relevant)	List of other certificates: If S.23.1 is "Other", please list the certificates:	Is the site partially certified?	If partially certified, which part is not in the UoC and why?	The volumes indicated in the fields S.27-S.30 apply to the following full calendar year:	Type of volumes indicated in S.27-S.30	ASC-certified production volume (in Kg)	Non ASC-certified production volume (in Kg)	Dispatched or sold as ASC-certified Volume (in Kg)	Dispatched or sold as non ASC-certified Volume (in Kg)	For Rivalve/Abalone: Volumes indicate in S.27 - S.30 are given in live weight equivalent or volume without shell	Note/ Other information
5112	Jibbersholmsholman	Owned	Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar)		60.750169	4.885064	Cages - circular plastic	8,000000	44728,000000	Intensive		mandag 4. juli 2022	fredag 8. juli 2022		20	Fallowing	GlobalGAP		No		2021	Actual volume	3368948		378000	2448000		

4. Harvest witnessing

4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8
Site ID - provided by ASC with publication confirmation of audit announcement.	Site name	Date of witnessed harvest:	Production unit ID:	Volume harvested (in Kg):	Average weight of animals (in g)	Partial harvest / full harvest:	Note/ Other information
5112	Jibbersholmane						There was no harvest during the audit

ASC takes data protection very seriously. ASC will only use any personal information you give us in connection with the audit report. For more information please read our privacy policy, which can be found here:

[ASC Privacy policy](#)
Provide stakeholder comments including CAB response, **please use the confidential Annex-2 in case of any confidential data not to be published.**

This table collects all the information relevant to stakeholders consulted during the audit process. Each stakeholder should be entered into a separate row, even where from the same company/organization

[illegible]

1) General, Client and CAB information



Means of transportation between office and site(s) and between sites within UoC
Estimated travel time between office and site(s) and between sites within UoC
Number of complaints received from stakeholders over past 12 months
Number of resolved complaints
Average time to resolve complaints (**days**)
Last Social Impacts Assessment (SIA) conducted in (**year**)

Name of nearby communities, Indigenous or not and the distance of the UoC to the nearest neighbouring community/-ies or neighbours (in km)

Name of nearby community	Indigenous	Distance of the UoC to the nearest neighbouring community/-ies or neighbours (in km)

Social audits performed at UoC

Standard	Certified since (Date)	Certified until (Date)	Date of last audit (Date)
SA8000			
BSCI	N/A	N/A	
SMETA	N/A	N/A	
ISO 45000			
ASC			
Others (specify)			

Subcontractors

Name of subcontractors	Place of work	Areas of work/processes

7. ASC CAR 17.6.1-2 Substitution risk assessment

Please note that auditor training on farm traceability is also covered in the MSC farm traceability module

7.1	Activities covered under the scope of the certification and under the scope of the audit	
	Activity	Under scope of certification
	Stocking	Not Covered
	Nursing	Not Covered
	Growing Out	Covered
	Transferring	Covered
	Harvest	Covered
	Vaccination	Covered
	Feeding	Covered
	Transportation	Covered
	Storage (if present at farm)	Not Covered
	Processing (if present at farm)	Not Covered
	Packing (if present at farm)	Not Covered
	Other (Please describe)	Not Covered

7.2	1. Possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance, species, produced within the same operation.	
	a) Partial Certification	no
	Reason for partial certification:	
	b) Similar appearance species produced in the UoC	no
	Similar appearance species:	
	Production units or batches excluded from the certification scope	
	c) Average % of products produced as non-ASC in the UoC per year	
	d) Traceability and segregation systems	n/a
	Description	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Segregation systems for non-ASC product	
	Description	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Traceability records identification	
	Description	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Other traceability systems in place:	
	Do the traceability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks?	
	Rationale	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	

7.3	2. 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.	
	a) Non-ASC farms of the same or similar species limiting with the UoC	no
	Description of neighbour farms	
	b) Non-ASC Neighbour farms owned or related to the same UoC	no
	If yes, Name of farms in case are related to the client:	
	c) Non-ASC products from other farms handled in the UoC	no
	Stage(s) when the non-ASC products are handled in the UoC	
	d) Segregation systems	n/a
	Description	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (stage). Transport from one seaside to the slaughterhouse at the time, only.	
	Physical identification	
	Description	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (stage). Transport from one seaside to the slaughterhouse at the time, only.	
	Segregation systems for non-ASC product	
	Description	
	Traceability records identification	
	Description	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (stage). Transport from one seaside to the slaughterhouse at the time, only.	
	Others systems:	
	Do the traceability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks?	
	Rationale	
	No risk of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit.	
	Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (stage). Transport from one seaside to the slaughterhouse at the time, only.	

7.4	3. Possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.	
	a) Company uses subcontracted services for harvesting, processing, packing or labelling	yes
	Description	
	Only approved wellboats used for harvest and certified slaughterhouses used for slaughtering, packing and labelling	
	b) Company uses subcontracted services providers for storage or transportation	yes
	Description	
	Only approved wellboats used for harvest and certified slaughterhouses used for slaughtering, packing and labelling	
	c) Traceability and segregation systems	yes
	Subcontractors are CoC certified	
	Description	
	Only approved wellboats is used during transshipments of salmon between the site and waiting cages/harvest plant. Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting/ 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 (stage).	
	All information is kept both in electronic system FishTalk and Maritech Innova in hard copies.	
	Contract and/or agreements in place including traceability conditions	
	Description	
	Only approved wellboats is used during transshipments of salmon between the site and waiting cages/harvest plant. Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting/ 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 (stage).	
	All information is kept both in electronic system FishTalk and Maritech Innova in hard copies.	
	Traceability records identification	
	Description	
	Only approved wellboats is used during transshipments of salmon between the site and waiting cages/harvest plant. Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting/ 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 (stage).	
	All information is kept both in electronic system FishTalk and Maritech Innova in hard copies.	
	Others systems:	
	Do the traceability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks?	
	Rationale	
	Only approved wellboats is used during transshipments of salmon between the site and waiting cages/harvest plant. Biosecurity legislation and implemented QMS management system and procedures at the site and within the company prevent the wellboats from visiting/ 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 (stage).	
	All information is kept both in electronic system FishTalk and Maritech Innova in hard copies.	

7.5	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.	
	Risk	Level
	a)	n/a
	Description	
	b)	n/a
	Description	
	c)	n/a
	Description	
	d) Traceability and segregation systems available for the risks above	n/a
	Description	
	Do the traceability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks?	
	Rationale	

ASC CAR 17.6.3-5 Product flow, traceability and segregation

Please describe the product flow within the UoC
Ongrowing production from juveniles (smolt) to harvest size
Conduct a traceability test of harvested products. In Case of partial certification perform a traceability test for ASC and non-ASC products.

Product Identification Code	20.15.007
-----------------------------	-----------

7.6	Production stage	Details of Documentation Reviewed		Description of how codes or documents link product at each stage
		Description	Date	
	A) Cage 007	FishTalk CV; Product information	02.08.2022	20.15.007 delivered from Finn autumn 2020, Ova from Mowil
	B) Smolt from unit 1205, Finn	FishTalk Setsteth CV; Product information	31.08.2020	Deliverance from Finn ova from Mowil - delivered to Lingtals
	C)			
	D)			
	E)			
	F)			
	G)			
	H)			
	I)			
	J)			
	K)			
	L)			
	M)			

7.7	Traceability test(s) successfully conducted	yes
7.8	Traceability information allows to link each stage of handling certified products	yes

ASC CAR 17.6.6.1-2 Traceability determination

7.9	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	yes
7.10	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	Coc not needed
7.11	Rationale for the decision	
	Products are authorised to enter an ASC Chain of Custody certification at the point where the fish is moved from the wellboat/fin 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.	
	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 is specified is needed and takes over in the ASC Salmon/ASC CoC certification process.	

ASC CAR 17.6.10.1 Point of First sale / handling

7.12	Entity name	CoC code
	Bremnes Seashore	ASC-C-01795
	Harstadeg Fiskeforreting	ASC-C-00424

ASC CAR 17.6.10.2 The point from which chain of custody is required to begin

7.13	From transportation from the UoC to the first point of sale or handling.	
7.13.1		

Product Identification Code	Details of Documentation Reviewed		Description of how codes or documents link product at each stage
	Description	Date	
A)			
B)			
C)			
D)			
E)			
F)			
G)			
H)			
I)			
J)			
K)			
L)			
M)			

8. UoC volumes & Audit Closing

Please indicate the correct volumes of the applicable quarter and year.

Volume reporting for complete UoC					
Quarter of the year:		Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
8,1	The volumes indicated in this table apply to the following year:	2021	2021	2021	2021
8.1.1	Type of volumes indicated in 8.2 - 8.5	0	0	0	0
8,2	ASC-certified production volume (in Kg)	461635	1191969	1351515	363829
8,3	Non ASC-certified production volume (in Kg)	0	0	0	0
8,4	Dispatched or sold as ASC-certified Volume (in Kg)	0	0	238000	140000
8,5	Dispatched or sold as non ASC-certified Volume (in Kg)	0	0	1160000	1288000

Decision		
8.6	Certification decision	The final certification decision has been taken after needed activities, as per ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements Version 2.2 April 2019.
8.7	Certificate valid from	
8.8	Certificate valid till	
8.9	Eligibility date	

Confidential Annexes		Annex filled in?	Annex submitted to ASC?
8,10	Annex-1 Interviewee information	Yes	No
8,11	Annex-2 Stakeholder comments	Yes	No
8,12	Annex-3 Social information	No	No
8,13	Annex-4 Volume data	Yes	No

9. Open & Extended NCs

Please indicate in the table below **ONLY** the non-conformities detected in the previous audit, which had the status: open or extended in the previous final audit report.

This table is to evaluate the closure of the open/extended non-conformities from the previous audit. Add rows to the tables as needed.

[illegible]

10. B-EIA & p-SIA checklist

Checklist and guideline for auditors on a complete B-EIA & p-SIA process and report.
Please find all requirements for B-EIA and p-SIA in the ASC standards.

Biodiversity-inclusive Environmental Impact Assessment		
	B-EIA checklist	Validated by auditor? Notes
10,1	1. Quality of the B-EIA process (e.g., was it participatory and transparent?). B-EIA carried out by a valid expert in accordance with requirements lined out in the ASC standards.	
10,2	(b) The B-EIA was publicly (locally) communicated with sufficient time for interested parties to participate and/or get informed.	
10,3	(c) Stakeholders are listed and impact descriptions are documented and in preparation of the final B-EIA report, meetings with the listed stakeholders (or by stakeholders chosen representatives) have taken place.	
10,4	(d) These meetings have been recorded and the minutes are attached to the final report; names and contact details of participating stakeholders included.	
10,5	(e) Evidence is provided that draft and final B-EIA reports have been submitted to local government representatives and, if requested by stakeholders, a legally registered civil organization chosen by these stakeholders.	
10,6	(f) Evidence is provided that the final B-EIA reports have been submitted and reviewed by a specialist with appropriate expertise on biodiversity issues.	
10,7	(g) B-EIA completed according to guidance on B-EIA and pSIA relationship (transparency and consultation).	
10,8	2. Risk analysis: actual (past and present) impacts of the current farms, or potential impacts of the intended farm or expansion of existing farm and at least two alternatives (one of these is the “no farm or no expansion” scenario). Concepts to cover include:	
10,9	(a) The type of farming, possible alternatives and a summary of activities likely to affect biodiversity.	
10,10	(b) An analysis of opportunities and constraints for biodiversity (include “no net biodiversity loss” or “biodiversity restoration” alternatives).	
10,11	(c) Expected biophysical changes (in soil, water, air, flora and fauna) resulting from proposed or existing activities or induced by any socioeconomic changes.	
10,12	(d) Spatial and temporal scale of influence, identifying effects on connectivity between ecosystems, and potential cumulative effects.	
10,13	(e) Available information on baseline conditions and any anticipated trends in biodiversity in the absence of the proposal.	
10,14	(f) Likely biodiversity impacts associated with the proposal or current operations in terms of composition, structure and function of surrounding ecosystems	
10,15	(g) Biodiversity services and values identified in consultation with stakeholders and anticipated magnitude, direction and timeline of changes in these (highlight any irreversible impacts).	
10,16	(h) Possible measures to avoid, minimize or compensate for significant biodiversity damage or loss, making reference to any legal requirements. Information required to support decision making and summary of important gaps.	
10,17	(j) Proposed IA methodology and timescale.	
10,18	3. Impact statement is available and contains all of the requirements listed above along with a clear indication of authors and affiliations.	
10,19	4. Review process, reviewers (decision makers), and decisions clearly documented.	
10,20	5. Clear understanding as to how options for mitigation and offsetting were determined and how avoidance actions were prioritized over compensation	
10,21	6. Names, affiliations and experience of the reviewing specialist are documented and clear understanding of how affected groups were involved and how balanced consideration was given to conservation vs. development goals in the peer review.	
10,22	7. Clear articulation of a biodiversity management system including targets and monitoring strategies for mitigation.	

Participatory Social Impact Assessment		
	p-SIA checklist	Validated by auditor? Notes
10,23	1. Quality of the p-SIA process (e.g., is it participatory and transparent).	
10,24	(a) The intent to conduct a p-SIA is locally publicly communicated with sufficient time for interested parties to participate and/or get informed.	
10,25	(b) In listing stakeholders, in making impact descriptions, and in preparation of a final p-SIA report-document meetings with the listed stakeholders (or by stakeholders chosen representatives) have taken place.	
10,26	(c) These meetings have been minuted and these records are attached to the final report; names and contact details of participating stakeholders are included.	
10,27	(d) Evidence is provided that draft and final p-SIA reports have been submitted to a local government representative and, if stakeholders so desire, to a (by stakeholders chosen) legally registered civil organization.	
10,28	(e) B-EIA done and completed according to guidance in the ASC standards (appropriate accreditation and consultation).	
10,29	2. The risks and actual (past and present) impacts of the current or intended farm and at least two alternatives (one of these is the “no farm or no expansion” scenario). Concepts to cover include:	
10,30	(a) Economic aspects (influence on employment opportunities, influence on other livelihoods in community).	
10,31	(b) Natural resource access and use (land and water tenure, influence on quality and availability of natural resources including water).	
10,32	(c) Human assets (food security, health and safety, education, indigenous knowledge).	
10,33	(d) Physical infrastructure (access to roads, electricity, telephone, housing, waste disposal systems).	
10,34	(e) Social and cultural aspects (indigenous/traditional/customary rights and beliefs, social exclusion/inclusion, gender equity, changes in age composition of the community, local informal institutions and organizations).	
10,35	(f) Governance aspects (influence of aquaculture on norms, taboos, regulations, laws, conflict management and whether these changes add up to more or less transparency, accountability and participation in decision making.	
10,36	3. Research and report probable impacts that are likely to be most important. In doing this, it is important to arrange meetings with stakeholders to let them prioritize and to let them express how they assess/view/feel; identify both positive and negative risks and impacts.	
10,37	4. Do deeper investigations into priority impacts with a focus on the question: “What changes will lead to if they indeed come about?” These include:	
10,38	(a) Physical effects to man-made and natural structures and processes.	
10,39	(b) Likely adaptations and the social and economic effects of making such adaptations.	
10,40	(c) How these effects and indirect effects would compare to having no intervention.	
10,41	(d) How effects may or might be cumulative.	
10,42	5. Make recommendations to maximize the positive and minimize the negative, with consideration to compensation options for those lands and people impacted. Also include recommendations on how to avoid these issues with the intended farm or farm development.	
10,43	6. Propose a mitigation plan assuming the farm development will take place or continue (in an adapted form if that seems appropriate); include a “closure and reclamation plan” explaining how repair or restoration will take place after farm closure or bankruptcy	
10,44	7. Develop and approve with all stakeholders a monitoring plan and indicators on both positive and negative risks and impacts (make use of FDG and/or PRA methodologies in this step).	
10,45	8. A summary with recommendations and conclusions is made available to all involved in the process and, through local public notices, made accessible to all members of the local community.	

Adjust the column width as needed to show the whole text or provide more space to write
Corresponds to ASC Salmon standard version 1.3

													Proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB	Proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB	Proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB					
Indicator Number	Indicator Text	Audit Evidence	Overall Indicator evaluation	Description, justification and conclusion for the evaluation decision	Date of NC detection	Deadline for NC close-out	Actual date of close-out	NC Status	VR submitted	Status of submitted VR	VR used	G&A submitted /used	Root cause analysis	NC correction	NC Corrective action	Auditor evaluation	Extension justification	New deadline for NC close-out	Notes	
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	Electronic copies of laws, regulations and requirements with references to Lovdata with updates and electronic links in LANDAX system. Covered by internal procedures in LANDAX. Strict monitored by relevant authorities on these issues License from Hordaland Fylkeskommune, d.t. 25.11.2014, ref 2014/19397-18 MTB 3620 tons, site 11665 Jibbersholman, signed Bård Sandal, standard requirements Discharge license ref no 2014/0603.T .d.t.20.11.2014 from Fylkesmannen i Hordaland (signed Tom Pedersen), MTB 3620 tons, standard requirements Production plan for 2022-2023, ref 21/14280, approved by Fiskeridirektoratet d.t.28.11.2021 Also seen changes in production plan approved dated 21/14272 dated 01.30.2022 No inspections from Fylkesmannen regarding discharge license or NFD (Fiskeridirektoratet) Mattilsynet (NFSO) had been on a visit 14.08.2021, no NC report dated 05.09.2021 Seen map from NFD (Fiskeridirektoratet) and "miljøstatus.no", site and national preservation areas are not in conflict with site Jibbersholman Statement d.t. 30.08.2021, signed by CEO Kristian Botnen Lingalaks AS, site not in conflict with any national preservation areas.	Compliant																	
1.1.2	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	Authorised auditor statement d.t. 05.05.2022 for Lingalaks AS (organisation no 960 900 626), KPMG (HS) Links to relevant laws in LANDAX (electronic quality system). License from Hordaland Fylkeskommune, d.t. 25.11.2014, ref 2014/19397-18 MTB 3620 tons, site 11665 Jibbersholman, signed Bård Sandal, standard requirements Discharge license ref no 2014/0603.T .d.t.20.11.2014 from Fylkesmannen i Hordaland (signed Tom Pedersen), MTB 3620 tons, standard requirements Production plan for 2021-2022, ref 20/15030, approved by Fiskeridirektoratet d.t.07.01.2021 Registered in national company register "Enhetsregisteret" 10.05.1991, Lingalaks AS (organisation nr. 960 900 626)	Compliant																	
1.1.3	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant nation and local labour laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	Online access to lovdata.no with laws and regulations. Seen report from NLA (Arbeidstilsynet) ref no 2020/15013, dated 26.06.2020, 4 NC, 3 NC's are closed. 1 NC has extended timelimit to 15.11.2021 for the last NC, according to letter 2020/15033 dated 13.08.2021	Compliant																	
1.1.4	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	License from Hordaland Fylkeskommune, d.t. 25.11.2014, ref 2014/19397-18 MTB 3620 tons, site 11665 Jibbersholman, signed Bård Sandal, standard requirements Discharge license ref no 2014/0603.T .d.t.20.11.2014 from Fylkesmannen i Hordaland (signed Tom Pedersen), MTB 3620 tons, standard requirements Production plan for 2022-2023, ref 21/14280, approved by Fiskeridirektoratet d.t.28.11.2021. Also seen changes in production plan approved dated 21/14272 dated 01.30.2022 Registered in national company register "Enhetsregisteret" 10.05.1991, Lingalaks AS (organisation nr. 960 900 626) As described in above permits. Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. 103639-01-001, dt.13.01.2022. Sampling date 08.10.2021 MOM-8, 03.11.2021(field work 08.10.2021), report no 103638-01-001, status 1 - very good, performed by Åkerblå MTB reported to government/ Altinn end of month Environmental reports and surveys reported to Altinn max 1 month after felt sampling done and results available from contractor. No indications of non compliance.	Compliant																	
2.1.1	Indicator: Redox potential or (S) sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) (6), following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I of the Salmon standard v.1.3 Requirement: Redox potential > 0 mV or Sulphide ≤ 1.500 µMol/L Applicability: All farms except; Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standards under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix VI for requirements on transparency for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC adapted, ISO 16665:2013, ISO 5667:2004). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. 103639-01-001, dt.13.01.2022. Sampling date 08.10.2021. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 + 1 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Sediments Option #1 ASC survey performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass), verified in FishTalk and production reports Redox Eh values ranging from JIB-2 = 389 mV and JIB-5 = 269 mV, in ref point it was 421 mV Redox potential. National regulations (NS 9410) Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022	Compliant																	
2.1.2	Indicator: Faunal index score indicating good (7) to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I of the Salmon standard v.1.3 Requirement: AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI)(B) 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; Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standards under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix VI for requirements on transparency for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC adapted, ISO 16665:2013, ISO 5667:2004). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. 103639-01-001, dt.13.01.2022. Sampling date 08.10.2021. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 + 1 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Opt #2 Shannon Wiener used. Van Veen grab used according to site specific MOM-C (NS9410) ASC survey performed at peak biomass (at >75% peak biomass). Shannon Wiener index score outside AZE: stations JIB-2 = 4.208 and JIB-5 = 5.173 MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal). Independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index. Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022	Compliant																	
2.1.3	Indicator: Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I of the Salmon standard v.1.3 Requirement: ≥ 2 highly abundant (9) taxa that are not pollution indicator species Applicability: All farms except; Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standards under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix VI for requirements on transparency for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.	Olex map and GPS coordinates with ASC sampling points. Site-specific sampling regime (ASC adapted, ISO 16665:2013, ISO 5667:2004). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Point adapted to bathymetric conditions. Performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. 103639-01-001, dt.13.01.2022. Sampling date 08.10.2021. VanVeen grab used according to established method. 5 + 1 sampling stations, sampling in near, intermediate and remote zone. Highly abundant taxa within AZE: stations JIB-1, JIB-3 and JIB-4. RESULT: All stations = >10 MOM-8/C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal). Independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022	Compliant																	
2.1.4	Indicator: Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible (10) modelling system (11) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except; Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standards under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix VI for requirements on transparency for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.	Site-specific sampling regime (ASC dokumentasjon ISO 16665:2013 adapted) Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement). Modified MOM-C according to NS9410 (Norwegian authorities and legislation requirement) Survey developed and performed by Åkerblå AS, report nr. 103639-01-001, dt.13.01.2022	Compliant																	
2.2.1	Indicator: Weekly average percent saturation (16) of dissolved oxygen (DO) (17) on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I of the Salmon standard v.1.3 Requirement: ≥ 70% (18) Applicability: All farms. An exception to this standard shall be made for farms that can demonstrate consistency with a reference site in the same water body.	All weekly calculations show oxygen values above 70%. Saturation. Oxygen measurement autologged with Steinsvik ORBIT probes (two probes in cage 7, depth 7 and 5 meter). Seen report from week 35-2021 to 49-2021, lowest was 75,40%. The fish was slaughtered in week 49. Most data in place, some separate days are missing eg. 10 and 25.09 and 10. and 11.11.21 No measurements below 70% dissolved oxygen has been registered/observed. Oxygen autologged and checked weekly (described in procedure). Calibration weekly (exposing probes to air). Cleaning when necessary. Instructions from equipment producer available. Seen oxygen logg Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022	Minor	All weekly calculations show oxygen values above 70%. Saturation. Oxygen measurement autologged with Steinsvik ORBIT probes (two probes in cage 7, depth 7 and 5 meter). Seen report from week 35-2021 to 49-2021, lowest was 75,40%. The fish was slaughtered in week 49. Most data in place, some separate days are missing eg. 10 and 25.09 and 10. and 11.11.21 No measurements below 70% dissolved oxygen has been registered/observed. Oxygen autologged and checked weekly (described in procedure). Calibration weekly (exposing probes to air). Cleaning when necessary. Instructions from equipment producer available. Seen oxygen logg Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022	06.jul.22	06.jul.23	Closed					A combination of technical error (probes not sending over all data) and human error (central feeding office forgetting to register O2 values). Rootcause 2022: This has taken time because the supplier of the camera system are developing new program to be able to collect oxygen values. the registration will also be registered according to NS 94178 (Laks og regnbuerørret - Enhetlig terminologi og metoder for dokumentasjon av produksjon), who's not in place yet.	Until a more permanent solution is in place, we will measure daily O2 values with handheld probes and register this information in Fishtalk, together with the environmental measurements that are already taken daily (salinity and temperature). A more permanent solution to this non-conformance would be the purchase of oxygen-measurement equipment that sends the information over to a cloud solution automatically, or an improvement in the data collection of already existing sensors (i.e. on cameras). Comment audit NC 22: Registration and measuring of oxygen is done by the feeding central. To be sure of dily registrations this might have to be included in a daily checklist. Deadline manuel registration if oxygen levels are not registered and procedure update: 1. september 22, long term improvements 1. july 23	A more permanent solution to this non-conformance would be the purchase of oxygen-measurement equipment that sends the information over to a cloud solution automatically, or an improvement in the data collection of already existing sensors (i.e. on cameras). This is being looked into as a "DP" (driftsforbedring) task.	2022.09.11 TOG NC closed based on information from the company, checklist 2021.10.26 TOG Root cause and corrective plan is accepted					
2.2.2	Indicator: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/L DO Requirement: 5% Applicability: All	Records confirm all oxygen values above 2 mg/liter DO limit in period 35-2021 to 49-2021, lowest 6,45 mg/l (27.09.2021) Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022	Compliant																	
2.2.3	Indicator: For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets (19), demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently (20) classified as having "good" or "very good" water quality (21) Requirement: Yes (22) Applicability: All farms except, Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt from standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.	Classification and targets for water bodies at the website vann-nett administrated by The Norwegian Water Resources (NVE) and Energy Directorate. The farm is located in Vestland county, Alver municipality. The receiving water-body is "Kvølmosen - Villangosen", ID 0261030603-6-C, and the regional water-body authority is Vestland Fylkeskommune. Classification of the water body is "moderate exposed coast", ecological and chemical quality is defined as "good". Checked 04.07.2022. Details can be reviewed at https://www.vann-nett.no/portal/#/waterbody/0261030603-6-C	Compliant																	

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

5.2.12	<p>Indicator: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO1105)</p> <p>Requirement: None(106)</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Valid WHO list 6th edition 2019 demonstrated</p> <p>List of treatments used is presented, no antibiotics used at site.</p>	Compliant																
5.2.13	<p>Indicator: Number of treatments(107) of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 3</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>No antibiotics used the recent cycles.</p>	Compliant																
5.2.14	<p>Indicator: If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load(108) is at least 15% less than the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p>Requirement: Yes (109)</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>No antibiotics used</p>	N/A																
5.2.15	<p>Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers(110) of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Seen procedure "Sporbarhet" ID 1763, d.1.04.05.2022, inclusive traceability and routines for registration of all therapeutant treatments</p> <p>All information in link on consumer package, traceable from package back to farm and cage by internet link, all therapeutants use stored.</p> <p>Governed by internal procedure in QMS "Sporbarhet". Fish CV follows fish automatically through to customer in Fish Track.Regular treatment records to buyer as Fish Talk CV. New CV is established for every harvest day</p> <p>Seen CV for cage 02, slaughtered 04.11.2021, all treatment and feeding history are included. Slaughtered at Bremnes Seashore</p>	Compliant																
5.3.1	<p>Indicator: Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p>	N/A																
5.3.2	<p>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</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>No consecutive treatments done in present cycle without desired effect.</p>	N/A																
5.3.3	<p>Indicator: Specific rotation, providing that the farm has ≥1 effective medicinal treatment product available, every third treatment must belong to a different family of drugs</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>1 effective medicinal treatment used on last complete production cycle H20 - SLICE</p>	Compliant																
5.4.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class(112)</p> <p>Requirement: 100% (113)</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Exception is allowed for:</p> <p>1) farm sites that have closed, contained production units where there is complete separation of water between units and no sharing of filtration systems or other systems that could spread disease, or,</p> <p>2) farm sites that have ≥55% water recirculation, a pre-entry disease screening protocol, dedicated quarantine capability and biosecurity measures for waste to ensure there is no discharge of live biological material to the natural environment (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of effluent)</p>	<p>In Fish Talk and stocking/harvest reports:</p> <p>Following periode between 18G and 20G: 06.05.20 to 17.07.20</p> <p>In Fish Talk and stocking/harvest reports.</p> <p>Planned stocking 22G 17.07, 15.08 and first week of October 2022</p> <p>Last slaughtering date 20G:18.12.2021</p> <p>First stocking date 20G: 17.07.2020</p> <p>Last stocking date 20G: 04.09.2020</p> <p>Last slaughtering date 18G: 31.01.2020</p> <p>Ova CVs, Smolt CVs, smolts health certificates, all information available in Fishtalk.</p>	Compliant																
5.4.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentified transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality(114), the farm has:</p> <p>1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority</p> <p>2. Increased monitoring and surveillance(115) on the farm and within the ABM</p> <p>3. Promptly(116) made findings publicly available</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Continuous evaluation. No events of UIA category mortality categorised nor suspected at farm. Ref to indicator 5.1.4a for details of monitoring</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p>	Compliant																
5.4.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence of compliance(117) with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code(118)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Seen link in veterinay health plan to relevant internett page OIE Awareness of OIE aquatic Animal Health Code.</p> <p>Fish health management plan "Veterinær Helseplan Lingalak", ID 1722, valid for site Jibbersholmane, d.1.12.04.2022, version 6 B.I.K and E. H is responsible. Signed by Birgit Lillevet Kvåle dated 06.07.2022.</p> <p>Includes measurements for identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites.</p> <p>Confirmed during interviews</p>	Compliant																
5.4.4	<p>Indicator: If an OIE-notifiable disease(119) is confirmed on the farm, evidence that:</p> <p>1. the farm, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected</p> <p>2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM (120)</p> <p>3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease</p> <p>4. the farm promptly(121) made findings publicly available</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Site management and veterinarian has the responsibility to inform governments if notifiable diseases occur:</p> <p>No occurrence of OIE-notifiable diseases</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p>	Compliant																
6.1.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>The right of Freedom of association is ensured. The agreement with trade unions available. Tariff agreement in place for 2020-2022, they are working on a new agreement valid to 2024.</p> <p>Declaration of good social practice, "Erklæring om god sosial praksis", ID 1673, dated 07.04.2022 signed by union representative.</p> <p>Trade union worker representative was elected during trade union meeting of employees.</p> <p>Svein Inge Henriksen for all Lingalak's sites.</p> <p>Safety representatives Jarle Hella (local for Radoey 2021) and Kjetil Tolleshaug (2021) Dan Leander Wilhelmssen (main safety representative for the whole company)</p> <p>The communication open by phone, email, social networks. Safety representative meets employees annually during safety rounds.</p> <p>The representative has possibility to visit farms. Management is encouraging to be organised. TU and worker safety representatives were interviewed and confirmed information presented above.</p>	Compliant																
6.1.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>The job contracts have link to working rules and local tariff agreement, the statement of right for freedom of association is included</p> <p>Declaration of good social practice, "Erklæring om god sosial praksis", ID 1673, dated 07.04.2022 signed by union representative.</p> <p>No documentation that this document is presented to all workers</p> <p>Interview confirms communication. All workers confirmed free possibilities to be organised.</p>	Minor	The job contracts have link to working rules and local tariff agreement, the statement of right for freedom of association is included	07.jul.22	07.jul.23	Open							Human error - information should have been given during "allmate" in June.	Inform employees in "hast allmate", consider and implement permanent routines to ensure information on changes, deadline 1. november 22	2022.09.11. TOG	Plan for closure of NC accepted		
6.1.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>During audit no outstanding cases identified.</p> <p>Collective bargaining is implemented during consultations and agreement with Trade unions.</p> <p>The sector Tariff agreement is in place for 2018-2020, agreement is continued.</p> <p>Local collective bargaining agreement (lønnsregulativ) in Lingalak's for 2021, this agreement is agreed yearly (03).</p>	Compliant																
6.2.1	<p>Indicator: Number of incidences of child(123) labour(124)</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All except; Child: Any person under 15 years of age. A higher age would apply if the minimum age law of an area stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling. Minimum age may be ≥14 if the country allows it under the developing country exceptions in ILO convention 138.</p>	<p>Standard requirements apply.</p> <p>Minimum age of permanent workers is over 18. Extra worker (summer worker) is 16 years.</p> <p>The information is maintained in contracts and HR records.</p>	Compliant																
6.2.2	<p>Indicator: Percentage of young workers(125) that are protected(126)</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Training procedure (ID 1696) "Opplæring" dated 14.05.2020 for employees has dedicated chapters for young workers training.</p> <p>The procedure of Young workers is defined, but it has limited specific information about job limitations. There is an attachment to job contracts for young workers specifying that they can not work overtime.</p> <p>Identification process is in place. No young workers employed at the time of the audit.</p> <p>The time sheets in Tidsbank program, interview with workers and site manager.</p> <p>Typical scheme is 8 hours per day on work days and or weekends.</p> <p>Verified no young workers doing overtime in holidays or weekends</p> <p>The dedicated risk analysis covering Young workers' work at sites to be organised in case of employment</p> <p>Site was inspected, but no young workers employed.</p>	Compliant																
6.3.1	<p>Indicator: Number of incidences of forced(129), bonded(130) or compulsory labour</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Contracts are understood. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted.</p> <p>The education programs are credited by company.</p> <p>After shift workers are free to leave.</p> <p>No cases of withhold of identitydocuments, salaries benefits, property or documents identified.</p> <p>Payroll records are maintained.</p>	Compliant																

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

Audit findings Salmon

Corresponds to Salmon Standard v.1.3

[illegible]

Metric table

Where the requirement is "None", please use 0 (zero) if requirement is met

Corresponds to ASC Salmon standard version 1.3

Indicator No	2.1.1a	2.1.1b	2.1.2a	2.1.2b	2.1.2c	2.1.2d	2.1.3	4.7.4	5.2.2	5.2.3	5.2.11
Impact Category	Benthic	Benthic	Benthic	Benthic	Benthic	Benthic	Benthic	Benthic	Chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants
Indicator Text	Redox potential in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) (in mV), following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1.	Sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) (in µMol/L), following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1.	AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI)	Shannon-Wiener Index	Benthic Quality Index (BQI)	Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI)	Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology (highly abundant taxa that are not pollution indicator species) outlined in Appendix I-1	Evidence that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight OR in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentration as measured at three reference sites in the water body	Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries	Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian	Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments
Requirement/ Site ID	> 0 mV	≤ 1,500 µMol/L	≤ 3.3	> 3	≥ 15	≥ 25	≥ 70%	Yes	None	100 %	None
5112	✓269			✓4,208			✓3	✓0	✓0	✓100	✓0

5.2.12	5.2.13	8.12	8.15	8.16	8.17	2.3.1	4.2.1	4.2.2a	4.2.2b	4.4.2c	3.4.1
chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants	Chemicals/therapeutants	Feed	Feed	Feed	Feed	Feed	Mortality/survival/escapes
Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the world health organization	Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle	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.	Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries	Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle	Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO	Percentage of fines [18] in the feed at point of entry to the farm (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) (by weight of the feed)	Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1)	Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1)	Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources (calculated according to Appendix IV-2) (in g/kg feed)	Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent.	Maximum number of escapees in the most recent production cycle
None	≤ 3	100 %	Yes	≤ 3	None	< 1% by weight of the feed	< 1.2	< 2.52	(EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed	100 %	300
✓0	✓0	✓100	✓0	✓0	✓0	✓0,86				✓100	✓0

5.1.3	5.1.4	5.1.5	5.1.6	8,6	2.5.1	3.4.2	5.4.1	8,7	8,13	3.1.7	2.2.1	2.2.2
Mortality/survival/escapes	Mortality/survival/escapes	Mortality/survival/escapes	Mortality/survival/escapes	Mortality/survival/escapes	other	other	other	other	other	Parasites	Water quality	Water quality
Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner	Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis	Maximum viral disease-related mortality on farm during the most recent production cycle	Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6% (of total mortalities)	Maximum number of escapees in the most recent production cycle	Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used	Accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers (%)	Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single year class (%)	Accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish (%)	Percentage of smolt groups tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm	In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2. (mature female lice per farmed fish)	Weekly average percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO) on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4	Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/L DO
100 %	100 %	≤ 10%	≤ 40% of total mortalities	300 fish	0	≥ 98%	100 %	≥98%	100 %	0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish	≥ 70%	5 %
✓100	✓100	✓8,3	✓4,1	✓0	✓0	🟡98	✓100	🟡98	✓100	✗0,2	🟡70	✓0

8.4	8.26	2.5.2	2.5.5	3.2.3	3.3	6.6.1	6.2.2	6.5.1	6.7.1	6.8.2	6.2.1	6.3.1	6.4.2	6.9.1	6.10.1	7.3.1
Water quality	Water quality	Wildlife interactions	Wildlife interactions	Wildlife interactions	Wildlife interaction	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social	Social
Maximum total amount of phosphorus (in kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period) released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1)	Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (Methodology in Appendix VII - 2)	Number of mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on the farm	Maximum number of lethal incidents on the farm over the prior two years (< 9 lethal incidents with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals)	Use of non-native species for sea lice control or on-farm management purposes	Use of transgenic salmon by the farm	The percentage of workers whose basic wage (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage	Percentage of young workers that are protected	Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures and policies on a yearly basis	Percentage of workers who have contracts	Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed within a 90-day timeframe	Number of incidences of child labour	Number of incidences of forced, bonded or compulsory labour	Number of incidences of discrimination	Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions	Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws	Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources without community approval
4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period	60 %	0	< 9 lethal incidents, with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals	None	None	0	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	None	None	None	None	None	None
✖ 6,81		✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 100	✔ 100	✔ 100	✔ 100	✖ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0	✔ 0

[illegible]