

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 | Lingalaks AS |
| 1.4.2 UoC name | Jibbersholmane |
| 1.5 Country where UoC is located | Norway |
| 1.6 ASC 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 Päivi |
| 1.16 Surname | Teivainen-Lædre |
| 1.17 Position in the UoC (Job title) | Quality manager |
| 1.18 Email address | paivi.laedre@lingalaks.no |
| 1.19 Phone number | 90030650 |
| 1.20 Other means of contact e.g. Skype | 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 | tirsdag 4. oktober 2022 | |
| Audit ID | A0006208 | |
| ASC standard principles covered by the audit | Principle 1 | Covered |
| | Principle 2 | Covered |
| | Principle 3 | Covered |
| | Principle 4 | Covered |
| | Principle 5 | Covered |
| | Principle 6 | Covered |
| | Principle 7 | Covered |
| | Principle 8 | Covered |

| 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?

| 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.13 | 3.14 | 3.15 | 3.16 | 3.17 | 3.18 | 3.19 | 3.20 | 3.21 | 3.22 | 3.22.1 | 3.22.2 | 3.23 | 3.23.1 | 3.24 | 3.25 | 3.26 | 3.26.1 | 3.27 | 3.28 | 3.29 | 3.30 | 3.31 | 3.32 |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|--|---|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| 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 3.23 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 3.27-3.30 apply to the following full calendar year: | Type of volumes indicated in 3.27-3.30 | 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 3.27 - 3.30 are given in live weight equivalent or volume without shell | Note/ Other information |
| 5112 | Hibbersholm | 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 | Following | 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 |

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

| Activity | Under scope of certification |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Stocking | Not Covered |
| Nursing | Not Covered |
| Spawning Out | Covered |
| Transferring | Covered |
| Harvest | Covered |
| Vaccination | Covered |
| Following | 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 |

| 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 | |
| Tracability and segregation systems | |
| Physical identification | 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 | 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. | |
| Tracability records identification | yes |
| 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 tracability systems in place: | |
| Do the tracability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks? | yes |
| 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. | |

| 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 | |
| Segregation systems | |
| Physical barriers | 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 sea-site to the slaughterhouse at the time only. | |
| Physical identification | 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 sea-site to the slaughterhouse at the time only. | |
| Segregation systems for non-ASC product | N/A |
| Description | |
| Tracability records identification | yes |
| 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 sea-site to the slaughterhouse at the time only. | |
| Other systems: | |
| Do the tracability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks? | N/A |
| 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 sea-site to the slaughterhouse at the time only. | |

| 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 | |
| b) Only approved wellboats used for harvest and certified slaughterhouses used for slaughtering, packing and labelling | yes |
| c) Company uses subcontracted services providers for storage or transportation | yes |
| Description | |
| d) 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 | N/A |
| 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. | |
| Tracability records identification | N/A |
| 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. | |
| Other systems: | |
| Do the tracability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks? | yes |
| 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. | |

| 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 tracability systems mitigate the mixing and substitution risks? | N/A |
| Rationale | |

ASC CAR 17.6.3-5 Product flow, traceability and segregation

Please describe the product flow within the UoC
 Ongoing 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 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|

| | Production stage | Details of Documentation Reviewed | | Description of how codes of documents link product at each stage |
|----|----------------------------|--|------------|--|
| | | Description | Date | |
| A) | Ongoing fish, harvest | FishTalk CV; Product information | 02.08.2021 | 20.15.007; delivered from Finn Aquatics 2020; One from Mow |
| B) | Smolt from unit 1205, Fjon | FishTalk; Setafish CV; Product information | 31.08.2020 | Deliverance from Finn ova from Mow - delivered to Lingtals |
| C) | | | | |
| D) | | | | |
| E) | | | | |
| F) | | | | |
| G) | | | | |
| H) | | | | |
| I) | | | | |
| J) | | | | |
| K) | | | | |
| L) | | | | |
| M) | | | | |

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

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

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

ASC CAR 17.6.6.1-2 Traceability determination

| 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 | |
| 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 | |
| Rationale for the decision | |
| Products are authorized to enter an ASC Chain of Custody certification at the point where the fish is moved from the wellboat/ live fish carrier and delivered direct 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

| Entity name | COC code |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Bjermes Seafood | ASC-C-01795 |
| Haranger Fiskeforvling | ASC-C-02824 |
| | |
| | |

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

| |
|---|
| From transportation from the UoC to the first point of sale or handling |
|---|

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: | | | | |
| 8,1.1 | 2021 | 2021 | 2021 | 2021 | |
| 8,2 | 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 |

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

| 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 | Proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB | | Proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB | | Proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB | | Auditor evaluation | Extension justification | New deadline for NC close-out | Notes | |
|------------------|--|---|------------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | Root cause analysis | NC correction | NC Corrective action | NC Corrective action | NC Corrective action | | | | | | |
| 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.1.20.11.2021 Also seen changes in production plan approved dated 21/14272 dated 01.30.2022 No inspections from Fylkesmannen regarding discharge licence 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.1.07.01.2021 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.1.28.11.2021. 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-B, 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 ≤ 1500 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) 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-B/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 documentation 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 (6) 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 regnbuerret) - Enhettlig 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). This is being looked into as a "DF" (driftsforbedring) task. | 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 "DF" (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 - Villangsoen", 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/porta1/6/waterbody/0261030603-6-C | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3.1.2</p> <p>Indicator: A demonstrated commitment (42) to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water; Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.</p> | <p>Company involved in several research projects, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OJUNO, mandatory for all producers - Blue Planet, analyses of nutrition in fjordsystem, together with Norse Reaserch. - Salmon Tracking project- "SalmonTracking2030", research on wild stock in rivers, together with others producers in production area 3 and 4 - Rein Hardangerfjord, celaning of the local environment - Fjordnet as a member Bergens Næringsråd - No food to waste with UIB - Kabis, cooperation between NGO, academics and companies - Visingssenter <p>Some of the projects described in 3.1.2 a. Includes non-financial support. Evaluated by technical team.</p> <p>They have denied some projects, eg one project denied due to capacity seen documentation dated 13.09.2021</p> <p>Reports from projects above, where Lingalaks AS contribute are publicly available on request to institutions concerned.</p> <p>Projects have mostly webpages, eg salmon tracking, reinhardangerfjord.no</p> <p>There are legal limits for maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and the individual farm. Maximum 0,5 mature female sea lice all year, except in sensitive period (week 16 to week 21) were the action limit is 0,2 mature female lice and moving lice based on the legal authorities regulations for lice control.</p> <p>0,1 internal limit from Monday week 13 to Sunday in week 39.</p> <p>Procedure "Lusetelling og krav til behandling og samordning" ID 1714, dated 08.06.2022 shows regularity of lice count, how to count and maximum sea lice load.</p> <p>Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard AS and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene.</p> <p>Report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene confirmed no weeks above limits 2021 - 2022</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.1.3</p> <p>Indicator: Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water; Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.</p> | <p>There are legal limits for maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and the individual farm. Maximum 0,5 mature female sea lice all year, except in sensitive period (week 16 to week 21) were the action limit is 0,2 mature female lice and moving lice based on the legal authorities regulations for lice control.</p> <p>0,1 internal limit from Monday week 13 to Sunday in week 39.</p> <p>Procedure "Lusetelling og krav til behandling og samordning" ID 1714, dated 08.06.2022 shows regularity of lice count, how to count and maximum sea lice load.</p> <p>Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard AS and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene.</p> <p>Report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene confirmed no weeks above limits 2021 - 2022</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.1.4</p> <p>Indicator: Frequent (43) on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available (44) within seven days of testing</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water; Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.</p> | <p>There are legal limits for maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and the individual farm. Maximum 0,5 mature female sea lice all year, except in sensitive period (week 16 to week 21) were the action limit is 0,2 mature female lice and moving lice based on the legal authorities regulations for lice control.</p> <p>0,1 internal limit from Monday week 13 to Sunday in week 39.</p> <p>Procedure "Lusetelling og krav til behandling og samordning" ID 1714, dated 08.06.2022 shows regularity of lice count, how to count and maximum sea lice load.</p> <p>Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Fishguard AS and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene.</p> <p>Report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene confirmed no weeks above limits 2021 - 2022.</p> <p>Verified functionally link for website to "barentswatch.no". All lice testing is made publicly available</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.1.5</p> <p>Indicator: In areas with wild salmonids, (45) evidence of data (46) and the farm's understanding of that data, around salmonid migration routes, migration timing and stock productivity in major waterways within 50 kilometres of the farm</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water; Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.</p> | <p>Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar) and trout (Salmo trutta) is naturally occurring in the area.</p> <p>Overview with relevant links and report, inclusive fiskingnorge.no/lakseelver, lakseelver.no/nb/news, lakseelver.no/nb/fakta, miljodirektoratet.no, vitenskapsrådet.no.</p> <p>Seen status report from "Risikorapport Norsk Fiskeoppdrett 2022 – Risikovurdering" (Steering Committee for lice level), dated 04.05.2022</p> <p>The report "Status for norske laksebestander 2021" by Vitenskaplig råd for lakseforvaltning shows records from wild salmon surveys since 1983.</p> <p>Seen map from "lakseregisteret" by Norwegian Environment Agency as basis for map with farm and an area of 50 km around (includes salmon rivers/waterways)</p> <p>Sensitive periode is stated in regulation "Forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus i akvakulturanlegg", to be week 16 to week 21</p> <p>Good understanding of issue in the company</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.1.6</p> <p>Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Arctic char, with results made publicly available. See requirements in Appendix II of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water; Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.</p> | <p>Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar) and trout (Salmo trutta) is naturally occurring in the area.</p> <p>Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law. Governmental monitoring and reporting</p> <p>Overview with relevant links and report, inclusive fiskingnorge.no/lakseelver, lakseelver.no/nb/news, lakseelver.no/nb/fakta, miljodirektoratet.no, vitenskapsrådet.no.</p> <p>Seen status report from "Risikorapport Norsk Fiskeoppdrett 2022 – Risikovurdering" (Steering Committee for lice level), dated 04.05.2022</p> <p>The report "Status for norske laksebestander 2021" by Vitenskaplig råd for lakseforvaltning shows records from wild salmon surveys since 1983.</p> <p>Seen map from "lakseregisteret" by Norwegian Environment Agency as basis for map with farm and an area of 50 km around (includes salmon rivers/waterways)</p> <p>Reports public available at governmental webpages: www.lakseregister.fylkesmannen.no, www.nina.no and www.imr.no.</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.1.7</p> <p>Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish (47). See detailed requirements in Appendix II of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water; Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.</p> | <p>Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar) and trout (Salmo trutta) is naturally occurring in the area.</p> <p>Sensitive periode is stated in regulation "Forskrift om bekjempelse av lakselus i akvakulturanlegg", to be week 16 to week 21</p> <p>Sea lice counted weekly and recorded in FishTalk, and reported to Åkerblå and authorities "Altinn" weekly. Seen report and record in BarentsWatch for site Jibbersholmene - site no weeks above limit</p> <p>Reference to VR 227 approved 10.05.2019 by ASC for indicator 3.1.7 defines limit to <0.2 mature sea lice females per salmon. Rationale for use is that the site is for VR227 is within Norwegian jurisdiction and Norwegian legislation</p> <p>Private initiatives interfering with wild stock is prohibited by law, monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids administered by IMR. Direct feedback loop hence impossible to obtain.</p> <p>Sent to ASC 01.07.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | VR 227 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.2.1</p> <p>Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially produced in the area by the date of publication of the ASC Salmon standard</p> <p>Requirement: Yes (49)</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical barriers that are in place and well-maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.</p> | <p>Salmonides, e.g. S salar, S. trutta, naturally occurring in the area.</p> | <p>N/A</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.2.2</p> <p>Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research (50) 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 (51)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes (52)</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Submitted to ASC in email 30.06.2022</p> <p>Salmo salar native to region.</p> | <p>N/A</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.2.3</p> <p>Indicator: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Cleaning fish; Lumpfish (Rognkjeks) and wrasses (Grønngylte, Bergylte and Bergnebb) are all native to region.</p> <p>Cleaning fish; Lumpfish (Rognkjeks) and wrasses (Grønngylte, Bergylte and Bergnebb) are all native to region. Documentation available, e.g.:</p> <p>Sluttvedtinnnummer: 40-1113700 20.07.2021, from 2840 Fensfjorden Masfjorden, boat Frida H 00-14-AM, species Bergylte 271 Bergnebb 100 kg (82), and Grønngylt 332</p> <p>"Transport logg" from Austevoll Sjøtjeneste dates 16.02.2021 31.855 lump fish. Seen health attestation on the fish dated 27.01.2021 signed by Bjarte Langhelle, FomAS</p> <p>Procedure "Rensetisk" ID 1723, d t 16.06.2020, inclusive routines for cleaner fish</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.3</p> <p>Indicator: Use of transgenic (54) salmon by the farm</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Statement d t 31.08.2021, from Lingalaks AS, signed by Kristian Botnen that no transgenic organisms are used in production. Ova suppliers statements and ova CV states traditional genetics and breeding are applied, only.</p> <p>National, industry and corporate policy of not using transgenic fish.</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.4.1</p> <p>Indicator: Maximum number of escapes (57) in the most recent production cycle</p> <p>Requirement: 300 (58)</p> <p>Applicability: All farm. A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. See auditing guidance for additional details.</p> | <p>No escapes registered. Documented in production and recording system FishTalk.</p> <p>Documented by report from company and Barentswatch - checked 04.07.2022 (www.fiskeridir.no).Cross-checked and verified with the estimate of unexplained loss.</p> <p>Documents are and will be available for at least 10 years.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.4.2</p> <p>Indicator: Accuracy (59) of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers</p> <p>Requirement: ≥ 98%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Stock count provided by FM site. They use vaccination numbers as basis. Vaccination counting by camera technology from "Maskon". Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 05.06.2016.</p> <p>In case of counting during production at sea (e.g. grading, delicing) wellboat performs this. Seen specification for Aquascan registration unit CSF series (used in wellboat company Sølvrans AS) with accuracy 98 - 100%. Seen statement from Sølvrans regarding Aquascan with accuracy 98 %. Wellboats also use harvest number for calibration.</p> <p>Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered.</p> <p>Farm does not use counting equipment.</p> <p>Maskon stating approx. 100 % accuracy 05.06.2016.</p> <p>Seen specification for Aquascan registration unit CSE1600 (used in wellboats from Sølvrans AS) with accuracy 98 - 100%.</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>3.4.3</p> <p>Indicator: Estimated unexplained loss (60) of farmed salmon is made publicly available</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Specific site reports and records documented and available in production system FishTalk</p> <p>Verified the company understands how to calculate EUL.</p> <p>EUL V20 - 1.83 (16.269)</p> <p>Published on companys website</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3.4.4</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and reporting of risk events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); reporting and follow up of escape events); and worker training on escape prevention and counting technologies</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Procedure to prevent escape "Tiltaksplan mot rømming" ID 1746, d.1 20.03.2019 and a contingency plan regarding escape version 5, ID 1776, d.1 08.04.2022</p> <p>Risk assessment for escapes, d.1 28.03.2022</p> <p>Nets individually tagged and registered in NetReg and AkvaCom with expiry date of certificates/service card. Seen overview in NetReg with no nets over the expiry date. Strength tests and certificates available for all nets used at site, seen example cage 4 BSM 4905 strength test done 20.06.2022 valid 24 months</p> <p>External training courses in escape prevention for staff, seen training record for all employees, escapes prevent training, e.g Kenneth Marøy, d.1 07.06.2016, by SjømatNorge, Jan-Harald Norahl d.1. 15.05.2021 by Blue Planet, Jarle Hella d.1. 07.06.2016 by Sjømat Norge</p> <p>Good awareness demonstrated interview</p> <p>The Escape Prevention Plan and accompanying documents covers the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - net strength testing; - appropriate net mesh size; - net traceability; - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. <p>All nets are inspected after they are put to sea and moorings are inspected when changed and in intervals. Inspection report, d.1 31.03.2022, new bolts by Techno Dive.</p> <p>Monthly inspection by ROV or diving after incidents/bad weather/delicing.</p> <p>Additional control when nets are washed. Diving licence and health certificate ok</p> <p>All structures NITEK certified Norwegian standard NS9415 (Site certificate nr AS212 rev 4, 11655 Jibbersholmman by Aquastructure valid to 30.08.2026, approved for over 1 million fish)</p> <p>They do daily check of nets and cages, eg. seen checklist dated 03.11.2021 - the site has been empty since December 2021</p> <p>Open system</p> <p>Implementation confirmed e.g net strength and net certificate for nets documented in "net-reg" by Marenot and internal net register.</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.1.1</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed (63)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Feed supplier: Skretting (www.skretting.com) and Biomar (www.biomar.no)</p> <p>Last complete production cycle (20G):</p> <p>Skretting: 4.719.596 kg</p> <p>Biomar: 30.014 kg</p> <p>E.g Skretting order no. 002214751, 100 500 kg 56 S 2500-50A, dated 15.07.2021, verified input in FishTalk, used on Jibbersholmmane</p> <p>Information letter to suppliers; Biomar (27.08.2021) and Skretting (19.05.2022)</p> <p>Skretting: Audited by DNV GL GG CFM, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.22 -they have gotten an extension valid to 13.07.2022</p> <p>Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2022.</p> <p>Method #2 Massbalance</p> <p>Statement from Biomar;</p> <p>INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION FROM FEED SUPPLIER FOR COMPLIANCE WITH ASC SALMON STANDARD VERSION 1.3 2020 dated 15.02.2022</p> <p>Statement from Skretting;</p> <p>Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture dated January 2022</p> <p>Statement and certificate for feed supplier (Skretting and BioMar) verified.</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.2.1</p> <p>Indicator: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for growth (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV of the Salmon standard v.1.3)</p> <p>Requirement: < 1.2</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsupplier Skretting and Biomar</p> <p>Skretting:</p> <p>"Feed and raw material CV" dated January 2022 states all marine ingredients is certified after Marine Trust or MSC or subject to a Fishery Improvement Project.</p> <p>Trimmings fishmeal: 20,5% Trimmings fishhols 31,5%.</p> <p>Biomar:</p> <p>Declaration dated 18.02.2020. Fish source score verified and found above limits. All individual scores >6, BM scores > 6 according to Fish source score ISAL. In Biomar Overview on marine ingredients. Fish species used in Method #2 Massbalance Biomar Whole fish: European Sprat, Atlantic Herring, Sandeel (MSC), Achoveta, Antarctic Krill, South American Pichard, European Sprat, Norway Pout, Chilean Jack Mackerell, European Pichard</p> <p>Trimmings: various All species applied have compliant scores. Trimmings fishmeal: 39,7 % Trimmings fishhols 22,7%.</p> <p>Statement from Biomar;</p> <p>INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION FROM FEED SUPPLIER FOR COMPLIANCE WITH ASC SALMON STANDARD VERSION 1.3 2020 dated 15.02.2022</p> <p>Statement from Skretting;</p> <p>Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture dated January 2022</p> <p>Last complete production cycle (20G): eFCR= 1,46</p> <p>Last complete production cycle (20G):</p> <p>Skretting: FFDRm- no documentation</p> <p>Biomar: FFDRm = 1,41</p> <p>No documentation of results submitted to ASC</p> | <p>Minor</p> | <p>07.jul.22</p> | <p>07.jul.23</p> | <p>Closed</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.2.2</p> <p>Indicator: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for growth (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV of the Salmon standard v.1.3), or, Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources (65)(calculated according to Appendix IV of the Salmon standard v.1.3)</p> <p>Requirement: FFDRo < 2.52 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsupplier Skretting and Biomar</p> <p>Skretting:</p> <p>"Feed and raw material CV" dated January 2022 states all marine ingredients is certified after Marine Trust or MSC or subject to a Fishery Improvement Project.</p> <p>Trimmings fishmeal: 20,5% Trimmings fishhols 31,5%.</p> <p>Biomar:</p> <p>Declaration dated 18.02.2020. Fish source score verified and found above limits. All individual scores >6, BM scores > 6 according to Fish source score ISAL. In Biomar Overview on marine ingredients. Fish species used in Method #2 Massbalance Biomar Whole fish: European Sprat, Atlantic Herring, Sandeel (MSC), Achoveta, Antarctic Krill, South American Pichard, European Sprat, Norway Pout, Chilean Jack Mackerell, European Pichard</p> <p>Trimmings: various All species applied have compliant scores. Trimmings fishmeal: 39,7 % Trimmings fishhols 22,7%.</p> <p>Statement from Biomar;</p> <p>INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION FROM FEED SUPPLIER FOR COMPLIANCE WITH ASC SALMON STANDARD VERSION 1.3 2020 dated 15.02.2022</p> <p>Statement from Skretting;</p> <p>Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture dated January 2022</p> <p>Option #1</p> <p>Last complete cycle (18G): eFCR= 1,46</p> <p>Skretting: FFDRo - no documentation</p> <p>Biomar: FFDRo = 1,61</p> <p>No documentation of results submitted to ASC</p> | <p>Minor</p> | <p>07.jul.22</p> | <p>07.jul.23</p> | <p>Closed</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.3.1</p> <p>Indicator: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries(66) certified under a scheme that is an ISAL member (67) and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries</p> <p>Requirement: Not required</p> <p>Applicability: N/A</p> | <p>Not required</p> | <p>N/A</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.3.2</p> <p>Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score (65, 68) for the fisheries from which all marine raw material in feed is derived</p> <p>Requirement: All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score > 6</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsupplier Skretting and Biomar</p> <p>Statement from Biomar, Proof of mass balance compliance, d.1 20.02.2021, signed by Erik Olav Gracey</p> <p>In Biomar Overview on marine ingredients: Fish species used in Method #2 Massbalance Biomar Whole fish: Blue Whiting (MSC certifikatessuspenden in Q4 2020), Peruvian Anchoveta, Sandeel, Antarctic Krill, Atlantic Herring, Norway Pout, European Spratt, S. American Pichard, Madeiran Sardinella, European Anchovy, Pacific Anchoveta, European Pichard, Thread Herring</p> <p>Trimmings: Herring and white fish trimmings</p> <p>Skretting:</p> <p>Correspondence verified. Individual score >6 and Biomass score >6.</p> <p>No independent assessment needed</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.3.3</p> <p>Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Skretting: Audited by DNV GL GG CFM, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.22 -they have gotten an extension valid to 13.07.2022</p> <p>Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2022.</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>4.3.4</p> <p>Indicator: Feeds 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), whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed</p> <p>Requirement: None (72)</p> <p>Applicability: All. For species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, an exception is made if a regional population of the species has been assessed to be not vulnerable in a National Red List process that is managed explicitly in the same science-based way as IUCN. In cases where a National Red List doesn't exist or isn't managed in accordance with IUCN guidelines, an exception is allowed when an assessment is conducted using IUCN's methodology and demonstrates that the population is not vulnerable.</p> | <p>Registration in Fish Talk on diet type, batch level with reference to CF supplier's feed serial number and percentage of fishmeal and other relevant information on feedsuppliers webportal. Statements from feedsuppliers with details of fisheries and raw material sources in specific feeds for this site in this period have scores according to ASCs requirement for this indicator.</p> <p>BioMar</p> <p>Statement from Biomar, Proof of mass balance compliance, d.1 20.02.2021, signed by Erik Olav Gracey -</p> <p>Also seen certificates issued by SAI Global on sustainability of fish meal, eg from FF Skagen AS valid to 19.11.2022.</p> <p>Skretting</p> <p>"Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture" dated January 2022</p> <p>Not from vulnerable fisheries</p> | <p>Compliant</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|--------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4.4.1 | <p>Indicator: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums(76) and local laws(77)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Regular commercial contact info and websites for both suppliers, Skretting and Biomar</p> <p>BioMar "Raw material purchasing policy for BioMar Norway"15.02.2022 Skretting "Feed and raw material CV" dated January 2022 and "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture" dated January 2022</p> <p>Skretting: Audited by DNV GL GG CFM, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373823641, valid to 23.05.22 -they have gotten an extension valid to 13.07.2022 Biomar: Audited by BV GG CFM, Global G.A.P. CFM Version 2.2 Aug16. Certificate GGN CMF 4050373810030, valid to 20.08.2022.</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.4.2 | <p>Indicator: Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent (78)</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>The policy supports responsible feed sourcing and a commitment to continuous improvement of responsible sourcing of feed ingredients after international standards like RTRS or equivalent. Policy declared in statement d.t 31.08.2021, signed by CEO Kristian Botnen Lingalaks AS</p> <p>BioMar "Raw material purchasing policy for BioMar Norway"15.02.2022</p> <p>Skretting "Feed and raw material CV" dated January 2022 and "Documentation to demonstrate compliance with ASC Standards for responsible salmon aquaculture" dated January 2022</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.4.3 | <p>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</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, for each individual raw material containing >1% transgenic content (81)</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Biomar "Statement on compound fish feed" dated 03.02.2022 signed by Ellinor Helland</p> <p>Skretting "Feed and raw material CV" dated January 2022</p> <p>Statements from feedsuppliers on non use of GMO/transgenic in feed for 2021 Informed by stating feed suppliers for announced ASC farms production cycle have 100% non GMO policy.</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5.1 | <p>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)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikalieh nderingsplan" ID 1862, d.t 30.06.20, e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Marenos/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR.</p> <p>Document licence from Ragn Sells avd Sunnhordaland, no 2017.0653.T, d.t 28.08.2018, signed Nina Vadøy, Fylkesmannen i Hordaland.</p> <p>Avfallplan ID 1750, d.t 01.03.2019, procedure for correct waste handling and potential environmental impact from waste</p> <p>Seen statement dated 30.08.2021 by CEO Kristian Botnen including no dumping of no-biological waste and proper/responsible waste handling</p> <p>Seen record invoice for ensilage "K2 Ensilasje", 31.000 kg, pH < 4.0 to Ragnsells 31.12.2021. Seen record invoice dated 30.11.2021, "Teleskopske lyststoffr r" to Ragnsells</p> <p>All special and dangerous waste, e.g rest oil and filters, is collected, stored properly and delivered to approved waste company (BIR/NGIR). Declarations is available at www.deklarerer.no - verified during audit</p> <p>Waste companies is recycling what's possible to recycle</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5.2 | <p>Indicator: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Waste management plan "Avfall og kjemikalieh nderingsplan" ID 1862, updated 02.07.2021, e.g. rest waste, medicine, special waste to BIR/NGIR, production equipment to Marenos/Egersund, esilage Scanbio, rest waste NGIR.</p> <p>Avfallplan ID 1750, d.t 01.03.2019, procedure for correct waste handling and environmental impact of waste</p> <p>Waste companies is recycling whats possible to recycle</p> <p>No infractions identified.</p> <p>Seen invoice no 8110131, d.t 09.08.2021, from M re Not, old net, NOFR ID MND 7073</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.6.1 | <p>Indicator: Presence of an energy use assessment verifying the energy consumption on the farm and representing the whole life cycle as set as outlined in Appendix V of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/t fish produced/production cycle</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Records and calculations ok</p> <p>Last complete production cycle 2020G: 715.210.128 kj Scope 1 fossile: 113.390.928 kj Scope 2 el: 601.819.200 kj 2.826,529 MT biomass produced during last complete production cycle (20G)</p> <p>Last complete production cycle (2020G): 253 kj/ton biomass Scope 1 Diesel, fuel oil, crude oil, petrol, propane Scope 2 Electricity.</p> <p>Assessed and compared between sites and production forms.</p> <p>No documentation of information submitted to ASC</p> | Minor | No documentation of information submitted to ASC | 07.jul.22 | 07.jul.23 | Closed | | Human error - lack of competence/awareness due to personal changes | Submit data to ASC, deadline 1. september | Records and calculations updated, used calculation factors from Milj direktoratet og NVE. Diesel used at aggregates included. Last complete production cycle 2020G: 4.294.950.264 kj Scope 1 fossile: 3.693.167.064 kj Scope 2 el: 601.783.200 kj 2.826,529 MT biomass produced during last complete production cycle (20G) | 2022.09.11 TOG Seen updated calculations 2022.09.14 TOG Seen documentation that updated information has been sent to ASC 14.09.2022. | | | | | | | | |
| 4.6.2 | <p>Indicator: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG(85)) emissions(86) on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Records OK</p> <p>2021 Scope 1 - 7.496 kg CO2 Scope 2 - 2.842 kg CO2 Totalt - 10.338 kg CO2</p> <p>Scope 1 diesel from diesel workboat, truck, generator and scope 2 is purchased electricity and purchased service boat diesel consumption and landbase. CO2 used. Calculations and assessment provided. Data conversion: Data from CEMAsys dated 18.01.2021</p> <p>No documentation of results submitted to ASC</p> | Minor | No documentation of information submitted to ASC | 07.jul.22 | 07.jul.23 | Closed | | There has been a number of changes of personell in the company, and following up of this criteria fell between "two chairs" as it were and was not followed up adequately. Overall, human error - lack of competence/awareness due to personal changes. | Submit data to ASC, deadline 1. september | 2021 Scope 1 - 7.496 kg CO2 Scope 2 - 2.842 kg CO2 Totalt - 10.338 kg CO2 | 2022.09.11 TOG Seen updated calculations 2022.09.14 TOG Seen documentation that updated information has been sent to ASC 14.09.2022. | | | | | | | | |
| 4.6.3 | <p>Indicator: Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed(87) used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Biomar: 1.58 kg CO2 / kg feed Skretting: no documentation</p> <p>No documentation of GHG emission from feed in the most recent completed production cycle</p> <p>No summarization</p> <p>No documentation of results submitted to ASC</p> | Major | Biomar: 1.58 kg CO2 / kg feed Skretting: no documentation | 07.jul.22 | 07.jul.23 | Closed | | Skretting submitted data as average for the feed production, not specifically for the production site Jibbersholmene. Supplier follow-up and QA of data was not done properly prior the audit. Data submission to ASC was incorrect. | Ask for the correct data from Skretting, and recalculate the data. Submit correct data to ASC, deadline 15th september | Biomar: 1.58 kg CO2 / kg feed Skretting: 1.93 kg CO2 / kg feed Feed used Biomar: 30 014,1 kg Feed used Skretting: 4 719 596 kg | 2022.09.11 TOG Seen updated calculations 2022.09.14 TOG Seen documentation that updated information has been sent to ASC 14.09.2022. | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7.1 | <p>Indicator: For farms that use copper-treated nets(90), evidence that nets are not cleaned(91) or treated in situ in the marine environment</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.</p> | <p>No cobber-based treatment (antifoulant) is used.</p> <p>Aquanet Protect (coating - no copper), Steen-Hansen, 03.03.2017, EU DIR 2017/830, EF 1907/2006 (REACH), 1272/2008/EF (CLP), 790/2009/EF</p> <p>Statement d.t 30.08.2021, signed by CEO Kristian Botnen, no use of copper based antifoulant is used on nets. Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7.2 | <p>Indicator: For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment (92)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.</p> | <p>Marenos station Radey and Sebatad cleans nets for Jibbersholmene on land. Process water collected in tanks and recycled in process before delivered to waste handling facility. Process is approved by authorities.</p> <p>No use of cobber based antifoulant is used</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7.3 | <p>Indicator: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix I of the Salmon standard v.1.3</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.</p> | <p>Confirmed no use of copper-based treatment on nets (antifoulant)</p> | N/A | Confirmed no use of copper-based treatment on nets (antifoulant) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7.4 | <p>Indicator: Evidence that copper levels(93) are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, or, in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.</p> | <p>Confirmed no use of copper-based treatment on nets (antifoulant)</p> <p>Submitted to ASC 30.06.2022</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7.5 | <p>Indicator: Evidence that the type of biocides used in net antifouling are approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.</p> | <p>Aquanet Protect (coating - no copper), Steen-Hansen, 03.03.2017, EU DIR 2017/830, EF 1907/2006 (REACH), 1272/2008/EF (CLP), 790/2009/EF</p> <p>Chemical used in 4.7.5a is approved according to legislation following jurisdictions of the European Union and Norway.</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1.1 | <p>Indicator: Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases, parasites and environmental conditions relevant for good fish health, including implementing corrective action when required</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p> | <p>Fish health management plan "Veterin r Helseplan Lingalaks", ID 1722, valid for site Jibbersholmene, d.t 12.04.2022, version 6 B.I.K and E. H is responsible. Signed by Birgit L llevik Kv le dated 06.07.2022.</p> <p>Includes measurements for identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites.</p> | Compliant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 |

