



ASC (Aquaculture Stewardship Council) Farm Certification Audit Report

Certificate Holder:	Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative, Shizugawa Branch
Scope of Assessment:	Oyster farms in Togura Area in Minamisanriku Town, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi Prefecture, Japan
Certificate Code:	ASC-AMITA-F-1001
Certificate issue date:	30 March 2016
Certificate expiry date:	29 March 2019

Form 3 – Public Disclosure Form

*This form shall be submitted by the CAB no less than thirty (30) calendar days prior to any onsite audit *. Any changes to this information shall be submitted to the ASC within five (5) days of the change and not later than 10 days before the planned audit. If later, a new announcement is submitted and another 30 days rule will apply.*

*The information on this form shall be public * and should be posted on the ASC website within three (3) days of submission.*

This form shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.

This form should be translated into local languages when appropriate

PDF 1 Public Disclosure Form

PDF 1.1 Name of CAB

AMITA Corporation

PDF 1.2 Date of Submission

3rd April 2017

PDF 1.3 CAB Contact Person

PDF 1.3.1 Name of Contact
Person

Hitofumi Yamanoshita

PDF 1.3.2 Position in the CAB's
organisation

Team Leader

PDF 1.3.3 Mailing address

3-2-4 Kudankita, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 102-0073
Japan

PDF 1.3.4 Email address	ninsho@amita-net.co.jp
PDF 1.3.5 Phone number	+81-3-5215-8326
PDF 1.3.6 Other	-

PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client

PDF 1.4.1 Name of Company	Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative, Shizugawa Branch
PDF 1.4.2 Name of Contact Person	Mr. Fujio Abe
PDF 1.4.3 Position in the client's organisation	Vice manager of Shizugawa Branch, Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative
PDF 1.4.4 Mailing address	1 Tsunomiya, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi, 986-0781
PDF 1.4.5 Email address	fujio.a@jf-miyagi.com
PDF 1.4.6 Phone number	+81-226-46-9211

PDF 1.4.7 Other

PDF 1.5 Unit of Certification

PDF 1.5.1 Single Site

PDF 1.5.2 Multi-site

Yes

PDF 1.5.3 Group certification

PDF 1.6 Sites to be audited

Site Name	GPS Coordinates	Other Location Information	Planned Site Audit(s)	Date of planned audit
Demarcated Fishery Right No.1526 located in Togura fishery area	38° 39.16' N, 141° 26.82' E 38° 39.27' N, 141° 27.64' E 38° 39.03' N, 141° 27.74' E 38° 38.74' N, 141° 27.43' E 38° 38.76' N, 141° 27.08' E 38° 38.63' N, 141° 27.06' E 38° 38.63' N, 141° 26.72' E 38° 38.75' N, 141° 26.62' E		Yes	13th and 14th March 2017
Demarcated Fishery Right No.1528 located in Togura fishery area	38° 39.16' N, 141° 27.80' E 38° 39.29' N, 141° 28.67' E 38° 38.89' N, 141° 28.70' E 38° 39.04' N, 141° 27.85' E		Yes	13th and 14th March 2017
Demarcated Fishery Right No.1530 located in Togura fishery area	38° 39.40' N, 141° 28.74' E 38° 39.42' N, 141° 28.98' E 38° 39.40' N, 141° 29.46' E 38° 39.24' N, 141° 29.46' E 38° 39.25' N, 141° 29.16' E 38° 38.96' N, 141° 29.10' E 38° 39.01' N, 141° 28.82' E		Yes	13th and 14th March 2017
Demarcated Fishery Right No.1534 located in Togura fishery area	38° 39.29' N, 141° 30.02' E 38° 39.25' N, 141° 30.20' E 38° 39.08' N, 141° 30.16' E 38° 38.81' N, 141° 30.18' E 38° 39.00' N, 141° 29.54' E		Yes	13th and 14th March 2017

Demarcated Fishery	38° 39.61' N, 141° 30.08' E	Yes	13th and 14th
Right No.1535 located	38° 39.63' N, 141° 30.29' E		March 2017
in Togura fishery area	38° 39.75' N, 141° 31.07' E		
	38° 39.46' N, 141° 31.07' E		
	38° 39.45' N, 141° 30.25' E		
	38° 39.49' N, 141° 30.09' E		

PDF 1.7 Species and Standards

Standard	Species (scientific name) produced	Included in scope (Yes/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used	Version Number
Abalone				
Bivalve	Crassostrea gigas	Yes	ASC Bivalve Standard	1.0
Freshwater Trout				
Pangasius				
Salmon				
Shrimp				
Talapia				
Seriola/Cobia				
Other				

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

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in- person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted

PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1 Contract Signed:	19th October 2015
PDF 1.9.2 Start of audit:	1st February 2017
PDF 1.9.3 Onsite Audit(s):	27th and 28th April 2017
PDF 1.9.4 Determination/Decision:	19th May 2017

PDF 1.10 Audit Team

	Column1	Name	ASC Registration Reference
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor	Naoya Ogawa	
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts		
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor	Tomoko Shiroki	

Nonconformity Report Form

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

Ref#	Text to be provided by:		
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	2017.1
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Naoya Ogawa
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	2017/4/28
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	First surveillance
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpretation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been approved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interpretation log reference	N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.	N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open
NCF 7	CAB		Closed
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major
NCF 9	CAB		Minor
NCF 10	CAB		Observation
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity	2017/7/27
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity	3 months after final report is issued.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	ASC Bivalve Standard Version 1.0 Jan 2012
NCF 14	CAB	Source Document	
NCF 15	CAB	Clause Number	5.1.2
NCF 15	CAB	Text of Requirement	Evidence of appropriate storage and/or disposal of biological waste
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity	Temporary stock yard of oystershells is a town owned land where the Fishery Cooperative Association makes a lease contract with the town. The validity of the contract was confirmed as from 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2017. However the association did not understand if the contract was renewed.
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected	Contract from 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2017. No contract since then.
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	None
NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	None
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	The expiry date of the contract was not managed, therefore we overlooked the expiry date. 2017/4/28 Fujio Abe
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Auditor confirmed the root cause. 2017/4/28 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	A new contract between the head office of the Miyagi Prefecture Fishery Cooperative and Minamisanriku Town from 2017/4/1 to 2020/3/31 is being made. 2017/7/27 Fujio Abe
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	A new contract being made was confirmed. 2017/7/27 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	A person to manage contracts will be appointed. A list of contracts necessary for Shizugawa Branch will be made, and expiry date of each contract will be checked regularly. 2017/7/27 Fujio Abe
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	By the preventive actions, it is decided that contracts will be managed thoroughly. 2017/7/27 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	2018/4/27
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	The contract is being made between the the head office of the Miyagi Prefecture Fishery Cooperative and Minamisanriku Town, and it will needs some days to complete.

NCF 28 CAB	Extention request approval	2017/7/27
NCF 29	Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	It is under process of contracting and it is sure that the contract will be signed.
NCF 30	Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

Nonconformity Report Form

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

Ref#	Text to be provided by:		
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	2017.2
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Naoya Ogawa
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	2017/4/28
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	First surveillance
NCF 5		Has a variation or interpretation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been approved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interpretation log reference	N/A
NCF 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.	N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open
NCF 7	CAB		Closed
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major
NCF 9	CAB		Minor
NCF 10	CAB		Observation
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity	2017/7/27
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity	3months after final report is received.
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	
NCF 14	CAB	Source Document	ASC Bivalve Standard Version 1.0 Jan 201
NCF 15	CAB	Clause Number	5.2.1
NCF 15	CAB	Text of Requirement	Evidence of energy use monitoring relative to production and ongoing effort to improve efficiency
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity	Fuel consumption amount is reported annually from each farmer to the Association. The association asked farmers to submit records of fuel consumption amount in 2015, but some farmers did not report it.
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected	List of fuel consumption amount in 2015
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	None
NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	None
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Three oyster members who had not reported were planning to go out of business, and there was no record anymore. 2017/4/28 Fujio Abe
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Auditor confirmed the root cause. 2017/4/28 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	The three members who will go out of business will be excluded from the producers list. 2017/7/27 Fujio Abe
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	The corrective action was confirmed. 2017/7/27 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	In the future, records will be submitted from all registered producers. The records for FY2016 are being collected. 2017/7/27 Fujio Abe
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Auditor will check if all producers will submit records in FY 2016. 2017/7/27 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	2018/4/27
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	Because records for FY2016 are being collected currently.
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	2017/7/27
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	It is understandable that it will take more time to collect data from each producer.
NCF 30		Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

Nonconformity Report Form

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

Ref#	Text to be provided by:		
NCF 1	CAB	NC Reference	2017.3
NCF 2	CAB	NC Detected by	Naoya Ogawa
NCF 3	CAB	Date Detected	2017/4/28
NCF 4	CAB	Audit Reference	First surveillance
NFC 5		Has a variation or interpretation (Form 1) that relates to this NC been approved by ASC. If so include the ASC variation or interpretation log reference	N/A
NFC 6		Justification for applying the approved variation or interpretation.	N/A
NCF 6	CAB	Status of NC	Open
NCF 7	CAB		Closed
NCF 8	CAB	Grade of NC	Major
NCF 9	CAB		Minor
NCF 10	CAB		Observation
NCF 11	CAB	Deadline for closing the nonconformity	N/A
NCF 12	CAB	Explanation for deadline for closing the nonconformity	N/A
NCF 13	CAB	Requirement Reference	Source Document
NCF 14	CAB		Clause Number
NCF 15	CAB		Text of Requirement
NCF 16	CAB	Description of the nonconformity	ASC Bivalve Standard Version 1.0 Jan 2017.4.2 Occupational health and safety training is available for all employees
NCF 17	CAB	Statement of evidence detected	Wearing a life jacket is decided when boarding a ship during the landing of oysters. Farmers are also aware. However, it was confirmed that some farmers did not wear it.
NCF 18	Client	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author)	Interview to farmers
NCF 19	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	None
NCF 20	Client	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted)	None
NCF 21	CAB	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted)	We knew the necessity of wearing a life jacket to producers, but they were not thoroughly informed and all the producers did not yet understand the necessity. 2017/4/28 Fujio Abe
NCF 22	Client	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Auditor confirmed the root cause. 2017/4/28 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 23	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	In order to protect our own life, we invited the oyster department members at the general meeting to wear life jackets without fail when boarding boat. 2017/7/27 Fujio Abe
NCF 24	Client	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted)	The corrective action was confirmed. 2017/7/27 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 25	CAB	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted)	Continue to thoroughly known. It will be announced again at the next general meeting scheduled for September. 2017/7/27 Fujio Abe
NCF 26	Client	Request to extend the implemetation period for corrective action(s) until	All the producers who met at the time of the audit on site were wearing a life jacket. The observation is kept open to check if the effort is established. 2017/7/27 Naoya Ogawa
NCF 27		Justification for extention request	N/A
NCF 28	CAB	Extention request approval	N/A
NCF 29		Reason(s) for approval/ disapproval	N/A
NCF 30		Date on which the nonconformity was closed	

ASC Audit Report – Opening

General Requirements

- C1** Audit reports shall be written in English and in the most common language spoken in the areas where the operation is located.
- C2** Audit reports may contain confidential annexes for commercially sensitive information.
- C2.1** The CAB shall agree the content of any commercially sensitive information with the applicant, which can still be accessible by the ASC and the appointed accreditation body upon request as stipulated in the certification contract.
- C2.2** The public report shall contain a clear overview of the items which are in the confidential annexes.
- C2.3** Except for the annexes that contain commercially sensitive information all audit reports will be public.
- C3** The CAB is solely responsible for the content of all reports, including the content of any confidential annexes.
- C4 Reporting Deadlines* for certification and re-certification audit reports**
- C4.1** Within thirty (30) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a draft report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- C4.2** Within five (5) days the ASC should post the draft report to the ASC website.
- C4.3** The CAB shall allow stakeholders and interested parties to comment on the report for fifteen (15) days.
- C4.4** Within twenty (20) days of the close of comments, the CAB shall submit the final report to the ASC in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- C4.5** Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.
- C4.6** Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducible results.
- C5 Reporting Deadlines* for surveillance audit reports**
- C5.1** Within ninety (90) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a final report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- C5.2** Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.
- C5.3** Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducible results.

1 Title Page

1.1 Name of Applicant

Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative, Shizugawa Branch

1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report]	Public Certification Report
1.3 CAB name	AMITA Corporation
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Naoya Ogawa
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Report author – Naoya Ogawa, AMITA Corporation Report reviewer – Hitofumi Yamanoshita, AMITA Corporation
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Mr. Fujio Abe, Vice manager of Shizugawa Branch, Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative
1.7 Date	4th September 2017

2 Table of Contents

I. Audit Report – Opening
II. Audit template – Bivalve
III. Audit Report – Traceability
IV. Audit Report – Closing
Nonconformity Report Form
Public Disclosure Form

3 Glossary

Terms and abbreviations that are specific to this audit report and that are not otherwise defined in the ASC glossary

None

4 Summary

A concise summary of the report and findings. The summary shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.

4.1	A brief description of the scope of the audit	The scope of the audit is oyster farms in Togura area of Minamisanriku Town, Miyagi Prefecture.
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	The farms are operated by 38 families. There is no employees employed by those families. The Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative is a cooperative of these farmers.
4.3	Type of unit of certification (select only one type of unit of certification in the list)	Muti-site
4.4	Type of audit (select all the types of audit that apply in the list)	Second Surveillance
4.5	A summary of the major findings	There was no Major noncompliance found during the audit. Two Minor non-compliance and one Observation were issued.
4.6	The Audit determination	Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative, Shizugawa Branch is granted for continuation of the ASC bivalves certification for Crassostrea gigas.

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1	CAB Name	AMITA Corporation
5.2	CAB Mailing Address	3-2-4 Kudankita, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 102-0073 Japan
5.3	Email Address	ninsho@amita-net.co.jp
5.4	Other Contact Information	Tel: +81-3-5215-8326

6 Background on the Applicant

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

6.2 A description of the unit of certification (*for initial audit*)/ changes, if any (*for surveillance and recertification audits*)

See Public Disclosure Form

Minamisanriku Town is located at North–East of Miyagi Prefecture. The town stretches 18km from east to west and 18km from north to south and the total area of the town is 163.74km. The town is facing the Pacific Ocean on its east side and other sides are surrounded by mountains of 300m to 500m. All boundaries of the town are dividing ridges. All rivers in town runs into Shizugawa Bay so the town is located in one river basin where a rich nature of sea and mountain are integrating. Coastal area shows rich and unique features of ria coast so that the coastal area is designated as a National Park (named Sanriku Fukko National Park). Since the town is located on the Pacific coast, due to the ocean current, the climate is comparatively warm in Miyagi Prefecture. The town is cool in summer and warm in winter with only a little snow.

With its rich nature, Marine Products Industry and Forestry have been main industries in Minamisanriku Town. Especially coastal areas have been one of the greatest aquacultural farms in Japan. In Shizugawa Bay, aquaculture of Seaweed (*Pyropia* spp.) oyster, Ascidiacea (*Halocynthia* spp.) have been traditionally aquacultured. Silver salmon aquaculture has started after 1975. In recent years, scallop aquaculture has been popular.

Aquaculture of oyster in Miyagi Prefecture has a long history. The beginning is said to be about 300 years ago. In 1899, fisheries experiment station of Miyagi Prefecture was established to research the methodologies for aquacultures. During 1930s, “Raft culture” method was developed which enabled oyster aquaculture in deep Shizugawa bay. In 1952, “Longline suspended–culture” method was developed which exponentially promoted offshore aquaculture.

One important aspect of history of Minamisanriku Town is the damages caused by earthquakes and subsequent Tsunami and the town’s recovery from the damage. The town was heavily affected by the Tsunami due to its geological characteristics. There are historical records of damages by Tsunami in the town. Old records are from Heian Era (9th to 12th centuries). Recent records are from 1896 and 1933 when Sanriku Tsunami hit the town and from 1960 when Tsunami reached the town from Chile earthquake. The history of the town cannot be spoken without mentioning its destructive damages from Tsunami and its recoveries. And then on 11th March 2011, there was the Great East Japan Earthquake and subsequent Tsunami of 20m in height. Minamisanriku Police reported that 566 people died and 212 are still not found. Almost all low land along coast was destroyed. Aquacultural facilities too were totally destroyed. So people had to recover everything from zero.

Within Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative Association Shizugawa Branch Togura Area Oyster Subcommittee, family–run aquaculture has been conventionally organised. Each farmer is allocated a certain sea surface and each farmer manages his/her own farm. Fisheries Cooperative Association functions as a coordinator. Each farmer is a family business without any employees. Before the Great East Japan Earthquake, farmers established farms competitively and so the farms were so packed that it was not easy to access by boats. As a consequence, poor development of oysters due to too–dense farming was observed. After the Earthquake, the Association made use of a subsidy of state government named “Support program of hard–working aquaculture” and managed farms as one cooperative management body rather than individual managers for approximately 3 years (from February 2012 to March 2015). During this period, number of farms were reduced dramatically so that there are much more spaces between farms now which aimed at improving the growing environmental quality which will lead to better quality of oysters. The program ended in March 2015. After this program, the management structure returned to its original structure where each family manages their own farm. However, the system developed during the 3–year–period of the program has been retained.

There is no change to the unit of certification at this surveillance.

6.3	Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	None
6.4	Other certification(s) obtained before this audit	None
6.5	Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>current</u> year	120,000 kg (without shell)
6.6	<u>Actual</u> annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>previous</u> year (mandatory for surveillance and recertification audits)	Oyster without shell: 119,442kg Oyster with shell: 37,510kg (April 2016 – March 2017)
6.7	Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification (select one or more in the list)	raft
6.8	Number of employees working at the unit of certification	0

7 Scope

7.1	The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Bivalve Standard Version 1.0 Jan 2012
7.2	The species produced at the applicant farm	Oyster (<i>Crassostrea gigas</i>)
7.3	A description of the scope of the audit including a description of whether the unit of certification covers all production or harvest areas (i.e. ponds) managed by the operation or located at the included sites, or whether only a sub-set of these are included in the unit of certification. If only a sub-set of production or harvest areas are included in the unit of certification these shall be clearly named.	The scope of the audit is oyster farms located in the southern half of Shizugawa bay. All farmers of Togura area, Minamisanriku Town are included in the scope of the certificate. Northern half of Shizugawa bay is used by farmers of Shizugawa area and is out of the scope.
7.4	The names and addresses of any storage, processing, or distribution sites included in the operation (including subcontracted operations) that will potentially be handling certified products, up until the point where product enters further chain of custody.	Tsunomiya Oyster Processing Plant – 106 Hara, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi Hadenya Oyster Processing Plant – 197-1 Togura, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi Takahama Oyster Processing Plant (Mr. Kiyohiro Goto) – 9-2 Wakamiya, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi Choshimizu Oyster Processing Plant (Mr. Tokuji Abe) – 163-1 Fujihama, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi Choshimizu Oyster Processing Plant (Mr. Makoto Sasaki) – 40 Choshimizu, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi 'Tabunoki' shop – 5 Tsunomiya, Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Motoyoshi-gun, Miyagi
7.5	Description of the receiving water body(ies).	Southern half of Shizugawa bay

8 Audit Plan

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

Naoya Ogawa – Lead auditor

Conducting the Audit – 4th September 2017
 Writing of the report – Completed on 30th September 2017
 Reviewing the report – Completed on 31st October 2017
 Taking the certification decision – on 1st November 2017

- 8.2** Previous Audits (if applicable):

		NC reference number	Standard clause reference	Closing deadline – status – closing date of each NC
8.2.1	Initial audit – mm/yyyy	2015.1	1.1.1	n/a – Closed – 19th November 2015
		2015.2	2.3.1	31st January 2017 – Closed – 20th November 2015
	Surveillance audit 1 – mm/ yyyy	2017.1	5.1.2	
		2017.2	5.2.1	
		2017.3	7.4.2	
	Surveillance audit 2 – mm/ yyyy	None		
	Recertification audit – mm/ yyyy			
	Unannounced audit – mm/ yyyy			
	NC close-out audit – mm/ yyyy			
	Scope extension audit mm/ yyyy			

- 8.4** Audit plan as implemented including:

		Dates	Locations
8.4.1	Desk Reviews	1st Sep 2017	–
		4th Sep 2017	Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Miyagi, Japan
8.4.2	Onsite audits	4th Sep 2017	Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Miyagi, Japan
8.4.3	Stakeholder interviews and Community		
8.4.4	Draft report sent to client		
		2nd Apr 2018	Togura, Minamisanriku-cho, Miyagi, Japan
8.4.5	Draft report sent to ASC		–
		7th Nov 2018	
8.5.5	Final report sent to Client and ASC		–
		7th Nov 2018	

- 8.7 Names and affiliations of individuals consulted or otherwise involved in the audit including: representatives of the client, employees, contractors, stakeholders and any observers that participated in the audit.

Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative Association

Mr. Fujio Abe, Economic Business Department Kesenuma General Branch Shizugawa Branch assistant manager.

Mr. Kiyohiro Goto, Shizugawa Branch Steering Committee Togura sub-branch Oyster Subcommittee manager.

Observers

Mr. Satoshi Maekawa, WWF Japan, Nature Conservation Division, Fisheries Officer.

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

Name of stakeholder (if permission given to make name public)	Relevance to be contacted	Date of contact	CAB responded Yes/No	Brief summary of points Raised	Use of comment by CAB	Response sent to stakeholder
	No comment was received					

AUDIT MANUAL – ASC BIVALVE STANDARD

Scope: The requirements of the ASC Bivalve Standard apply globally to all locations and scales of filter-feeding bivalve aquaculture production systems. Bivalve aquaculture is defined by this Dialogue as active husbandry of bivalve shellfish from seed to harvest within a defined area and with defined ownership of the shellfish being cultured.

PRINCIPLE 1. OBEY THE LAW AND COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND REGULATIONS WHERE FARMING OPERATION IS LOCATED

1.1 Criteria: All applicable legal requirements and regulations where farming operation is located

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
1.1.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of compliance with all applicable legal requirements and regulations where the farming operation is located (e.g., permits, licenses, evidence of lease, concessions and rights to land and/or water use)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Obtain copies of applicable land and water use laws.</p> <p>b. Obtain original lease agreements or land titles on file.</p> <p>c. Keep records of inspections for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).</p> <p>d. Obtain all necessary permits relating to land and water use as required by local and national authorities.</p> <p>e. Provide a detailed map of the farm with at least 4 GPS coordinates to show that farm location in relation to national preservation areas.</p> <p>f. If the farm is sited within a national preservation area or marine protected area, maintain documents to show that the farm's activities are consistent with legal requirements and regulations of the protected area.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>A. Verify compliance with applicable land and water use laws.</p> <p>B. Confirm client holds original lease agreements or land titles. Where documentation is informal or validity is in doubt, interviews of relevant neighbors should be conducted to establish support of the claims.</p> <p>C. Verify that inspection records comply with national and local laws and regulations (as applicable).</p> <p>D. Verify the farm has valid permits relating to land and water use. Where documentation is informal or validity is in doubt, interviews of relevant neighbors should be conducted to establish support of the claims.</p> <p>E. Verify that the farm is represented accurately through verification of at least one of the GPS coordinates. If possible, verify spatial information using Google Map, satellite images or similar means.</p> <p>F. If applicable, verify that the farm complies with legal requirements and regulations of the national protected area.</p>	Compliant	<p>Based on Fishery Act (last amended on 5th August 2015), a demarcated fishery right is established. Act on the Protection of Fishery Resources (last amended on 13th June 2014) and Sustainable Aquaculture Production Assurance Act (last amended on 13th June 2014) are also applied. No breach to any of the law are reported. The client kept a file containing all the latest applicable laws. The client make a list of all the applicable laws together with the latest amendment dates. Certified copy of register of Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative Association Shizugawa Branch was confirmed. Land of Togura Sub-branch was owned by a person before but the owner was changed to Minamisanriku Town. Therefore a land lease agreement with Minamisanriku Town is being made.</p> <p>Two Oyster Cooperative Processing Centres are owned by Miyagi Prefecture Northern Facilities Owner Fisheries Cooperative Association. There are possession licenses of fishery harbour land. Tsunomiya Cooperative Processing Centre (Primary Fishery harbour, under town's management): From 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2020. Hadenya Cooperative Processing Centre (Secondary Fishery harbour, under prefectural management): From 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2020. There is no inspection by the state or prefecture unless there is any issue reported. Until now, there has been no case of reporting any issue. When granting a fishery right, there is an inspection by advisory committee.</p> <p>When fishery rights are renewed, there is an instruction by Miyagi Sea Coordinating committee which is managed by the prefecture and public consultative meeting is held. Information is also published on website of the prefecture and via public relations magazine issued by the prefecture. Record of public consultative meeting held on 11th April 2013 and all participants were confirmed. "Speech application" used in the meeting was also confirmed. There is a record of participating in a seminar of the Coordinating committee held on 31st May 2013.</p> <p>License under a demarcated fishery right dated from 1st September 2013 to 31st August 2018 was confirmed. Licensed demarcated units for Oyster culture are numbered 1526, 1528, 1530, 1534 and 1535. Latitudes and longitudes are specified in the license. Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative Association Main Office is preparing a map based on these coordinates. Related documents such as Fishing rights exercise rules and application for Fishing rights exercise rules are also confirmed.</p> <p>All Fisheries Cooperative Association members signed an agreement (with Chairperson of Shizugawa Branch Steering Committee) to demonstrate their commitment not to be involved with any illegal activities. It is basically to follow the Violation sanctions provisions of Fishing rights exercise rules.</p> <p>Latitudes and longitudes are specified in the license under a demarcated fishery right. Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative Association Main Office is preparing a map based on these coordinates. Auditors confirmed that coordinates in the map being prepared matches with the coordinates in the license. During the site visit, GPS was used to check the farms are located according to the map.</p> <p>Most of the demarcated units for Oyster culture are located in a area classified as ordinary zones of Sanriku Fukko National Park. There is no restriction in relation to fishery in this category. A part of the demarcated units for Oyster culture are located in a area designated as wildlife preserve. Hunting and capturing of wildlife is prohibited here but no restriction to aquaculture.</p> <p>Adjacent island named Tsubaki Shima (Ao Shima) is designated as a special protection zone of National Park as well as Special Natural Monument titled "Tsubaki Shima Tropical plant communities". However, oyster aquaculture does not affect the island so that there is no restriction to fishery.</p>

PRINCIPLE 2. AVOID, REMEDY OR MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS ON HABITATS, BIODIVERSITY, AND ECOLOGICAL PROCESSES

2.1 Criteria: Benthic effects for off-bottom and suspended-culture methods^[1]

2.1.1	<p>Indicator: Acceptable levels of total 'free' sulfides in surficial sediment (0-2 centimeters from the surface) measured beneath the farm in comparison to control sites[2]</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 1500 µM, monitoring every five years is required, ≥ 1500 µM and ≤ 3000 µM, monitoring every year is required</p> <p>Applicability: Off bottom and</p>	<p>a. If the farm site is a non-depositional area: Ensure that monitoring via video or seabed imaging transects is conducted prior to the first audit and at least once every five years thereafter (Proceed to 2.2.)</p> <p>b. If the farm site is a depositional area of soft substrate: An initial assessment of S concentration in sediments shall be conducted according to Appendix 1 & 2 of the Bivalve Standard. Direct measurement of S concentration may be replaced by an analysis of benthic community structure in areas where this biotic approach is preferred by the client or is already mandated by a regulatory body [3] (see 2.1.4.).</p> <p>The client shall present information detailing the sampling design used and results of the S assessment: - If S concentration is ≤ 1500 µM, monitoring shall be conducted every five years (Proceed to 2.2.). - If S concentration is ≥ 1500 µM and < 3000 µM, monitoring shall be conducted every year (Proceed to 2.2.).</p>	<p>A. Verify from video or seabed imaging evidence that the aquaculture site is non-depositional.</p> <p>B. Verify documentation that the farm has conducted an initial assessment of S concentration within a 6 month period prior to the first audit using either direct measurement or analysis of benthic community structure.</p>	Compliant	<p>At the time of the initial audit, since there was no institution that could carry out the survey method prescribed by ASC, they entrusted to EAC Corporation (a private company) to measure the concentration of total sulphide in dry mud, which is a general investigation method in Japan. It was confirmed that there was no significant difference between inside and outside the farm. After the first audit, the system that can measure sulphide by the method specified by ASC was prepared by Tohoku University, so they entrusted it to Tohoku University and measured the sulphide concentration of sediment again on 27th October 27 2016. Samples were taken at eleven points inside the farm and seven points outside the farm and measured. As a result, no sulphide concentration exceeding 1500 µM was found at any point inside or outside the farm. As a result, the next sulphite concentration measurement in the sediment can be done after 5 years.</p>
-------	--	--	--	-----------	--

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
	Applicability: On-bottom and suspended methods over depositional substrate	c. If the farm intends to conduct measurements of total 'free' sulfides using a method different from the one prescribed in Appendix IV & V of the Bivalve Standard (e.g. in order to comply with local regulations), the farm must first request a variation from ASC showing how the alternate method will meet the intent of the Standard in an equivalent way.	C. If applicable, confirm that the variation request was approved by ASC and document in the audit report how the alternate method of measuring free sulfides meets the intent of the Standard in an equivalent way.		
		d. Others, please describe			
2.1.2	Indicator: Unacceptable levels of total 'free' sulfide in surficial sediment measured beneath the farm in comparison to control sites Requirement: $\geq 3000 \mu\text{M}$ Applicability: Off-bottom and suspended methods over depositional substrate	a. If initial assessment of S concentration is $\geq 3000 \mu\text{M}$, the farm is not certifiable unless natural background S levels exceed $3000 \mu\text{M}$ (proceed to 2.1.3.). Management response is required to reduce S levels. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify documentation of initial assessment of S concentration by either direct measurement or analysis of benthic community structure.	Compliant	As above, no sulphide concentration exceeding $1500 \mu\text{M}$ was found at any point inside or outside the farm.
2.1.3	Indicator: In cases where natural background sulfide levels exceed $3000 \mu\text{M}$, the annual S concentrations should not significantly ^[3] exceed levels measured at reference sites located outside the farm ^[4] Requirement: Yes Applicability: Off-bottom and suspended methods over depositional substrate	a. Provide results comparing sampled S culture area to reference sites outside the farm (see Appendices I & 2 for the comparison to control sites). If S concentrations beneath the farm structures are not found to be significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) than reference sites, monitoring shall be conducted every year. (Proceed to 2.1.5.). b. Others, please describe	A. Verify comparison with natural background levels if presented.	Compliant	As above, no sulphide concentration exceeding $1500 \mu\text{M}$ was found at any point inside or outside the farm.
2.1.4	Indicator: Sulfide analysis may be replaced by direct analysis of benthic community structure (i.e. infaunal surveys) in areas where this biotic approach is preferred by the applicant or is already mandated by a regulatory body ^[5] Requirement: Yes Applicability: Off-bottom and suspended methods over depositional substrate	a. Notify the CAB if the farm used the biotic approach and identify a source reference (i.e. a scientific publication) for the method used. b. Provide documentary evidence to show how the farm established equivalency of biotic indices with sulfide levels (e.g. reports from analysis of infaunal surveys). c. If S equivalency is $< 3000 \mu\text{M}$, proceed to 2.1.1. If S equivalency is $> 3000 \mu\text{M}$, proceed to 2.1.2. d. Others, please describe	A. Record whether the farm replaced the sulfide analysis with a direct analysis of benthic community structure. If yes, confirm that the farm's benthic community analysis complies with requirements [5]. B. Review farm datasets for benthic community structure to confirm that the farm has established equivalency of indices with sulfide levels. C. Verify that the farm correctly used the equivalent S concentrations to determine the next action (i.e. whether to establish monitoring frequency, or to compare to reference sites).	N/A	Benthic community structure analysis has not been conducted.
2.1.5	Indicator: Allowance for bivalve aquaculture over areas that provide a particularly significant or essential biological or ecological function within the broader ecosystem ^[6] Requirement: None	a. Prepare results from video or seabed imaging survey of the farm. b. Summarize information about sensitive habitats in proximity to farming operations (e.g. using a map of habitat distribution; see 1.1.1e) noting any areas where biogenic structures are located [8]).	A. Verify that video or imagery demonstrates that the farm is not located over areas that provide significant biological or ecological function within the broader ecosystem. B. Verify farmer knowledge of sensitive habitat in proximity to farming operations.	Compliant	Minamisanriku Town Seabed status survey was conducted during 15th to 18th May 2011. Video from this survey is kept. No ecologically important ocean area was confirmed near the farms. It was soon after the Earthquake so many rubbles were found but the amount of rubbles were less than expected. Seaweed bed is considered to be sensitive habitats. There is a map of seaweed bed in Shizugawa Bay. Comparison study of seaweed bed and aquaculture farms was conducted during November 2009 to March 2014. Aquaculture farms are located deeper than 10m and seaweed beds exist in areas of 5m depth or above. So they do not overlap. During the site visit, auditors confirmed that farms are not located near seaweed beds.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
	Applicability: Off-bottom and suspended methods	c. Others, please describe			
2.2 Criteria: Pelagic effects					
2.2.1	Indicator: The ratio of clearance time ^[7] (CT) over retention time ^[8] (RT) Requirement: >1 Applicability: All* *If the area of all of the farms within a water body as defined in Appendix I of the Bivalve Standard, inclusive of the certification unit, is less than 10% of the total area of the water body, then requirements 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 need not apply.	a. Present a map showing the water body and all farm locations (including the unit of certification). Calculate the percent of the water body area covered by farms and present values used in the calculation. b. If combined area of all farms is < 10 % of total area of the water body, then 2.2.1 does not apply (Proceed to 2.3.1.). c. If the area of the farm is ≥ 10% of the water body, calculate clearance time (CT) of the dominant bivalve stocks (wild and cultured) for the water body. Provide all bivalve census information and published clearance rates ^[9] used in the calculation. d. If the area of the farm is ≥ 10% of the water body, calculate the retention time (RT) of the water body. Calculate CT / RT ratio. Provide all data used in the calculation, including references. e. Others, please describe	A. Verify the accuracy of values used in the defining the areas of the farm and water body. B. Verify this conclusion and document in the audit report. C. Verify that the CT has been correctly calculated from appropriate census data and published clearance rate data. Verify bivalve density. D. Verify that the farm meets the requirement of CT/RT>1 .	Compliant	According to the enclosed coastal seas net of Ministry of Environment, area of Shizugawa Bay is calculated as 46.8km with a line connecting Udatsusaki and point of triangulation at Terahama in Togura area being one of the boundaries. http://www.env.go.jp/water/heisa/heisa_net/waters/sizugawawan.html There is also a clear map showing the area of the demarcated fishery right. Areas occupied by oyster rafts are compared with the area of Shizugawa Bay. Scallop (<i>Patinopecten yessoensis</i>) is also farmed in this bay and this Criterion should include total area of all bivalve farms, so areas occupied by scallop rafts are also calculated. In Shizugawa Bay, oyster aquaculture is taking place not only in Togura area but also in Shizugawa area and Utazu area. So all areas occupied by oyster raft and scallop raft of all these regions are added to compare with the area of Shizugawa Bay. When rafts are simulated as a surface, not lines, all rafts occupied 6.92% of the Shizugawa Bay. So it is sufficiently smaller than 10%.
2.2.2	Indicator: Where clearance time is less than retention time, the ratio of clearance time over primary production time ^[9] (PPT) Requirement: >3 Applicability: All farms not compliant with 2.2.1.	a. Calculate the yearly averaged phytoplankton biomass (B) and primary production (PPP) for the entire water body. Provide all information regarding the sampling methods used and the locations and times of each sample. Provide all references used in the conversion of values into similar units. b. Calculate primary production time (PPT) and CT / PPT ratio. Provide all data used in the calculation, including references. c. Others, please describe	A. Verify the accuracy of all estimates and that values used represent yearly averages for the entire extent of the water body. B. Verify that the ratio of CT / PPT > 3.	N/A	2.2.1 is compliant.
2.2.3	Indicator: Equivalency with requirements 2.2.1 or 2.2.2 may be demonstrated, if a farm or group of farms is able to prove, through more comprehensive carrying capacity modeling that, in aggregate, they do not exceed the ecological carrying capacity of the applicable water body in which they are located Requirement: Yes Applicability: -	a. Provide the published peer-reviewed publication describing the model as applied to the present state of the water body and all associated aquaculture. b. Provide the model estimates of CT, RT, and PPT. If these were not directly presented in the publication, provide additional information as to how these parameters were calculated. c. Others, please describe	A. Verify that the model has been published in a peer-reviewed journal and that it applies to the present state of water body and all associated aquaculture. B. Verify that the model results clearly show that the farm does not exceed the ecological carrying capacity of the water body. CT/RT and PPT values must meet the levels indicated in 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, respectively.	N/A	2.2.1 is compliant.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
2.3 Criteria: Critical habitat and species interactions					
2.3.1	Indicator: Allowance for harm to threatened/endangered species ¹⁰¹ or the habitat on which they depend Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Provide a list of threatened or endangered species as identified by national law or the IUCN Red List. To obtain the IUCN Red List designated species, perform the above search and record all IUCN Red List species and farm-related threats. b. Provide a map showing location of the farm (see Indicator 1.1.1e) relative to the known distribution of endangered species or critical habitats in the area. c. If a threatened or endangered species is identified in region of the farm (including receiving and source waters), document the specific actions the farm takes to minimize impacts. – e. Others, please describe	A. Repeat the search to verify that client obtained an accurate result. Verify through additional databases and government reports to cross-check whether endangered species exist in the immediate vicinity of the farm. B. Verify that client is aware of these endangered species or critical habitats located near farm. C. Verify the actions taken by the client to minimize impacts and document them in the audit report. D. During interviews with local community members, confirm there is no evidence that the farm harms threatened/endangered species or the habitat on which they depend.	Compliant	Red list of Miyagi Prefecture is currently under revision. Species in intertidal zone are to be covered in this list. Data related to marine benthic organism is not sufficient and there is no red list. WWF Japan consulted existing materials and experts and has developed a list of threatened/endangered species listed in IUCN red list. Red list of Ministry of Environment and Red list of Miyagi Prefecture that exist or were found in the past in the region. 8 bird species and 2 mammals were listed at the time of the initial assessment, and 1 reptile was added from consultation after the initial assessment. Oyster aquaculture never seems to have any direct negative impact on any of the species listed. Birds use the area as resting and feeding site but the oyster aquaculture is unlikely to be putting any pressure on their habitats nor any case of death of the birds caused by farm reported. Regarding the possibilities of water quality change affecting the organisms in intertidal zone or physically preventing the movement of marine mammals, there is no research on these. Regarding fish species, <i>Leucopis petersii</i> which is designated endangered species by the Ministry of Environment is considered to live in this region. But this fish lay eggs in river and stays in seaweed bed so the farms are unlikely to be causing any impact on them. The association presented which rivers this fish runs in order to understand their habitats. There are 5 species of Eelgrass. One of which is endangered but the habitat does not overlap with farms. For seaweeds, one of endangered species designated by the Ministry of the Environment has been newly confirmed, but habitats also do not overlap with farms. Since farms are managed for many decades, there is no data on status of threatened/endangered species in the absence of farms. There is a map of seaweed beds in Shizugawa Bay. Aquaculture farms are located deeper than 10m and seaweed beds exist in areas of 5m depth or above. So they do not overlap. During the site visit, auditors confirmed that farms are not located near seaweed beds. Currently there is no case where farms are considered to be affecting the threatened/endangered species. Hence no measure is needed. Several farmers who are also local community members were consulted but no information about threatened/endangered species or their habitats were obtained. Minamisanriku Town is preparing to apply for the Ramsar Convention with seaweed bed as a candidate area, and explained it to committee members and producers. There was no disagreement.
2.4 Criteria: Environmental awareness					
2.4.1	Indicator: Evidence of environmental training, compliance to regional codes of practices or implementation of environmental management plans. Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Provide documentation of environmental training/education of staff (e.g. certificates, evidence of workshops attended etc.) (OR) b. Provide documentation of regional codes of practice and actions taken to ensure compliance, including staff training (OR) c. Provide evidence for implementation of an environmental management plan. d. Others, please describe	A. Verify documented evidence of farm worker environmental training (OR) B. Verify that documentation of regional codes of practice are up to date and adhered to and that staff have been appropriately trained in its execution (OR) C. Verify that the farm has an environmental management plan and that the plan is implemented.	Compliant	After the Earthquake, “hard-working fishery small committee meeting” was held every week. Records of the meetings were confirmed. There is a record of annual meeting of Togura Oyster Subcommittee held on 3th September 2015. Oyster farmers were explained about ASC certification in this meeting. Board's meeting is held monthly. Other records confirmed are: Oyster Processing seminar organised by prefecture on 20th August 2015; two participants in Sustainable Seafood Week Business forum on 9th June 2015; Oyster Aquaculture training seminar organised by prefecture on 5th June 2014; etc. In order to be ASC certified, internal study sessions were organised in the Association and a professor of Tohoku University was invited to give a lecture on environment of the bay. The applicant also participate in annual reporting seminar of Miyagi Prefecture Kesennuma Fisheries Experiment Station. When any research is carried out by a third party with cooperation of the Association, the applicant participate in the reporting seminar. Farm improvement plan based on Sustainable Aquaculture Production Assurance Act is established. The duration of this plan is the same as the application of fishery right. The contents of the plan is explained in the meetings of Oyster Subcommittee. Progress report based on the plan is submitted to the prefecture twice a year. The report dated 17th April 2015 was confirmed. Above mentioned plan includes environmental regulations such as number of rafts, fish disease control and chemicals. Associate Professor Kazuhisa Komatsu of the University of Tokyo gave a lecture on the environment at “Council thinking about the future of Shizugawa bay” held at Minami Sanriku-cho local regional wholesale market on 16th January 2017. Association staff and farmers participated it. It is recorded in the diary. The town is working towards the registration of the Ramsar Convention, and explained at the Steering Committee of 30th September 2016 (the Steering Committee is the representative of the district). In addition, the briefing session by the town was in Togura area. It was held on 28th October, 2nd and 12th November, 2016, etc. Association staff and farmers participated. In 2016 Tohoku University was investigating the natural situation of Minamisanriku Town, and a briefing session was held. Staff and producer representatives participated it. Briefing sessions are planned on 6th Sep 2017 about new salmon feed containing rice flour. On 7th Sep 2017, “Information exchange meeting between beach and water examination” will be held at Kesen-numa Fisheries Research Institute. They will discuss the findings of researches with fishermen. The general assembly is scheduled to be held in September every year, and since this year there are quality inspections of oysters on 20 Sep, they plan to do it after receiving the result.
3.1 Criteria: Introduced pests and pathogens					
	Indicator: Allowance for the illegal introduction of a non-native species,	a. Maintain documentation showing the origin of culture stock including names, addresses, contact person(s) and delivery dates when applicable.	A. If documented evidence exists linking farm to an illegal introduction within 10 years prior to assessment, farm is not eligible for certification.	Compliant	There is no evidence of introducing illegal culture stock in the past 10 years. All culture stocks are purchased from companies in the prefecture. Locally collected young shells of local oyster is also used as necessary. In Miyagi Prefecture, even after the Earthquake when all culture stocks were lost, no culture stocks were brought from other prefectures in order to avoid the risk of pathogens. From 2012 to 2014, farmers in Togura sub-branch cooperatively purchased culture stocks under the “Support program for

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
3.1.1	pest or pathogen attributable to the farm within 10 years prior to assessment.	-	B. During interviews with local community members, confirm there is no indication that the farm has caused an illegal introduction of a non-native species, pest, or pathogen in the last ten years.		hard-working aquaculture and all purchase records are kept. Records before the Earthquake were all washed away and so lost. The support program ended in 2015 and farmers purchase culture stocks individually. So a "Report Form" was newly developed in order to annually report stock purchase information, fuel (petrol, diesel, and heavy oil) consumption record and oil change record to the Association. In 2015, about 70% of culture stocks are collected locally and the rest was purchased from companies in other regions within the prefecture. The association asked each farmer to submit the seedling purchase record in 2015, and compiled it into a list. They also have a copy of invoices at the time of purchase. Invoices such as on 13th February 2015 were confirmed. The record of 2016 is being requested to each farmer. Several farmers who are also local community members were consulted but no information about introduction of illegal culture stock in the past was obtained. In 2017 they also used locally-collected young shells and purchased young shells. The percentage of locally-collected young shells is increasing.
	Requirement: None Applicability: All	c. Others, please describe			

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence (1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
3.1.2	Indicator: Documentation of compliance with established protocol or evidence of following appropriate best management practices for preventing and managing disease and pest introductions with seed and/or farm equipment. Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Provide documentation of established protocol or best management practices used in preventing and managing disease and pest introductions. b. Provide evidence that the farm has implemented established protocols or best management practices for preventing and managing disease and pest introductions with seed and/or farm equipment. c. Others, please describe	A. If applicable, documentation of compliance with established protocol or best management practices exists and is available. B. During the on-site inspection look for evidence the farm has implemented protocols or best management practices provided in 3.1.2a	Compliant	No pathogen has occurred with culture stock in the prefecture in the past. So the best practice is consider to used only the culture stock in the prefecture. On 2nd February 2011, the state government notified each prefecture about the risk of Oyster Herpes Virus. In response to this, Miyagi Prefecture Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Department General Manager ordered not to purchase culture stocks from other prefectures. In case if falling dead oyster or pathogen is found to be occurring, the Association immediately report to the prefecture and investigation will begin. Officers on the Association are explained about the pest management system in the training seminar. The system is informed to farmers too. In the annual report, purchase invoice and delivery note of culture stocks are checked so that origin can be confirmed. Farmers are motivated to use local stocks. Voluntary self-check of oyster norovirus is conducted once a month. Notice letter issued by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to Miyagi Prefecture, Fishery Associations and other companies in Miyagi Prefecture about regulations about bringing culture stocks from outside the prefecture and pest management were confirmed. Past available purchase records of culture stock proves that there has been no introduction of culture stock from outside the prefecture.
3.2 Criteria: Sustainable wild seed procurement					
3.2.1	Indicator: Excluding larval collection, evidence that purchased or collected wild seed is not harvested from an open-access, unregulated source Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Maintain documentation showing the origin of culture stock with names, addresses, contact person(s) and delivery dates of each purchase. b. Provide documentation that wild seed has not been collected from an open-access, unregulated source. c. Others, please describe	A. Verify that wild seed is not from an open-access, unregulated source B. Verify that documentation is available that shows wild seed collected is procured from an area that falls under existing regulatory schemes	Compliant	Purchase invoices and delivery notes of culture stocks since 2012 were confirmed. E.g. Invoice dated 13th February 2015. Amount of self collected larval are recorded by each farmer and reported to the Association annually. Fishery right of seed oyster is in place. There are many private individual right holders. They also belong to the Fishery Cooperative Association. There is no upper limit of amount to be collected by each right holders but the total collection capacity in the prefecture as a whole is only about 1.2 million hanging wires. During June to August when larva occurs, the Prefecture issues Coastal Aquaculture News (Seed Oyster News) every week. Larva occurs naturally in abundance and only a little portion is considered to be used. The statistics shows that past 50-year-use of larva has not affected the natural population. There are data about amount of larva occurrence and collected amount within the prefecture. It is considered that only a very small percentage of larva occurred is collected. Among the rest, a few more percent naturally grows on quay side and most larva dies naturally. Estimate shows that at maximum 1.1% of larva and 1.7% of larva are collected in Ishinomaki/Matsushima Bay and Shizugawa Bay respectively. Farmers collect necessary amount of naturally occurring larva and purchases from companies in the prefecture if the amount collected is not sufficient.
3.3 Criteria: Introduced non-native cultivated species					
3.3.1	Indicator: Evidence of responsible ^[11] introduction of non-native cultivated species Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. If the farm works with the culture of newly-introduced non-native bivalve species, obtain permit(s) substantiating compliance with ICES guidelines for introduction of exotic species and certification to ICES requirements regarding parasites and pathogens.[11]. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify the farm has obtained permits showing compliance with ICES guidelines for introduction of exotic species and certification to ICES requirements regarding parasites and pathogens.	Compliant	There is no use of non-native oyster culture stock. The state government, Prefecture and the Association all try to prevent the use of non-native species. Purchasing from abroad is costly so no one is interested in buying from abroad.
3.4 Criteria: Native species cultivation					
3.4.1	Indicator: For hatchery produced seed, documentation of efforts made to address genetic concerns specific to species and geographic region where the seed will be out-planted Requirement: Required Applicability: All farms producing	a. Provide documentation of the use of local, wild broodstock to address genetic concerns specific to species and the geographic region where the seed will be out-planted (OR) b. Provide documentation of the scale of farming activities and the reproductive potential of crops (e.g., whether diploid or triploid, or considering age at harvest and age at first maturation) are well-below the size and reproductive potential of the natural population within a reasonable "dispersal kernel" from the farm. (OR)	A. Verify that efforts have been made to address genetic concerns specific to species and the geographic region where the seed will be out-planted. Document in the audit report the farms use of the local, wild population for the broodstock with appropriate rotation of spawned individuals. If there is uncertainty about whether a broodstock is of local origin, record source locality in the audit report (OR) B. Verify that the reproductive potential (e.g., whether diploid or triploid, or considering age at harvest and age at first maturation) of the hatchery produced seed is well-below the size and reproductive potential of the natural population within a reasonable "dispersal kernel" from the farm are (OR)		Farmers are using the natural culture stock of Miyagi Prefecture so that there is no genetic concern. Fisheries Agency notified each Prefecture to investigate and report when triploid is planned to be used. In Miyagi Prefecture there was a research of triploid in the past. However, it was decided that the prefecture is not going to allow the use of triploid so that there is no use of triploid in the prefecture now. They have plenty of naturally occurring larva. So no hatchery produced seed is used.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
	seed	c. Provide documentation on the production of sterile seed for out-planting from breeding programs that intentionally alter wild stocks for improved culture traits, such as growth, yield, survival and morphology (OR)	C. Verify the existence of a breeding program that produces altered sterile seed for out-planting (OR)	Compliant	
		d. Provide documentation of cooperation with restoration efforts in the geographic region using out-planting that involves the intentional divergence from wild stocks to produce disease resistant wild populations	D. Verify that the farm's breeding program is in coordination with existing restoration efforts in the geographic region.		
		e. Others, please describe			
3.5 Criteria: Transgenic animals					
3.5.1	Indicator: Allowance for farming of transgenic ^[12] animals Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Maintain documentation showing the origin of culture stock with names, addresses, contact person(s) and delivery dates of each purchase (see 3.2.1a). b. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not culture transgenic bivalves. – d. Others, please describe	A. Verify that farm documents show the origin of culture stock with names, addresses and contact person(s) of suppliers. B. Verify that farm records for cultured stock (3.5.1.A) clearly indicate that the stock is not transgenic. C. Suspicion of transgenic shellfish being cultured requires validation by the sampling of 3 individuals from suspected stock and shipped for genetic mapping by an ISO 17025 certified laboratory to determine gene sequence and unknown sequences	Compliant	In Miyagi Prefecture there was a research of triploid in the past. However, it was decided that the prefecture is not going to allow the use of triploid so that there is no use of triploid in the prefecture now. They have plenty of naturally occurring larva. So no hatchery produced seed is used. Chairperson of Oyster Subcommittee has signed a commitment on 4th November 2015 mentioning that the subcommittee is not to use triploid, genetically modified shellfish, species from abroad and non-native species.
PRINCIPLE 4. MANAGE DISEASE AND PESTS IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER					
4.1 Criteria: Disease and pest management practices					
4.1.1	Indicator: Allowance for the application of mutagenic, carcinogenic or teratogenic pesticides on the farm or farmed animals Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Maintain a record of all chemicals (any substance that is added by the producer to farm or farmed animals) used for prior 12 month period by farm and/or contractors. If the farm is located in an integrated facility, all chemicals used in hatcheries and processing plants must be recorded, in addition to those used in grow-out. Supply technical information on all chemicals used on the farm. b. Provide chemical supplier name and contact information. – d. Others, please describe	A. Verify by inspection and review of chemical use records that no mutagenic, carcinogenic or teratogenic pesticides are used by the farm and/or contractors on the farm or farmed animals during any stage of culture. B. Verify chemical supplier and contact information C. Inspect the farm's chemical inventory and cross-check to a sample of records for purchase and receipt.	Compliant	No chemical is used in farm or oyster processing centre. Ship bottom coating paints used are only those designated as appropriate.
4.1.2	Indicator: Allowance for the application of chemicals that persist as toxins in the marine environment or on the farm or farmed animals Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Same as 4.1.1.a. b. Same as 4.1.1.b. – d. Others, please describe	A. Verify by inspection and review of chemical use records that no chemicals are used by the farm and/or contractors on the farm or farmed animals that can persist as toxins in the marine environment. B. Verify chemical supplier and contact information C. Inspect the farm's chemical inventory and cross-check to a sample of records for purchase and receipt.	Compliant	No chemical is used.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
4.1.3	Indicator: Only non-lethal management (e.g., exclusion, deterrents and removal) of critical species ^[13] that are pests or predators Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Provide a list of all predator and pest control devices used at the site and their locations. b. Provide a description of all procedures used for managing pests and explain how the farm ensures that no harms is done to critical species (identified in 2.3.1.). c. Others, please describe	A. Validate the accuracy of the control devices listed through site inspection B. Verify that the farm takes appropriate precautions to ensure that no IUCN Red List species are harmed.	Compliant	Warm water treatment against organisms attached to oysters is conducted. Once a year during late July to early August, oysters are treated with warm water of 60 to 70 degrees C. Organisms other than oyster die because of high temperature. Boilers and hot-water pot are used. Oyster Subcommittee owns 25 boilers and there is a list of all boilers. In June 2015, organisms treated with the warm water were investigated. Among 4 samples tested, there was no red list species. Working conditions of the warm water treatment was observed. It was confirmed that the treatment would not affect RTE species.
4.1.4	Indicator: Allowance for the use of leadline or lead sinkers on predator netting Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Ensure that no leadline or sinkers are located on the farm or used on predator netting. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify through site inspection that these materials are not located on or used by the farm.	Compliant	Predator netting is not used. No use of lead.
4.1.5	Indicator: Allowance for the use of explosives Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Ensure that no explosives are used on the farm. b. Others, please describe	A. During the on-site audit, verify that there are no explosives on site. Confirm during interviews with local community members that the farm does not use explosives.	Compliant	No explosive is used.
PRINCIPLE 5. USE RESOURCES EFFICIENTLY					
5.1 Criteria: Waste management/pollution control					
5.1.1	Indicator: Evidence of waste reduction (e.g. reuse and recycling) programs Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and indicate which waste materials are recycled. b. Others, please describe	A. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials	Compliant	The most common waste is the oyster shells. Oyster shells are temporarily stored in a stock yard located in the forest in Togura area. Stored shells are then handed over to local company named Endo Gumi and recycled there to become a lime fertilizer. Before the Earthquake, Endo Gumi had a processing facility near the stock yard to process the shell to make fertilizer. But the processing facility was washed away by Tsunami. So the company is now bringing the shells to another company in Tome City to process. In the past, there was a trial to make fish bank blocks named "Shell Nurse" from the shells.
5.1.2	Indicator: Evidence of appropriate storage and/or disposal of biological waste Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Prepare a plan that details how the farm ensures proper disposal of all biological waste including separation and segregation of biological waste from non-biological waste. b. Maintain records to show how the farm disposes of dead bivalves and other forms of biological waste. c. Others, please describe	A. Verify that the farm has a plan for the proper disposal of biological waste. B. Verify from farm records that disposals follow the farm's plan. C. During the on-site inspection, confirm the farm's plan is effectively implemented. Evidence will include interviews with farm workers who confirm that disposals followed the plan.	Minor	Biological waste is processed as described above. A procedure named "Biological Waste Processing" was developed which include flow diagrams and photos. Before the Earthquake, oystershells were transported by the local company. But after the Earthquake when "Support program for hard-working aquaculture" was in place, farmers transported shells by themselves so that there is no clear record of transportation. Temporary stock yard of oystershells is a town owned land where the Fishery Cooperative Association makes a lease contract with the town. The validity of the contract was confirmed as from 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2017. However the association did not understand if the contract was renewed. See Minor CAR 2017.1. As an annex to this contract, agreement was made between the Association and Endo Gumi on 1st July 2014 and the payment of the leased land is made by Endo Gumi according to the agreement. There is a minute of meeting with the president of Endo Gumi on 5th November 2015. The minute was counter signed by the president of Endo Gumi. Before the Earthquake, there were some dead bivalves due to lack of oxygen in the sea. When they are dead, their tissues naturally decay and only the shells are left attached to rafts. So these empty shells were processed as described above. After the Earthquake, population density is kept low so that there is no dead bivalves due to lack of oxygen observed now. There has never been a dead bivalves observed which is considered to be caused by diseases. No mass grave case ever either. Small amount of living organisms are found attached to floats. They are removed on an empty ground and left there. Organisms treated with the warm-water treatment process fall off naturally into the sea. The warm-water treatment is done in early summer when the organisms are still small. In this way, those organisms are unlikely to occur again for a year. Auditors visited the harbour and the temporary stock yard and confirmed that above mentioned processes are implemented.
5.1.3	Indicator: Evidence of appropriate storage and/or disposal of chemical and hydrocarbon wastes Requirement: Yes	a. Ensure that the disposal of disused equipment and waste is done promptly, including hazardous waste from the site according to local law and Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS). Farms shall maintain an inventory of all chemicals used or located on site.	A. Verify through farm inspection that disposal is done according to local law and MSDS descriptions. e.g. no disposal of waste at sea or in any watercourse, burning of plastics and other synthetic materials	Compliant	No chemical is used. Hence no disposal. When engine oil of ships are changed, the old oil is processed appropriately by the company which changes the oil. Invoices of oil changes are kept. E.g. Invoice dated 18th November 2015 was confirmed. Foamed polystyrene is currently not used even as floats or in the processing centre. Other plastic wastes are not burned but appropriately treated. Old ropes are collected by the Association and then processed as an industrial waste.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
	Applicability: All	b. Others, please describe			
5.1.4	Indicator: Spill prevention and response plan for chemicals/hydrocarbons originating from farming operations Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Prepare a prevention and response plan spills of chemical and hydrocarbon waste. The plan shall outline the preventative maintenance of equipment exist and in place for the avoidance of fuel spills from vehicles, winches, cranes, and mechanical equipment on land and water. b. Maintain documentation regarding the training history of all employees in the proper disposal of waste and in the prevention and management of chemical and hydrocarbon spills as described in the above plan (5.1.4.a). c. Maintain documentation of equipment or structures that have come into contact with spilled chemicals and have been subsequently cleaned. d. Others, please describe	A. Verify that the farm has sufficiently documented prevention and response plans for dealing with potential spills of chemical and hydrocarbon waste. B. Verify that the farm has sufficiently documented the training of all employees in current prevention and response plans to manage chemical and hydrocarbon spills. C. Verify that the farm has sufficiently documented equipment or structures that have come into contact with spilled chemicals and the actions taken to clean the affected areas.	Compliant	Before the Earthquake, there were oil fences and absorbing mat in the office. Currently they are placed in the ship fuel station in the Shizugawa Market. The fuel station is about 15 minutes away by car from Togura Office. These equipment were provided by the prefecture. Small scale spillage is treated by the Fishery Cooperative Association and in case of large scale spillage, a local company is contracted to collect the spilled oil. The biggest risk of fuel and oil spillage is related to turn over of a small boat. Diesel engines of ships are fueled by the tank truck of the Association. Petrol used for outboard engine of a boat is bought individually by each farmer at ordinary petrol station and carried in a designated container. There has never been any reported case of spillage of the petrol. There is a written emergency communication structure in case of any spillage. In the past, farmers participated in a seminar organised by the Maritime Safety Agency. No training since the Earthquake. There is a communication structure in case of oil spillage. In Kesennuma, an adjacent city, there are number of large vessels sailing. So they run a drill to prepare for fuel spillage. But in this region, there is no large vessel coming so that there is no such drill conducted. Communication structure is displayed at Processing Centre as well as offices of the Association so that farmers can see it whenever needed. On 14th December 2016, a working ship moored at the port naturally sank and oil leaks were discovered. They immediately contacted the Maritime Security Agency, pulled out the ship, and absorbed the spilled oil with an absorption mat. For the oyster not to be affected, they stopped fishing for a week after that. Confirmed the record. There has been no accident since the one mentioned above.
Criteria 5.2: Energy efficiency					
5.2.1	Indicator: Evidence of energy use monitoring relative to production and ongoing effort to improve efficiency Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain records (e.g. receipts) of on-farm fuel and electricity usage. A minimum of 12 months of continuous records are required before the first audit. b. Compute the annual energy consumption for the last 12 months. Energy usage is itemized and summed in kilojoules. Conversions of energy components to kilojoules of energy can be found at: http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=about_energy_conversion_calculator . c. Using results from 5.2.1.b and the total weight (metric tons) of shellfish produced over the last 12 months, determine the farm's energy consumption relative to production. d. Document the main procedures undertaken by the farm to improve energy efficiency and provide a short summary of the effectiveness of those procedures. e. Others, please describe	A. Verify the farm maintains records. B. Verify the accuracy of the calculated annual energy consumption. C. Verify the accuracy of the calculated energy consumption relative to production. D. Report the main procedures used by the farm to improve energy efficiency and include a short summary of effectiveness in the audit report.	Minor	Amount of electricity and gas used in Togura Office is recorded. Amount of electricity and gas used in Processing Centre is also recorded. Diesel used for each farmer's ship diesel engine and heavy oil used for boilers of warm-water treatment are all sold by the Association so the amount is easily accessible. About 100 liters of diesel is fueled at a time. Amount of petrol used for outboard engine of a boat could be accessible before the Earthquake when the Association managed the petrol station. But the Association no longer manages the petrol station. Currently each farmer purchase the petrol individually. It is possible to keep the record of amount of petrol purchased. In case when the petrol is used for both the boat and their own private cars, the amount used for boat can be estimated. Amount can also be estimate by multiplying the number of working days by average consumption rate per day. Past data is not available. Fuel consumption amount is reported annually from each farmer to the Association. The association asked farmers to submit records of fuel consumption amount in 2015, but some farmers did not report it. See Condition 2017.2 . Currently 38 farmers belong to the Oyster Subcommittee. Each farmer owns 3 ships/boats on average. Only the largest one is used for landing the oyster. Although part of the data is missing, energy consumption was calculated to figure out the energy consumption per person. Converting the unit into KJ was done based on the conversion formula on the website. The calculated energy consumption per person was 99,555,054 KJ. The accuracy of the calculation was confirmed. Production amount of each Oyster Subcommittee member was calculated for oysters with and without shells. One person produced 31,843kg of oyster with the shells removed. Energy consumption per 1 Mt. of oyster was calculated to be 115,678,077KJ. The accuracy of the calculation was confirmed. In the past, there was an investigation under a project of New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization to assess the improvement of fuel consumption when a two-stroke cycle engine is replaced by a four-stroke cycle engine. Result showed sufficient improvement. Farmers used the subsidy named ""Support program for installing energy saving equipment"" (dated 13th July 2015) to replace the two-stroke cycle engine with four-stroke cycle engines. Now most farmers use four-stroke cycle engines. Boilers for warm-water treatment uses heavy oil. Togura Office received a fund from WWF Japan (under a project named ""Connect-warmth project"") on 19th June 2012 to install 10kw Solar panels. Cleaning of the bottom of boats has big impact on improving the fuel consumption rate. So each farmer is taking care of cleaning their own boats.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
5.2.2	Indicator: Maintenance records for farm equipment (e.g., boats and generators) are up to date and available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Prepare a maintenance plan which identifies the schedule for regular maintenance of farm equipment including boats and generators. b. Maintain records of equipment maintenance. A minimum of 12 months of continuous maintenance records must be provided for the first audit. c. Others, please describe	A. Verification that the farm has a plan covering regular maintenance of key farm equipment. B. Verify that maintenance records of equipment are accurate and complete for prior 12 month period	Compliant	Boats and boilers for warm-water treatment are privately owned. Based on regulations in Fishing Vessel Law, each boat receives regular inspection every 5 years and based on Ship Safety Act, regular inspection (main inspection every 6 years and one light inspection in between in the third year) are carried out by Japan Craft Inspection Organization. Depending on the size of boiler, Industrial Safety and Health Law regulates the requirements on the qualification and regular inspection. But the boilers the farmers own are simple small boiler which are exempt from these requirements. So each farmer checks their own boiler as necessary. Processing centre is visited by public health institute every year for an inspection. The inspection includes checking the proper function of all equipment. Electrical system is checked by Electrical Safety Association. There is a list of all ships/boats. Inspection records of ships/boats are kept by each farmer. Farmers also keep the insurance payment receipt for each ship/boat. E.g. One on 27th June 2015. Ship/boat insurance payment list is also kept. E.g. One on 29th January 2016. Inspection certificate of Japan Craft Inspection Organization is in place. 10 ships are applicable. E.g. One on 20th January 2016. Ship registration inspection application. E.g. One on 19th March 2014. Motored ship registration for each ship/boat. E.g. One on 18th November 2013. Inspection records of the processing centre. Records on water temperature, chlorine, cold storage chamber are kept everyday to check if there is anything going wrong or not.
PRINCIPLE 6. BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS COASTAL CITIZEN					
6.1 Criteria: Community relations and interaction					
6.1.1	Indicator: Visible floats must be of a uniform color, except where otherwise specified by law (if applicable to growing area) Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. If the farm uses visible floats, ensure that they are all uniform in color. – c. Others, please describe	A. If applicable, verify through site inspection that floats are uniformly colored. B. Verify that lights and bright colored buoys are minimized in comparison to those required for navigational safety	Compliant	Most floats are black. A few yellow floats are used for the purpose of indicators at places such as edge of rafts. Auditors confirmed on site that only minimum required number of yellow floats were used. Small beacon lights are placed in key spots which uses lights powered by solar panels. Two large beacon lights are used in the area. The colour of light follows the regulation in law.
6.1.2	Indicator: Uniform positioning and orientation of visible farm structures, except where specified by law (if applicable to growing area) Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Ensure that visible farm structures are uniformly positioned and oriented and do not impede navigation. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify through site inspection	Compliant	Oyster rafts were in order so that even large ships can go through easily. Confirmed during site visit. Places of the rafts are managed by GPS.
6.1.3	Indicator: Allowance for floats made out of open-cell Styrofoam Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Ensure that no open-celled Styrofoam floats are used or located on the farm. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify through site inspection that open-celled Styrofoam is not located on or used by the farm.	Compliant	Styrofoam floats including open-celled Styrofoam floats are not used for oyster rafts. Confirmed during site visit.
6.1.4	Indicator: Noise, light and odor originating from the farm are minimized in areas where it may impact others (if applicable to growing area) Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Prepare a list of all sources of noise, light and odor originating on the farm and include actions taken to reduce them b. Ensure that designated storage areas and containers exist for the materials that create odors. c. Others, please describe	A. Verify the existence of a list of all sources of noise, light and odor originating on the farm. Verify that actions taken to reduce these sources are appropriate. B. Verify through site inspection that storage areas and containers for materials that may create odor exist and are clearly designated.	Compliant	Before the Earthquake, temporary stock yard of oyster shells was in the harbour. It sometimes caused odor near neighbouring houses. After the Earthquake, the temporary stock yard is place in a forest and oyster shells are transported there everyday. So there is no more odor issue. No other sources of noise, light. Auditors confirmed during site visit that there was no source of odor.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
6.1.5	Indicator: Evidence of compliance with all applicable navigational rules and regulations Requirement: Required Applicability: Sea-based Farms	a. Provide a copy of local navigation rules and regulations. b. Maintain records of the training of relevant farm staff in local navigational rules and regulations. – d. Others, please describe	A. The farm maintains a copy of local navigational rules and regulations. B. Verify from records that all relevant staff have been trained. C. Verify through on-site interviews that workers are able to demonstrate an understanding of local navigational rules and regulations and the competency to act in accordance.	Compliant	Followings apply: Safety Regulations for Small Fishing Vessels based on Fishing Boat Act; Preventing Collisions at Sea Law; Maritime Traffic Safety Act; Act on Port Regulations. The applicant kept the latest laws and regulations list and actual documents. In order to steer a fishing boat, a license to operate small boats is needed. It is renewed every 5 years and each renewal is accompanied by a training seminar. The Association is informed by the Marine Office about the status of each farmer's license. So when renewal is needed, the Association informs the farmer to renew. The Association understands the status of license of each farmer. During 2016, 27 people renewed their license. The record was confirmed. Several farmers were interviewed and appropriate understanding was confirmed.
6.1.6	Indicator: Documented cleanup of receiving shoreline in response to gear loss based on local conditions Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Maintain a record of effort spent cleaning the receiving shoreline in response to gear loss. Record shall span at least a 12 month period prior to the audit. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify the existence of a record of cleaning the receiving shoreline. Verify that the cleanup frequency accurately reflects the probability of gear loss based on local conditions.	Compliant	No gear is lost for oyster aquaculture. Shoreline cleaning activity was held on 20th July every year (National Holiday named "Day of Sea"), but has not been conducted since the earthquake. After a storm, local people on their own upon consulting with town/prefecture officer (shoreline managers) clean up the shoreline. There was a storm on 18th January 2016 and they cleaned up after that. Shoreline managers are known. Before the Earthquake, broken floats are collected to be disposed. At the time of the Earthquake, all broken floats are disposed together with the rubbles. After the Earthquake, there has been no broken float. Some of the rafts tangled and sunk after a storm were collected. There has been no case of gear loss since the last one.
6.1.7	Indicator: Substantial gear (e.g., floats, cages, bags, predator nets and racks) is identifiable to farm (if applicable to growing area) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Ensure that all substantial gear is clearly labeled and identifiable as belonging to the farm. At a minimum, labeled gear shall include floats, cages, bags, predator nets and racks. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify through site inspection that any farm equipment is attributable to farm.	Compliant	Equipment such as floats are owned by Miyagi Prefecture Northern Facilities Owner Fisheries Cooperative Association. Farmers are renting the equipment so that they cannot label whatever they want or include their names. Though some farmers put an identification mark. When rafts break, for instance due to a storm, they are usually tangled up and stays there. So the original users can usually be identified later. Beacon light are owned by the Association and region names is written. Policy is asking each farmer to write their names on carrying container of petrol so prevent them to be stolen. Since theft of fuel from a ship that has been raising for a long time has occasionally occurred, they continue to ask producers to write their name on containers.
6.1.8	Indicator: Provision of equipment for gear recovery (e.g., scoop nets and grapple hooks) Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Ensure that the farm maintains equipment and /or mechanisms for recovering lost gear. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify through site inspection that the farm has recovery equipment and/or mechanisms for recovering lost gear.	Compliant	Each boat is equipped with a stick with a hook.
6.1.9	Indicator: A mechanism (e.g., insurance or an industry agreement to collect derelict gear) is in place for the decommissioning of abandoned farms Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Provide documentation of a mechanism for the collection and decommissioning of gear. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify the existence of a mechanism for the collection and decommissioning of gear.	Compliant	"Document regarding abandoning of a farm by member" was newly developed. When a farmer wishes to abandon a farm, "Closing business application" is to be submitted to the Association. Processes to follow are then discussed case by case. In most cases, next member to take up the place will be decided. There has been no case in the past where a farm was completely abandoned due to lack of replacing farmer.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
6.1.10	Indicator: Conflict resolution protocol, including publicly available registry of complaints and evidence of due diligence to resolve them Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Provide documentation outlining the farm's protocol for responding to complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations. b. Maintain publically available documentation of registered complaints and farm responses. - d. Others, please describe	A. Verify the existence of a farm protocol for responding to complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations. B. Verify that the farm implements its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation. C. Verify from the record that past complaints, when brought to farm attention, were dealt with swiftly. Confirm through interviews with representatives from the local community.	Compliant	"Complaints and Requests Following Up Procedure" was developed. No complaint so far. Several farmers who are also local community members were consulted but no information about complaints in the past were obtained. Rather, with the acquisition of certification, the relationship with school and people in the town has increased, the relationship with forest managers who have acquired FSC certification is also established, and a good relationship with the area is established. Tours on ASC certification and requests for information exchange are increasing.
6.1.11	Indicator: Evidence of outreach (e.g., meeting records, newsletters, consultation with communities and indigenous groups, or membership in association with documented outreach program) Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Provide documentation of community outreach and measures taken to maintain positive communication. Documented evidence shall include one or more of the following: - meeting records, - newsletters, - records of consultation with communities and indigenous groups, - membership in an association with a documented outreach program. b. Others, please describe	A. Verify that the client has documentary evidence of community outreach	Compliant	Under a program of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), trainees came from abroad to learn about the farms on 25th February 2015. JICA trainees are to come again in November. The farms receive 2 to 3 visits per year like this. The Association has a on-site training facility. The overview of aquaculture for each species is explained first from purchase to sales. Then visitors can visit the actual farms. This is leading activity in the prefecture. Visitors come to use this program several times a month. Face-to-face market named "Tabu no ki" is used for publishing information too. In the "Osabade" Festival which is held at the end of year, the Association provides fish for very low price. They were awarded at the 5th Biological Diversity Japan Awards by the AEON Environment Foundation. There are many acceptance of education for children inside and outside the town and training for companies. It is planned from 6 to 8 Sep 2017, too.
6.1.12	Indicator: Evidence of acknowledgment of indigenous groups' rights (if applicable to growing area) Requirement: Required Applicability: All	a. Provide a record of agreement or proof of acknowledgement of indigenous rights b. Others, please describe	A. Verify that records of agreement or proof of acknowledgement are evident and available.	N/A	Not applicable as no indigenous peoples exist here.
PRINCIPLE 7. DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY AND CULTURALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER					
7.1. Criteria: Child labor					
7.1.1.	Indicator: Incidences of child [14] labor [15] Requirement: 0 Applicability: All	a. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or higher (per national legal minimum age). b. System exists to monitor hours and conditions of young workers and light work by children. c. Young workers from 15 to 18 years of age [as defined in footnote 16]; have no conflicts between work and schooling; do not spend more than 10 hours/day on transportation time, school and work; and do not perform hazardous work [as defined in footnote 17]. d. Children under 15 perform only light work. Light work & school not to exceed 7 hours/day. e. Equal treatment for children of migrant workers. f. Others, please describe		Compliant	[All members] According to the Labour Standards Act of Japan, one cannot be employed as a permanent worker before the 1st April after s/he became 15 years old. There is no revision of the law. No young or child labour or light work. No migrant workers. [Farmers] Audit team confirmed via interview that all workers and part-time workers are grown up adult members of families and acquaintance. [Fisheries Cooperative Association] Audit team confirmed via interview that people under 15 are not employed.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
7.2. Criteria: Forced, bonded, compulsory labor					
7.2.1.	Indicator: Incidences of forced [18], bonded [19], or compulsory labor Requirement: 0 Applicability: All	a. Contracts clearly stated and understood by employees, no 'pay to work' schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs.		Compliant	[Farmers] Each farmer is a family business. Part of farmers hire acquaintances as part-time workers, but do not do compulsory labour. (confirmed via interview to farmers and office staff)
		b. Employees free to leave workplace and manage their own time.			[Fisheries Cooperative] Contract for employments are in place between the association and employees. Payment is made according to the payment regulation. Office staff sign employment contract as a form of condition of employment letter. Audit team confirmed via interview that office staff understand the contents of the letter.
		c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity papers.			Article 29 of employment regulation states that break during work and what to do during the break are up to the employees. Office staff can take one hour break during the work time (from 8:30 am to 17:00 pm) and use the break freely. Even when they cannot take a break on time they take it by staggered time. (Confirmed with the employment regulation and interview)."
		d. Employer shall not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.			Audit team confirmed via interview with office staff and manager that employee's original identity papers are not withheld by the association.
		e. Employees not obligated to stay in job to repay debt.			Payment is made according to the payment regulation. No personal property is withheld by the association. Employee's salaries are paid regularly and not withheld by the employer in order to oblige them to continue working for the employer (confirmed via interview to office staff).
		f. Others, please describe			There is a funding loan system in place but request for paying back is only done according to the paying back agreement. No additional forcing is made. Audit team confirmed via interview with office staff that they are not obligated to stay in job to repay debt.
7.3. Criteria: Discrimination					
7.3.1.	Indicator: Incidences of discrimination [20] Requirement: 0 Applicability: All	a. Written anti-discrimination policies in place, stating that the company does not engage/support in discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination		Compliant	[Farmers] Almost all farmers are family business without employment. Part of farmers hire acquaintances as part-time workers, but do not discriminate them. (confirmed via interview to farmers and office staff)
		b. Worker testimony supports that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. Records indicate objective mechanisms for employee reviews and the offering of promotion and training opportunities			[Fisheries Cooperative Association] Documents specifying such policies are not confirmed but employees are all uniform in terms of race, caste and nationality and no such discrimination was confirmed. Regarding gender, they have a single employment contract for both gender and no discrimination was confirmed. There are 3 permanent office staff and 5 temporary office staff. Payment system is specified for each type of operation so that no discrimination was confirmed in terms of employment types.
		c. Others, please describe			No condition based on gender etc. is set for employment. No other form of discrimination has occurred (Confirmed via interview to office staff and the manager).
7.4. Criteria: Health and safety					
7.4.1.	Indicator: All health and safety related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective action is taken when necessary Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Documentation is generated with regards to occupational health and safety violations.		Compliant	[Farmers & Fisheries Cooperative Association] In 2013, there was an accident. During landing of oyster on a boat, the boat swung and this person accidentally put the hand in washing equipment and hurt the hand. The accident was recorded in a diary dated 17th December 2013.
		b. Corrective action plans are implemented in response to accidents that have occurred. This should include: analysis of the root causes, address the root causes, remediate and prevent future accidents of similar nature.			After this accident, Kesennuma Marine Safety Station came to investigate. After the investigation, a notice was circulated in the region. The direct cause was because the washing equipment moved due to the swing of a boat. So the measure was consider to take special care in situations when waves are heaving up.
		c. Others, please describe			After the accident, a paper with photos was made and posted in the office of the association to remind people. Members of the association were informed of the accident to prevent similar accident to happen (auditors confirmed the posted paper in the office). In the past year there have been no cases of occupational health and safety breaches. (confirmed via interview to farmers and office staff) [Fisheries Cooperative] Employees of the association are involved in assembly service but there has never been any safety issue so far.

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
7.4.2.	Indicator: Occupational health and safety training is available for all employees Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Minimization of hazards/risks in the working environment, including documented systemic procedures and policies to prevent workplace hazards and their risks, shall exist and the information shall be available to employees. b. Emergency response procedures shall exist and be known by employees. c. Health and safety training for all employees is available, including training on potential hazards and risk minimization. d. Potentially dangerous chemicals are stored properly and as prescribed. e. Others, please describe		Compliant	<p>[Farmers & Fisheries Cooperative] "Togura sub-branch Oyster Subcommittee Occupational health and safety regulation" was developed. There are sections on safety training, social security coverage, prevention of accident re-occurring, safety management.</p> <p>Points of risk for each process is developed and displayed in the processing centre.</p> <p>They have a communication structure in case of accidents. The structure is displayed in the processing centre.</p> <p>Warm-water treatment uses hot water of at maximum 75 to 80 degrees C. But there was no case of burn injury in the past.</p> <p>Japan Coast Guard is promoting on a program named "Life guard ladies" where female promoters promote the use of life jacket. The Association also takes part in it.</p> <p>When a license to operate small boat is renewed, farmers receive a training seminar and safety is included in the seminar.</p> <p>Before the Earthquake, there was a seminar on safety management of leisure fishing boat but this program is no longer available.</p> <p>On 29th October 2014, Kesenuma Marine Safety Station contracted the Female Committee of Togura Sub-branch to be the "Life guard ladies. Record confirmed.</p> <p>Farmers participated in first aid seminar when they got the license to operate boat. In the past first aid seminar was held in the region, but it is no longer available in the region.</p> <p>AED is installed but no training on how to use it is given.</p> <p>Health and Safety information is shared during the general assembly (once a year) but lecture is not provided. (confirmed by interview to farmers).</p> <p>Wearing a life jacket is decided when boarding a ship during the landing of oysters. Farmers are also aware. However, it was confirmed that some farmers did not wear it (confirmed by interview to farmers). See Observation 2017.3</p> <p>[Farmers] Farmers are members of "Mutual Rescue Society of Water Accidents"</p> <p>There are procedures for taking actions in case of oil spillage, boat accident, distress and other accidents and illness (auditors confirmed the documents).</p> <p>[Fisheries Cooperative Association] Study seminar on safety for staff was not held in the past year. The role of office staff in the assembly service is to supervise. So the training on site given by the direct manager is sufficient. It is not related to safety of aquaculture. No dangerous chemical is used during work. (confirmed by interview to staff)</p>
7.4.3.	Indicator: Employer responsibility and proof of insurance (accident or injury) for employee medical costs in a job-related accident or injury, unless otherwise covered Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Documentation maintained by management confirms that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries. Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers. b. Others, please describe		Compliant	<p>[Farmers & Fisheries Cooperative] Regarding the above mentioned accident, the person was insured by an insurance of National Mutual Insurance of Water industry federation of cooperatives. The payment record was confirmed. The person was covered by this insurance as they were all managed under the "support program for hard-working aquaculture"</p> <p>It is up to farmers to decide if they wish to apply for an insurance of National Mutual Insurance of Water industry federation of cooperatives. The Association recommends farmer to continue with the same insurance. The Association does not have every information about insurance status of all farmers but almost 100% of farmers are covered by some sort of personal insurance.</p> <p>Boat insurance can also be used in many situations. Boat insurance is covered by the association.</p> <p>They have a plan to make a ledger covering all farmers.</p> <p>[Fisheries Cooperative] Office staff are covered by social insurance and employee's insurance. In case of accidents at work, the Workers' Accident Compensation Insurance is used (Confirmed via interview to office staff and the manager).</p>
7.5 Criteria: Fair and decent wages					
7.5.1.	Indicator: Payment of fair and decent wages Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employers/Managers understand and have policies to ensure the principle of equal pay for equal work. b. Employers ensure wages paid for a standard working week (no more than 48 hours) always meet, at least, legal/industry minimum standards. c. Labour conflict resolution policy in place to track conflicts and complaints raised, and responses to conflicts and complaints. d. Ratio of lowest wage rate to basic needs wage always exceeds 100%. e. Others, please describe		Compliant	<p>[Farmers] Almost all farmers are family business without employment. Part of farmers hire acquaintances as part-time workers, and remuneration is paid according to the time spent on oyster stripping work.</p> <p>[Fisheries Cooperative] Payment regulation is in place and payment is decided based on this regulation so that the payment system is clear. Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative merged on 1st April 2007 and at this point a common payment regulation was developed which unified the payment system in all branches. Office staff understand the contents of the regulation (confirmed via interview and the regulation).</p> <p>Article 29 of employment regulation states that specified work hour is 40 hours per week. Payment is regulated by payment regulation which meet the legal requirements.</p> <p>If there are problems concerning labour, there is a system that allows staff to talk with each other and consult with administrators at any time (confirmed via interview to office staff). Staff are consulted and evaluated based on the employee evaluation system of Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative (confirmed via interview to the manager).</p> <p>Minimum payment level specified in the payment regulation is well-above the minimum wage of Miyagi Prefecture. Minimum wage is set by each Prefecture as a level that workers can maintain the minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living. Therefore the minimum wage is the same level of basic needs wage, and the payment is well-above it.</p>
7.6 Criteria: Freedom of association and collective bargaining					

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence (1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
7.6.1.	Indicator: Employees have access to freedom of association and collective bargaining Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Workers have the freedom to form and join any trade union, free of any form of interference from employers or competing organizations set up or backed by the employer. The ILO specifically prohibits “acts which are designed to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control of employers or employers’ organizations”.		Compliant	[Farmers] Almost all farmers are family business. Part of farmers hire acquaintances as part-time workers, but they are one or two and the scale is too small to organise labour union. [Fisheries Cooperative Association] As a local fishery cooperative, they have never organized a trade union, also in last year. The managers do not restrict to organise a union (Confirmed via interview to office staff). Before the merge of the fishery cooperation, there was a trade union in the superior body (Federation of Prefectural Fisheries Cooperation), but no such an union for the current Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative (Confirmed via interview to office staff and the manager). No special communication related to freedom of association and collective bargaining was confirmed. Managers and all staff can communicate directly (via interview to office staff).
		b. Local trade union, or where none exists a reputable civil-society organization, confirms no outstanding cases against the employer for violations of employees’ freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.			
		c. Trade union representatives have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.			
		d. Explicit communications from the employer about their commitment to freedom of association and collective bargaining rights of all.			
		e. If trade unions exist, they are able to access/inform all workers directly (posters, pamphlets, visits).			
		f. Others, please describe			
7.7. Criteria: Non-abusive disciplinary practices					
7.7.1.	Indicator: Incidences of abusive disciplinary practices occurring on the farm Requirement: 0 Applicability: All	a. There is never any use of or support for (e.g. subcontractors using) corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, or verbal abuse.		Compliant	[Farmers] Almost all farmers are family business. Part of farmers hire acquaintances as part-time workers, but there is no abusive disciplinary practices. [Fisheries Cooperative] Corporal punishment, physical / psychological compulsion, abuse, etc. to office staff have not been reported (confirmed via interview to office staff). Disciplining of workers follow the labour standard act in Japan. There is a discipline classification of deductions of wages, however, this has never been implemented so far, also in the last year (confirmed via interview to the manager). There has been no reporting of disciplinary action. No fine nor wage deduction has implemented (confirmed via interview to office staff). Employment regulation specifies reducing measures (extenuation) of disciplinary actions. However there was no such a case in the past year.
		b. Fines or wage deductions shall not be acceptable as a method for disciplining workers (indicated by policy statements, as well as evidence from worker testimony).			
		c. Procedures exist for situations in which disciplinary action is required, and they establish the use of progressive verbal and written warnings. Aim should always be to improve the worker before letting him/her go. (Indicated by policy statements as well as evidence from worker testimony).			
		d. Others, please describe			
7.8. Criteria: Working hours					
7.8.1.	Indicator: Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws or expectations Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. No deductions in pay for disciplinary actions.		Compliant	[Farmers] Almost all farmers are family business without employment, so working hours are decided by themselves. Because shipping time by the association is fixed, opening time of the oyster processing centres is determined by it. Opening hours and users of the processing centre is specified. In the busiest season, it opens at 4 o'clock in the morning and can be used until noon. Sunday is a closing day because markets are also closed. In the afternoon after oyster processing, until 3pm, oyster for next day is landed. Landing oyster does not take long time. It finishes sometime even in one hour. Mechanisation made it easier to land oysters. Since the “Support program for hard-working aquaculture”, working hours has become shorter. No one works for more than 12 hours / day now. [Fisheries Cooperative] Disciplinary actions are regulated in the Labour Standard Act. However, no disciplinary action has been implemented so far, also in the past year. Payment regulation is clearly in place. Wages are transferred to employee's bank account every month (confirmed by interview to office staff and payment evidences). Audit team confirmed via interview that there is no such form of contract (information from farmers, association's staff and the manager). Payment regulation is clearly in place. Staff can refer to it anytime (confirmed via interview to office staff). Employment regulation regulates working hours to be 40 hours a week (from 8:30 am to 17:00 pm). Premium paid for overtime work is specified in the payment regulation and payment is made based on this regulation. Regarding the overtime work, there is almost no long-time overtime work during weekdays, and total overtime work does not exceed 12 hours per week. But in the busy seasons, they have to work during non-business days. Premium bonus is paid for such holiday works. However, there are cases where premium calculation was different from what is stated in the payment regulation (confirmed with records of overtime work and payment records). Overtime work and work on non-business days is not mandated by the employer. Employees ask to work overtime in writing when necessary and the direct manager approves it. A new computer system was introduced to request for overtime work
		b. Wage and benefits are clearly articulated to employees and rendered to employees in a convenient manner; e.g. no need to travel to collect benefits, no promissory notes, coupons or merchandise; payment in cash or check.			
		c. Labor-only contracting or false apprenticeship schemes are not accepted, including: revolving/consecutive labor contracts used to deny benefit accrual.			
		d. Clear, transparent mechanism for wage setting known to employees.			
		e. Employer shall comply with applicable laws and industry standards related to working hours. “Normal workweek” can be defined by law but shall not on a regular basis (constantly or majority of the time) exceed 48 hours. Only if allowed by law, variations (to the 48-hour regular work week) based on			
		f. All overtime shall be paid at a premium and should not exceed 12 hours per week.			
		g. Overtime work shall always be voluntary.			

		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Justification of classification of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability
		h. Others, please describe			since January 2017 (confirmed with the record or request for overtime work).

ASC Audit Report – Traceability

10	Traceability Factor	Description of risk factor if present.	Describe any traceability, segregation, or other systems in place to manage the risk.
10.1	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, produced within the same operation.	Because all oysters produced are to be certified, there is no possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product.	Oysters are clearly separated by farmers during harvesting and processing.
10.2	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, present during production, harvest, transport, storage, or processing activities.	Because all oysters handled are to be certified and no non-certified oysters will enter the processing process, there is no possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product.	Oysters are clearly separated by farmers during harvesting and processing. Shelled oysters are packed in a tamperproof container and traceability sticker is attached on it.
10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.	There is no subcontractor.	N/A
10.4	Any other opportunities where certified product could potentially be mixed, substituted, or mislabelled with non-certified product before the point where product enters the chain of custody.	No	N/A
10.5	Detail description of the flow of certified product within the operation and the associated traceability system which allows product to be traced from final sale back to the unit of certification	Oysters are harvested by each farmer. Each farmer shell oysters of him/herself and pack shelled oysters in a tamperproof container and attach traceability sticker. The sticker includes farmer's name, farm site and a use-by date.	

10.6 Traceability Determination:

10.6.1 The traceability and segregation systems in the operation are sufficient to ensure all products identified and sold as certified by the operation originate from the unit of certification, or	Yes
10.6.2 The traceability and segregation systems are not sufficient and a separate chain of custody certification is required for the operation before products can be sold as ASC-certified or can be eligible to carry the ASC logo.	A separate chain of custody is not required.
10.6.3 The point from which chain of custody is required to begin.	At buyers' factory where oysters are purchased and received from Togura area, Shizugawa Branch of Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative
10.6.4 Is a sepearate chain of custody certificate required for the producer?	No

ASC Audit Report – Closing

11 Findings

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

NC reference	NC Status	Clause Reference	Description of NC	Descriptions of actions pending
2017.1	Open	5.1.2 Evidence of appropriate storage and/or disposal of biological waste	Temporary stock yard of oystershells is a town owned land where the Fishery Cooperative Association makes a lease contract with the town. The validity of the contract was confirmed as from 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2017. However the association did not understand if the contract was renewed.	A new contract between the head office of the Miyagi Prefecture Fishery Cooperative and Minamisanriku Town from 2017/4/1 to 2020/3/31 is being made.
2017.2	Open	5.2.1 Evidence of energy use monitoring relative to production and ongoing effort to improve efficiency	Fuel consumption amount is reported annually from each farmer to the Association. The association asked farmers to submit records of fuel consumption amount in 2015, but some farmers did not report it.	The three members who will go out of business will be excluded from the producers list.

2017.3	Open	Occupational health and safety training is available for all employees	Wearing a life jacket is decided when boarding a ship during the landing of oysters. Farmers are also aware. However, it was confirmed that some farmers did not wear it.	In order to protect our own life, we invited the oyster department members at the general meeting to wear life jackets without fail when boarding boat.

- 11.2 A copy of the non-conformity report form completed for each non-conformity and observation raised.
- 11.3 If any approved requests for variations or interpretations have been used, a full copy of the approved variation or interpretation form shall be appended to the report. **If used in raising an NC**, the ASC reference number (NCF 5) and a justification for its use (NCF 6) shall be completed in the NC report form.

12 Evaluation Results

12.1 A report of the results of the audit of the operation against the specific elements in the standard and guidance documents.	Generally the operation of the oyster farms in Togura area meets the requirements of the ASC Bivalve standard V1.0.
12.2 A clear statement on whether or not the audited unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard(s).	The audited unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard.
12.3 In cases where Biodiversity Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA) or Participatory Social Impact Assessment (PSIA) is available , it shall be added in full to the audit report. IF these documents are not in English, then a synopsis in English shall be added to the report as well.	BEIA or PSIA is not available.

13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	Yes
13.2 The Eligibility Date (if applicable)	–
13.3 Is a separate coc certificate required for the producer? (yes/no)	No
13.4 If a certificate has been issued this section shall	
13.4.1 The date of issue and date of expiry of the certificate.	The date of issue: 30th March 2016 The date of expiry of the certificate: 29th March 2019

13.4.2 The scope of the certificate

Oyster farms in Togura Area, Shizugawa Branch of Miyagi Prefecture Fisheries Cooperative
Type of products: Oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*)
Standard: ASC Bivalve Standard Version 1.0 Jan 2012

13.4.3 Instructions to stakeholders that any complaints or objections to the CAB decision are to be subject to the CAB's complaints procedure. This section shall include information on where to review the procedure and where further information on complaints can be found.

Please contact AMITA Corporation for complaints procedure.
Address: 3-2-4 Kudankita, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 102-0073 Japan
E-mail: ninsho@amita-net.co.jp

14 Surveillance

14.1 Next planned Surveillance

14.1.1 Planned date

1st September 2018

14.1.2 Planned site

Togura farms, Minamisanriku-cho, Miyagi Prefecture

14.2 Next audit type

14.2.1 Surveillance 1

14.2.2 Surveillance 2

14.2.3 Re-certification

x

14.2.4 Other (specify type)