IMO Group Office
Weststrasse 51
CH-8570 Weinfelden
Fon +41 (0) 71 626 0 626
Fax +41 (0) 71 626 0 623
info@imo.ch
www.imo.ch

IMO Group Office Weststrasse 51 CH-8570 Weinfelden

NYAA Hatchery
Nan Ying Aquaculture Association
Taiwan

Final Audit Report*

CAB: Institute for Marketecology (IMO)
Author: M.Stark
Date: 27.03.2013

**This report is for public release and does not contain any confidential information.*

Table of Contents

Glossary

ASI	Accreditation Services International
CC	Certification Committee IMO
d	day(s)
IMO	Institute for Marketecology
KIB	Kim Bedford
Lead	Lead Auditor
MIS	Michèle Stark
UOC	Unit of certification
XTS	Xuan Tran Sang
SG	Steven Ge
TOS	Tori Spence

1. Executive Summary

Any version of this report in any other language than English is an unverified translation, and in case of differences the English version shall take precedence.

Both farms and hatchery are under assessment for ASC certification. This report only covers the assessment of hatchery.

The hatchery site was audited against principle one to seven in one day. The audit was carried out by three auditors in English and partly in Mandarin with translation.

During the environmental assessment, 5 major, 8 minor (5 majors and 4 minors closed prior to publication of this report) and 3 recommendations were raised. During the social assessment, 0 major, 0 minor (0 closed prior to publication of this report) and 0 recommendation was raised.

The assessment only covers activities of the hatchery which supplies to the farm. Farm activities such as the grow-out, the harvest, landing and subcontracted transport in sealed tanks to processing are covered in the farm reports. COC certification is required from the point of unloading from the sealed tanks.

IMO determines that all the requirements of the standard are sufficiently met and has certified Brave Tilapia Hatchery.

2. CAB contact information

Institute for Marketecology (IMO)
Fisheries & Aquaculture
Weststr. 51
8570 Weinfelden, Switzerland

Tel: 0041-71-626 0 626 (general)

Email: aqua@imo.ch

Website: www.imo.ch

3. Background on the applicant farm

Brave Taiwan Tilapia Hatchery is operated by only Mr. Shichang Chu and was established with his farm in 1980 with 7.1 hectares in Syuejia. The site includes a warehouse for feed in bags, spare equipment, pipes, tanks and nets. There are 14 fish ponds equipped with 7 automatic feeders, 1 power generator, 1 water pool, 36 aerators and 3 electronic water pumps.

The wastes from the fish farm, such as dead fish, as well as normal household wastes are taken away by the public garbage truck for incineration when there is a small amount. Whenever there are a large number of dead fish, the farmer will contact the environmental authority who sends biological waste removal vehicles to handle and go to incinerators or composting plant. Moreover, the used feed bag and empty chemical containers will be recovered by the original suppliers.

The annual production season is from March to September and average annual fry production is 60 million up to 40,000 heads per kg before moving to the growout facility.

The fish ponds are managed by the owner only. There is no hire of contracted workers for the farm and harvest, pond bottom preparation and equipment maintenance are performed by outsourced workers as needed.

This farm is mainly freshwater aquaculture with tilapia. The neighboring fish farms are mostly freshwater aquaculture with tilapia, milkfish, shrimp, carp, and sea bass. For economic reasons, the village has seen a loss of the younger generations of the population, and most of the farmers are older people.

No other farm certificates are held.

4. Scope

The assessment was carried out against the ASC Tilapia Standard v1.0.
The species produced at the farm is *Oreochromis Niloticus.*
Audit scope: Shihchang Chu (single site), tilapia hatchery (single site), *Oreochromis Niloticus*.
Receiving water bodies delineations: Jishuei River. .

5. Audit plan

action	locations	persons	dates*
Desk review: pre-audit data	IMO Head office	MIS	August
Audit (principle 1-6)	Farm site Head office	MIS (lead) & XTS	19-22.9.12 22.9.12
Audit (principle 7)	Farm site	SG	27.9.12
Stakeholder & community meetings/interviews	Syuejia Township Conference Room	SG	26.9.12
Writing of the report	IMO Head office	MIS	18.10.12
Reviewing the report	IMO Head office	TOS	18.10.12
Client report to client	IMO Head office	TOS	12.11.12

Updating report	IMO Head office	TOS	21.11.12
Draft public report to ASC	IMO Head office	TOS	21.11.12
Stakeholder comments			10 days
Updating report	IMO Head office	TOS	06.02.13
Certification decision	IMO Head office	CC	27.03.13
Final public report to ASC	IMO Head office	TOS	27.03.13

* The previous versions of the report are not public.

The audit was carried out with Shihchang Chu (hatchery manager). Other managers/staff/workers such as Tsai Ah-Yui(CEO of NYAA), Frank Chen (translator) joined parts of the audit, depending on their responsibility and the criteria being assessed.

Stakeholder and community interviews were carried out with the following persons:

Name	Affiliation
Wu Chun Chieh	Tainan City Government Fisheries Division of the Bureau of Agriculture
Qiu Qi Ming	Tainan City Government Fisheries Division of the Bureau of Agriculture
Zhuang Shi Xian	Tainan City Government Water Conservancy Bureau Water Resources and Administration Division
Chen Bow Wen	The Tainan science A district office Agricultural Science
Qiu Zhi Rong	The Tainan science A district office Agricultural Science
Lan Yu Ren	Tainan City Animal Health Inspection and Protection Office Aquatic and animal inspection group
Liu Jun Yan	Tainan City Animal Health Inspection and Protection Office Aquatic and animal inspection group
Zhang Shu Rong	Freshwater Aquaculture Fisheries Institute Research Center,C.O. A.
Chen Che Chun	Nation Chia Yi University
Tsai Chung Hsiung	Taiwan Tilapia Alliance
Huang Yuong Feng	Tainan City Ecological Conservation Society
Chiu Yizai	Syuejia Dist,Guanghua Village
Xie Jin Que	Xuejia Dist, Xiuchang Village
Chen Syue Sian	Xuejia Dist, Heping Village
Lee Kun Ming	Xuejia Dist, Sanqing Village
Hou Peng Wei	Pomp Shine Enterprise Corporation

6. Findings

Details of the evidence of compliance found during the audit for each individual criteria of the standard can be found in Annex 1.

Any outstanding non-conformities and their respective action plans are listed under section 10. of this report. Any recommendations or closed non-conformities are not listed here and are part of Annex 1.

Community interviews further confirmed the audit findings and interviewed persons emphasized their support for this project.

For details of stakeholder submissions received throughout the certification process, please see Annex 4.

The farm uses water from the canal besides the natural inflow of rain water. The farm manager uses an underground pipe system with mobile pumps when required. Active inflow is carried out perhaps once per year. Active outflow is usually only carried out if there is a risk of flooding during the typhoon season. There is passive outflow if water levels reach a too higher level. The outflow pipes are checked daily to assure there is no leakage.
Inflow and ouflow canals are well organized and always separate and all discharge into a forked canal, merging into the estuarine coastal zone. For this reason, it is very difficult to set the water sampling and monitoring points correctly and to evaluate the results.

In general, the farm under assessment was well prepared for the audit with all pre-audit data available prior to the audit. The auditors had open access to all documentation, the farm and staff/workers as required. The farm is well managed and documented and staff trained to implement the internal procedures. And according to the local community interview with stakeholders, no any negative comments about this farm were raised.

A description of the certification status can be found under section 8. of this report.

7. Evaluation results

Details of the evidence of compliance for each criteria in the standard can be found in Annex 1.

8. Decision

IMO determines that Brave Taiwan Tilapia Hatchery meets all the requirements of the standard and has issued a certificate for the scope defined under section 4. of this report. Any outstanding non-conformities and their respective action plans are listed under section 10. of this report

9. Determination of the start of the COC

Risk assessment - COC within the farm

L – low risk: no such activities or a controlled system in place (e.g. license)
M – medium risk: such activities occur within the farm but there is a good system in place
H – high risk: such activities occur, there is a risk of mixing and the system in place is not sufficient

Ref to CR	Integrity of certified products	Associated risk	rationale
17.5.1	System in use	L	Control system is in place according to GlobalG.A.P. (no longer certified)
17.5.1.2	The opportunity of substitution prior to or at harvesting	L	Little incentive for substitution.
17.5.1.3	The possibility of introducing product from outside the unit of certification	M	There are many tilapia farms in the region. However, NYAC maintains internal control of traceability and product flow.
17.5.1.4	Robustness of the management system	L	Despite the fact that they are no longer certified, NYAC has maintained the GlobalG.A.P management system
17.5.1.5	Any transshipment activities taking place	L	Ponds, no transhipment takes place.
17.5.1.6	The number and/or location of points of harvest	L	Harvest taken at every pond point.
	Overall risk estimation	L	

If the CAB determines the system is sufficient, products can enter into further certified chains of custody and be eligible to carry the ASC Label.

Scope of aquaculture certificate, including the points of change of ownership after which COC certification is needed:
Besides the grow out, the scope of the assessment includes the harvest. COC certification is required from the point of unloading from the sealed tanks. No retrospective approval has been applied for. Only products harvested as of the date of certification are approved to carry the ASC logo.

If the CAB determines the system is not sufficient, products may not enter into further certified chains of custody and are not eligible to carry the ASC Label.

The following products may not enter into further certified chains of custody and are not eligible to carry the ASC Label:
NA

This determination will remain in force until revised by the CAB in a subsequent audit.

10. Non-conformity report(s)

Producer: NYAA Hatchery

N° of CC	Year	Cat.	Non-conformity (summary)	Action plan	Deadline
2.3.1	2012	rec	Recommendation - calibration/use of equipment Re-check the manual of all equipment and implement calibration procedure as required.		Verification on next audit
3.1.1 +	2012	min	Records of fry, fingerling	Root Cause:	Verificatio

Producer: NYAA Hatchery					
N° of CC	**Year**	**Cat.**	**Non-conformity (summary)**	**Action plan**	**Deadline**
3.1.3 + 3.1.4			and suppliers The fry is bought from hatchery 1 and 3 together with the fry for his parent's farm (neighbors). Fry invoices/receipts not separate, can only track stocking from farm records. Fry invoices/receipts are therefore not separate, and fry can only be tracked by stocking records. However, this data is also available for his parent's farm. For some ponds, fry are initially stocked at his parent's farm and then transferred to his farm at around 60g. In the operator profile, the fry/fingerling suppliers are not correct/complete.	The records of fry, fingerling and suppliers of No.4 and No 6 ponds were calculated error. Corrective Action: Make sure the correction of the records of fry, fingerling amount, the farms should self request the accurate of record calculation, Peoples of the Association (NYAA) will check regularly (monthly) to prevent input wrong information Timeframe: 2012/09/25	n on next audit
4.1.1	2012	min	Mesh Size Incoming water is filtered through a fine mesh at inflow and at the exit point to the pond. The mesh is adequately sized to keep out other small fish and snails. The outflow, however, only has a wider grid at the exit point to the canal and a holed cap with wider mesh that is put over the pipe end at the pond side. This grid/mesh is presumably too large to prevent the escape of fry or eggs. The grid/mesh at the outflow is appropriately sized to retain grow-out fish but would not hold back egg or fry.	Root Cause: Drain pipe inlet and outlet are not using the appropriate mesh sieve. Corrective Action: Ensure the inlet and outlet drains in the fish pond are using the appropriate mesh sieve to prevent the escape of fish. Timeframe: Since 12/2012	Verification on next audit

Producer: NYAA Hatchery					
N° of CC	**Year**	**Cat.**	**Non-conformity (summary)**	**Action plan**	**Deadline**
4.1.2	2012	rec	Recommendation - Permanent barrier/mesh inspection There are daily records of mesh inspection, which does not always seem to coincide with the actual practices on site. Revise inspection practices or recording to coincide.		Verification on next audit
5.1.2	2012	min	Fishmeal There is no list of CITES database available during the audit to verify if the species used in fishmeal are listed by CITES.	Root Cause: Not presented the CITES information on data list. Corrective Action: Establish the list of CITES database and species are listed in CITES appendix 1, 2, 3. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	Verification on next audit
5.2.1	2012	min	Feed Supplier List of feed suppliers is available. There is one feed suppliers : POMP SHINE. Besides the approved feed which has been evaluated for principle 5, also empty feed bags from UNI-President were found on site during the audit. Apparently this feed is no longer used but the bags recycled by the feed supplier Pomp Shine (PSEC).	Root Cause: Sources of feed are commissioned to process feed, so feed suppliers to use the recycled bags to reduce the need for new bags with a goal of environmental protection. Corrective Action: NYAA has requested feed suppliers to use feed bags printed with the proper feed suppliers Timeframe: 2012/12	Verification on next audit
5.3.1	2012	Rec	Recommendation - energy budget worksheet The energy budget worksheet was completed and submitted to IMO prior to the audit. Due to a translation error, some electricity values were listed under gasoline. Please assure that the translation is correct/clear.		Verification on next audit
6.2.5	2012	Rec	Recommendation - Antibiotics application not according to prescription, but less and up to dosage recommended. Treatment should be applied according to vet prescription, however, the vet is familiar with this practice and accepts it. The grams antibiotics per kg of fish is often less due to price, which may lead to re-occurence of the disease.		Verification on next audit

Producer: NYAA Hatchery					
N° of CC	**Year**	**Cat.**	**Non-conformity (summary)**	**Action plan**	**Deadline**
6.3.2	2012	min	Disposal of dead fish The policy of dead fish does not mention the purpose of use of the dead fish after collection by trash car.	Root Cause: Handling of dead fish discarded but not written handling policy. Corrective Action: Set of dead fish processing policies: A small amount of the garbage truck (incineration, landfill) processing, handling a large number of dead fish by the environmental company. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	Verification on next audit

N° of CC	*Number of not fulfilled compliance criteria (e.g. 1.1.1). In case of doubts indicate at least chapter of report.*
Year	*First year when the non-conformity has been observed.*
Cat.	*Sanction Category: rate using rec, min or Maj*
Non-conformity	*Discrepancy to standard.*
Action plan	*Measure to correct non-conformity stated by company and to be approved by IMO. Implementation of corrective measure to be completed by deadline.*
Deadline	*Date when IMO will assess the implementation of the corrective measure.*
Status	*Status of implementation of corrective measure: done, partly done, not done*
rec	*Recommendation (no action plan required)*
min	*Minor non-conformity: see Annex 2*
Maj	*Major non-conformity: see Annex 2*

11. Next scheduled audit

Next planned surveillance audit; (year, month):	September 2013
Complete re-certification every three years; at the latest (year):	2015

IMO has the right to carry out additional unannounced audits according to the IMO standard operation procedures (SOPs). Likewise, an additional audit can be carried out within the framework of a document review.

Operator's comments (optional):

NA

The operator has confirmed their agreement with this report and has committed to implementing the action plan/corrective measures. The final certification decision is made by the responsible certification officer at IMO.

Annexes

Annex 1a. Evaluation results P1-6

Please see separate document. The following information is confidential and has been removed from the public report:

- Water monitoring data and analysis

Annex 1b. Evaluation results P7

Please see separate document.

Annex 2. Classification of minor / major non-conformities

Minor non-conformities

a) For initial certification, the CAB may recommend the applicant for certification once an action plan to address non-conformity has been agreed to by both the client and the CAB.

i. The action plan shall include a brief description of:

A. The root cause(s) of the non-conformity

B. The corrective action(s) to be taken is intended to satisfactorily address the non-conformity

C. The timeframe for implementation of corrective action(s)

ii. Minor non-conformities may be extended once for a maximum period of one (1) year if full implementation of corrective action was not possible due to circumstances beyond the control of the client.

b) The CAB should raise a major non-conformity where minor non-conformities are repeatedly raised against a particular requirement.

c) The CAB shall require that minor non-conformities raised during surveillance audits are satisfactorily addressed in one (1) year.

Major non-conformities

a) The CAB shall require that major non-conformities shall be satisfactorily addressed by an applicant:

i. Prior to certification being granted.

ii. Within three months of the date of the audit or a full re-audit shall be required.

iii. That the root cause of the non-conformity is identified.

b) In the case of a major non-conformity raised during the period of validity of a certificate, the CAB shall require:

i. That the certificate holder satisfactorily addresses the non-conformity within a maximum of three (3) months

ii. Major non-conformities may be extended once for a maximum period of another three months if full implementation of corrective action was not possible due to circumstances beyond the control of the client

iii. That the root cause of the non-conformity is identified

Annex 3. Form 1– Request for Interpretation or Variance

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

I CAB Request

1.1 NAME OF CAB	**1.2 DATE OF SUBMISSION**	**1.3 CAB CONTACT PERSON**	**1.4 EMAIL ADDRESS OF CAB CONTACT PERSON**
1.5ASC DOCUMENT REFERENCE			
1.6BACKGROUND (PROVIDE FULL EXPLANATION OF THE ISSUE)			
1.7RECOMMENDED ACTION/DECISION			

II ASC Determination

2.1 STATUS	**2.2 DATE OF ASC DETERMINATION**
□Closed	
2.3 ASCDETERMINATION ON VARIANCE	
2.3 ASCINTERPRETATION	

Annex 4. Stakeholder submissions

including written or other documented information and CAB written responses to each submission.

Public consultation period	Stakeholder submission	IMO Response
Audit announcement (30 days prior to audit)	No Submission Received	N/A
Draft public report (10 days from report publication)	No Submission Received	N/A

criteria	recomen-dation	minor NC	major NC	NC	action plan	deadline	action plan approved by IMO	status
	1			COC/scope of audit Nurseries and sales agencies are expluded from the scope. In addition, NYAA is currently not included in the scope altheough the take over some of the duties/responsibilites of the farm managers. If nurseries/sales agencies/NYAA are to be used to handle ASC certified products, the scope must be adjusted.		na	na	na
2.1.1		1		Information provided prior to the audit some information from the IMO operator profile on the description of the farm/receiving water was missing prior to the audit but this was provided during the audit. This was mainly due to information going lost when the template was translated.	Information corrected/provided during audit	ok	ok	done
2.2.1		1		established species Peer-reviewed literature is available listing cichlids (*Oreochromis niloticus* , *Oreochromis mossambicus* and *Tilapia zillii*) as exotic species in Taiwan. The distribution is shown on various graphics and shows tilapia distributed throughout Taiwan in the canal/river systems. However, it does not specifically mention if these exotic species are established, however, it can be assumed that they are, based on the species characteristics and their wide distribution. However, the species farmed is a hybrid of *O.aureus* and *O.niloticus* which is/are not listed in the peer-reviewed article.	Root Cause: Peer-reviewed literature is available listing cichlids (Oreochromis niloticus, Oreochromis mossambicus and Tilapia zillii) as exotic species in Taiwan. The distribution is shown on various graphics and shows tilapia distributed throughout Taiwan in the canal/river systems however, it does not specifically mention if these exotic species are established. It can be assumed that they are based on the species characteristics and their wide distribution. However, the species farmed is a hybrid of O.aureus and O.niloticus which is not listed in the peer-reviewed article. Corrective Action: Provide clear proof of the existence of alien species and breeding species O.aureus and O.niloticus hybrids exist time. (literature:Taiwan freshwater fish farming (1), Fisheries Research Special Publication, No. 11,27-46,2010 page 29~32) Timeframe: 2012/11/27	prior to certification	ok	done
2.3.1			1	DDDO A Walklab digital dissolved oxygen meter (trans instruments) was used. In the manual, calibration is advised before a series of measuremens are carried out. The calibration procedure is described. The meter has a switch that can be slid from cal to read. During the audit, no calibration was carried out and the readings were taken on the cal setting for the morning values. In the evening, the first reading by the farm was initially taken on the cal setting again, after which the auditor proposed to switch to read. The reading shifted from the standard calibration value given in the manual of around 20 to 4.4. All evening readings were then carried out on read. The audit day data is not within range and significantly different to the DDDO value of the last 6 months. It is unclear if the 6 months data series is incorrect or what went wrong during the monitoring during the audit. On-site values both from the auditor and the farm are around twice the previous 6 month data as the readings were not taken correctly, and results are hence out of range.	Equipment recalibrated during audit and water monitoring repeated correctly during audit.	ok	ok	done
2.3.1	1			Recommendation - calibration/use of equipment Re-check the manual of all equipment and implement calibration procedure as required.		na	na	na
2.5.1			1	receiving water definition/monitoring Major all water quality parameters were monitored monthly as required except for chla (requirement given in 2.5.1e). A dataseries starting January 2012 is available, giving >6months data prior to the first audit. Chla: it is very difficult to understand from the audit manual, that chla needs monitoring independent of the outcome of 2.4.2. The farm had interpreted that as the outcome of 2.4.2 did not require compliance with chla metrics given in 2.4.4, chla monitoring was not required. Recommendation water monitoring stations RWRP, RWFO, RWFA: according to the original intention of the ASC standard, these monitoring points have not been located correctly. however, this background information is no longer in the current version of the audit manual or guidance documentation, therefore, it is very difficult for farms to have this knowledge or for different farms/CABs to interpret this correctly/in the same way. RWRP: located in artificial effluent canal upstream of the farms. However, SW moves up the estuary up to RP -> should be in natural water body/springs RWFO: located in artificial effluent canal at the height of the farms-> should be in natural water body/mixing zone estuary RWFA: located in artificial effluent canal at the height of the farms-> should be in natural water body/mixing zone estuary As soon as more guidance is available for setting these monitoring points correctly, they should be adjusted immediately by the farm. Minor	Root Cause: (1) There was a misunderstanding of the standard, whereas the farm interpreted that at depths <5meters there is no need to monitor chlorophyll a, so there was no implementation of the six-month monitoring Corrective Action: (1) The farm tried to collect water quality monitoring data from EPA to find in the "National Environmental Water Quality Information", national rivers, reservoirs, waters, groundwater, and beach to do a number of water quality monitoring. Unfortunately, in the receiving water bodies (rivers - Jishui River) and there is no monitoring of chlorophyll a. NYAA has consulted environmental agencies, the river water flows quickly and less likely to cause eutrophication of the area, there is no monitoring of chlorophyll a. There will be monitoring of chlorophyll a starting in October. Timeframe: (1) 2012/10/11 water testing done and sent to National Taiwan Ocean University for examination.	prior to certification	ok	done
2.6.1		1		Wetland No wetland map available showing a 5km radius of the farm or showing pre or post-1999 wetland coverage. However, there is no evidence showing that farm siting or related activities resulted in loss of wetland habitat since 1999. The farm was build prior to 1999.	Root Cause: Farms radius of 5km radius or before 1999 or after 1999 no wetland coverage maps and farm-related activities gave wetland ecological data Corrective Action: To provide the wetlands coverage map and wetlands ecological data analysis of the farms and Beimen district. This will show that within a radius of 5km of the farm before 1999 or after 1999, wetlands coverage in wetland reclamation, also did not lead to the loss of wetlands. (Basis: Important Wetland Conservation Programme http://wetland-tw.tcd.gov.tw/purpose.php) Timeframe: 2012/11/27	prior to certification	ok	done
3.1.1 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4		1		Records of fry, fingerling and suppliers The fry is bought from hatchery 1 and 3 together with the fry for his parent's farm (neighbors). Fry invoices/receipts not separate, can only track stocking from farm records. Fry invoices/receipts are therefore not separate, and fry can only be tracked by stocking records. However, this data is also available for his parent's farm. For some ponds, fry are initially stocked at his parent's farm and then transferred to his farm at around 60g. In the operator profile, the fry/fingerling suppliers are not correct/complete.	Root Cause: The records of fry, fingerling and suppliers of No.4 and No 6 ponds were calculated error. Corrective Action: Make sure the correction of the records of fry, fingerling amount, the farms should self request the accurate of record calculation, Peoples of the Association (NYAA) will check regularly (monthly) to prevent input wrong informationTimeframe: 2012/09/25	Verification on next audit	ok	open
4.1.1		1		Mesh Size Incoming water is filtered through a fine mesh at inflow and at the exit point to the pond. The mesh is adequately sized to keep out other small fish and snails. The outflow, however, only has a wider grid at the exit point to the canal and a holed cap with wider mesh that is put over the pipe end at the pond side. This grid/mesh is presumably too large to prevent the escape of fry or eggs. The grid/mesh at the outflow is appropriately sized to retain grow-out fish but would not hold back egg or fry.	Root Cause: Drain pipe inlet and outlet are not using the appropriate mesh sieve. Corrective Action: Ensure the inlet and outlet drains in the fish pond are using the appropriate mesh sieve to prevent the escape of fish. Timeframe: Since 12/2012	Verification on next audit	ok	open
4.1.2	1			Recommendation - Permanend barrier/mesh inspection There are daily records of mesh inspection, which does not always seem to coincide with the actual practices on site. Revise inspection practices or recording to coincide.		na	na	na

4.1.3			1	Trapping devices The ASC intent of trapping fish has been somewhat misunderstood. Nets between ponds and between ponds and the canal are inspected daily and if in need for repair, maintenance/action taken is recorded, in theory. 6 months data is available for the farm, however, no recorded repairs have occured in this period. The nets refered to are really escape prevention under 4.1.2 and not trapping systems. There are recordings for the mesh status and any actions taken in respect to repairs. However, the "trapped" fish for escape monitoring are presumably not trapped in these meshes.	Root Cause: There has been a misunderstanding of the ASC trapping fish requirement, but during this period if there is no drainage may therefore not applicable. Corrective Action: Set up maintenance record form of capture, trapping device, apart from records of repair or maintenance, to ensure trapping equipment prevent fish escape effective. Checked every three months to be recorded. Timeframe: 2012/12	prior to certification		ok	done
5.1.2		1		Fishmeal There is no list of CITES database available during the audit to verfiy if the species used in fishmeal are listed by CITES.	Root Cause: Not presented the CITES information on data list. Corrective Action: Establish the list of CITES database and species are listed in CITES appendix 1, 2, 3. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	Verification on next audit		ok	open
5.1.3		1		Feed supplier There is no policy of company to support feed manufacturers shifting to an ISEAL-accredited certfication scheme for fish meal/oil origins.	Root Cause: Not support for feed manufacturers to use (or migration) ISEAL authorized to verify the source of fishmeal / fish oil policy Corrective Action: Letter indicating commitment has been made Farm feed manufacturers to support the use of the ISEAL recognition verify the sources of fishmeal / fish oil policy Timeframe: 2012/11/23. Has been made to support the feed manufacturers use ISEAL recognized commitment to verify the source of fishmeal / fish oil.	prior to certification		ok	done
5.1.4			1	FishSource Score for feed manufacturer The farm does not have the manufacturer's letter of intent to commit to follow the requirment of FishSource Score.	Root Cause: Feed for farm feed supplier did not properly provide fish source scores information. Corrective Action: Ask feed manufacturers undertaking to meet the requirements of fish resources in the scores Timeframe: 2012/11/23 feed manufacturers committed to using the fraction of the fish source request undertaking has been made	prior to certification		ok	done
5.2.1		1		Feed Supplier List of feed suppliers is available. There is one feed suppliers : POMP SHINE. Besides the approved feed which has been evaluated for principle 5, also empty feed bags from UNI-President were found on site during the audit. Apparently this feed is no longer used but the bags recycled by the feed supplier Pomp Shine (PSEC).	Root Cause: Sources of feed are commissioned to process feed, so feed suppliers to use the recycled bags to reduce the need for new bags with a goal of environmental protection. Corrective Action: NYAA has requested feed suppliers to use feed bags printed with the proper feed suppliers Timeframe: 2012/12	Verification on next audit		ok	open
5.3.1	1			Recommendation - energy budget worksheet The energy budget worksheet was completed and submitted to IMO prior to the audit. Due to a translation error, some electricity values were listed under gasoline. Please assure that the translation is correct/clear.			na	na	na
6.1.1			1	% recovery Calculation results for recovery of the past 12 months was submitted prior to the audit, however, the wrong data was used for the calculations. No request for a different calculation method and justification was submitted to IMO before the audit. Calculations were not carried out according to the instructions. The farm can not calculate from 100g as fish are not weighed /counted during grow-out or during transfer (pond to pond). The farm can only calculate recovery from stocking to harvest. However, fry from the hatchery is not always received directly. Sometimes, fry is stocked at another farm (nursery) and transferred to the farm under assessment at around 60-150g. Again, numbers are not counted. This point was not really clear to NYAA, who was mainly using an old version of the audit manual and not all parts (instructions, footnotes etc) had been translated. In general the data as it is recorded at the time of the audit does not allow an exact verification of recovery rates. It is dificult to calculate and interpret the recovery rates. Since the production cycle is 12-18months, many of the ponds are not yet harvested and the calculation can not be completed for the last 12 months. In addition, some ponds were previously stocked with milkfish and have only recently been stocked with tilapia, which are still wihtin their first months of grow-out and can hence not be used for the calculation.	Root Cause: Fry purchasing habits can vary since purchasing breeding grounds for fry (born 2 to 3 inches). NYAA started breeding adult fish, in part, the purchase of seedlings (fish size of about 60-150g) breeding, production cycles vary from 6 -18 months may, calculation and interpretation of survival is difficult and complex. Corrective Action: Lists fit the way we calculate: (1)Fish fry (60 ~ 150g) the number of purchase by the listing of the number of months - (12 ~ 18) - (12 ~ 18) months of uncollected inventory divided by fry (60 ~ 150g) the number of purchase * 100% = A --- - (to harvest before the listing of mortality in fish from fry purchase) Note: Assuming farmers harvest period of 15 months, you need to first statistics harvest the number listed and 15 months 15 months Total memory remain unharvested inventory amount, calculated in accordance with the formula fish from fry purchase to harvest before death listed rate. (2) A The average fish harvested listed only weight (g) - The average fish fry purchase only the weight (g) = a ------ (the farmed total construction process of the fish only average mortality rate per gram (3) If the purchase fry the average weight of less than or equal to 100g (100 - average fish fry purchase only the weight) * a = B1 ---- purchased the fry reach 100g estimate of mortality If the purchase of the average weight greater than 100g then fry: (fry purchase Modest fish only weight -100) * a = B2 --- estimate mortality before purchase fry 100g (4) The survival rate (R) purchased fry average weight is less than or equal to 100g	prior to certification		ok	done
6.2.1		1		Banned substances There are 13 medecines that can be used in the farm according to the No. 1001474006- Seafood Animal Medecine used Regulation issued by the Council Agriculture in Oct 17, 2011, Tawain. However, the list of other subtances that may be used in the farm beside the medecine is not available. For export countries , there is no list of subtances banned available.	Root Cause: Banned substances list has only the domestic substances. There is no list of banned chemicals for domestic and export countries. Corrective Action: Query exports of chemicals and related provisions prohibited by the state (see attachment). Ensure the farm does not use chemicals banned by domestic and export countries and that there is an annual check of the relevant provisions. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	prior to certification		ok	done
6.2.5	1			Recommendation - Antibiotics application not according to prescription, but less and up to dosage recommended. Treatment should be applied according to vet prescription, however, the vet is familiar with this practice and accepts it. The grams antibiotics per kg of fish is often less due to price, which may lead to re-occurence of the disease.			na	na	na
6.3.2		1		Disposal of deadfish The policy of deadfish does not mention the purpose of use of the dead fish after collection by trash car.	Root Cause: Handling of dead fish discarded but not written handling policy. Corrective Action: Set of dead fish processing policies: A small amount of the garbage truck (incineration, landfill) processing, handling a large number of dead fish by the environmental company. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	Verification on next audit		ok	open
Total	3	8	5		examples:	see report (for minors)	see report	ok	open
						corrective measure implemented (for majors)		na	done

12 A ASC NYAA Hatchery

criteria	recomen-dation	minor NC	major NC	NC	action plan	deadline	action plan approved by IMO	status
	1			COC/scope of audit Nurseries and sales agencies are expluded from the scope. In addition, NYAA is currently not included in the scope altheough the take over some of the duties/responsibilites of the farm managers. If nurseries/sales agencies/NYAA are to be used to handle ASC certifieds products, the scope must be adjusted.		na	na	na
2.1.1		1		Information provided prior to the audit some information from the IMO operator profile on the description of the farm/receiving water was missing prior to the audit but this was provided during the audit. This was mainly due to information going lost when the template was translated.	Information corrected/provided during audit	ok	ok	done
2.2.1		1		established species Peer-reviewed literature is available listing cichlids (*Oreochromis niloticus* , *Oreochromis mossambicus* and *Tilapia zillii*) as exotic species in Taiwan. The distribution is shown on various graphics and shows tilapia distributed throughout Taiwan in the canal/river systems. However, it does not specifically mention if these exotic species are established, however, it can be assumed that they are, based on the species characteristics and their wide distribution. However, the species farmed is a hybrid of *O.aureus* and *O.niloticus* which is/are not listed in the peer-reviewed article.	Root Cause: Peer-reviewed literature is available listing cichlids (Oreochromis niloticus, Oreochromis mossambicus and Tilapia zillii) as exotic species in Taiwan. The distribution is shown on various graphics and shows tilapia distributed throughout Taiwan in the canal/river systems however, it does not specifically mention if these exotic species are established. It can be assumed that they are based on the species characteristics and their wide distribution. However, the species farmed is a hybrid of O.aureus and O.niloticus which is not listed in the peer-reviewed article. Corrective Action: Provide clear proof of the existence of alien species and breeding species O.aureus and O.niloticus hybrids exist time. (literature:Taiwan freshwater fish farming (1), Fisheries Research Special Publication, No. 11,27-46,2010 page 29~32) Timeframe: 2012/11/27	prior to certification	ok	done
2.3.1			1	DDDO A Walklab digital dissolved oxygen meter (trans instruments) was used. In the manual, calibration is advised before a series of measuremens are carried out. The calibration procedure is described. The meter has a swith that can be slid from cal to read. During the audit, no calibration was carried out and the readings were taken on the cal setting for the morning values. In the evening, the first reading by the farm was initially taken on the cal setting again, after which the auditor proposed to switch to read. The reading shifted from the standard calibration value given in the manual of around 20 to 4.4. All evening readings were then carried out on read. The audit day data is not within range and significantly different to the DDDO value of the last 6 months. It is unclear if the 6 months data series is incorrect or what went wrong during the monitoring during the audit. On-site values both from the auditor and the farm are around twice the previous 6 month data as the readings were not taken correctly, and results are hence out of range.	Equipment recalibrated during audit and water monitoring repeated correctly during audit.	ok	ok	done
2.3.1	1			Recommendation - calibration/use of equipment Re-check the manual of all equipment and implement calibration procedure as required.		na	na	na
2.5.1			1	~~Receiving water definition/monitoring~~ Major all water quality parameters were monitored monthly as required except for chla (requirement given in 2.5.1e). A dataseries starting January 2012 is available, giving >6months data prior to the first audit. Chla: it is very difficult to understand from the audit manual, that chla needs monitoring independent of the outcome of 2.4.2. The farm had interpreted that as the outcome of 2.4.2 did not require compliance with chla metrics given in 2.4.4, chla monitoring was not required. Recommendation water monitoring stations RWRP, RWFO, RWFA: according to the original intention of the ASC standard, these monitoring points have not been located correctly. however, this background information is no longer in the current version of the audit manual or guidance documentation, therefore, it is very difficult for farms to have this knowledge or for different farms/CABs to interpret this correctly/in the same way. RWRP: located in artificial effluent canal upstream of the farms. However, SW moves up the estuary up to RP -> should be in natural water body/springs RWFO: located in artificial effluent canal at the height of the farms-> should be in natural water body/mixing zone estuary	Root Cause: (1) There was a misunderstanding of the standard, whereas the farm interpreted that at depths <5meters there is no need to monitor chlorophyll a, so there was no implementation of the six-month monitoring Corrective Action: (1) The farm tried to collect water quality monitoring data from EPA to find in the "National Environmental Water Quality Information", national rivers, reservoirs, waters, groundwater, and beach to do a number of water quality monitoring. Unfortunately, in the receiving water bodies (rivers - Jishui River) and there is no monitoring of chlorophyll a. NYAA has consulted environmental agencies, the river water flows quickly and less likely to cause eutrophication of the area, there is no monitoring of chlorophyll a. There will be monitoring of chlorophyll a starting in October. Timeframe: (1) 2012/10/11 water testing done and sent to National Taiwan Ocean University for examination.	prior to certification	ok	done
2.6.1		1		Wetland No wetland map available showing a 5km radius of the farm or showing pre or post-1999 wetland coverage. However, there is no evidence showing that farm siting or related activities resulted in loss of wetland habitat since 1999. The farm was build prior to 1999.	Root Cause: Farms radius of 5km radius or before 1999 or after 1999 no wetland coverage maps and farm-related activities gave wetland ecological data Corrective Action: To provide the wetlands coverage map and wetlands ecological data analysis of the farms and Beimen district. This will show that within a radius of 5km of the farm before 1999 or after 1999, wetlands coverage in wetland reclamation, also did not lead to the loss of wetlands. (Basis: Important Wetland Conservation Programme http://wetland-tw.tcd.gov.tw/purpose.php) Timeframe: 2012/11/27	prior to certification	ok	done

3.1.1 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4		1		Records of fry, fingerling and suppliers The fry is bought from hatchery 1 and 3 together with the fry for his parent's farm (neighbors). Fry invoices/receipts not separate, can only track stocking from farm records. Fry invoices/receipts are therefore not separate, and fry can only be tracked by stocking records. However, this data is also available for his parent's farm. For some ponds, fry are initially stocked at his parent's farm and then transferred to his farm at around 60g. In the operator profile, the fry/fingerling suppliers are not correct/complete.	Root Cause: The records of fry, fingerling and suppliers of No.4 and No 6 ponds were calculated error. Corrective Action: Make sure the correction of the records of fry, fingerling amount, the farms should self request the accurate of record calculation, Peoples of the Association (NYAA) will check regularly (monthly) to prevent input wrong informationTimeframe: 2012/09/25	Verification on next audit	ok	open
4.1.1		1		Mesh Size Incoming water is filtered through a fine mesh at inflow and at the exit point to the pond. The mesh is adequately sized to keep out other small fish and snails. The outflow, however, only has a wider grid at the exit point to the canal and a holed cap with wider mesh that is put over the pipe end at the pond side. This grid/mesh is presumably too large to prevent the escape of fry or eggs. The grid/mesh at the outflow is appropriately sized to retain grow-out fish but would not hold back egg or fry.	Root Cause: Drain pipe inlet and outlet are not using the appropriate mesh sieve. Corrective Action: Ensure the inlet and outlet drains in the fish pond are using the appropriate mesh sieve to prevent the escape of fish. Timeframe: Since 12/2012	Verification on next audit	ok	open
4.1.2	1			Recommendation - Permanend barrier/mesh inspection There are daily records of mesh inspection, which does not always seem to coincide with the actual practices on site. Revise inspection practices or recording to coincide.		na	na	na
4.1.3			1	Trapping devices The ASC intent of trapping fish has been somewhat misunderstood. Nets between ponds and between ponds and the canal are inspected daily and if in need for repair, maintenance/action taken is recorded, in theory. 6 months data is available for the farm, however, no recorded repairs have occured in this period. The nets refered to are really escape prevention under 4.1.2 and not trapping systems. There are recordings for the mesh status and any actions taken in respect to repairs. However, the "trapped" fish for escape monitoring are presumably not trapped in these meshes.	Root Cause: There has been a misunderstanding of the ASC trapping fish requirement, but during this period if there is no drainage may therefore not applicable. Corrective Action: Set up maintenance record form of capture, trapping device, apart from records of repair or maintenance, to ensure trapping equipment prevent fish escape effective. Checked every three months to be recorded. Timeframe: 2012/12	prior to certification	ok	done
5.1.2		1		Fishmeal There is no list of CITES database available during the audit to verfiy if the species used in fishmeal are listed by CITES.	Root Cause: Not presented the CITES information on data list. Corrective Action: Establish the list of CITES database and species are listed in CITES appendix 1, 2, 3. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	Verification on next audit	ok	open
5.1.3		1		Feed supplier There is no policy of company to support feed manufacturers shifting to an ISEAL-accredited certfication scheme for fish meal/oil origins.	Root Cause: Not support for feed manufacturers to use (or migration) ISEAL authorized to verify the source of fishmeal / fish oil policy Corrective Action: Letter indicating commitment has been made Farm feed manufacturers to support the use of the ISEAL recognition verify the sources of fishmeal / fish oil policy Timeframe: 2012/11/23. Has been made to support the feed manufacturers use ISEAL recognized commitment to verify the source of fishmeal / fish oil.	prior to certification	ok	done
5.1.4			1	FishSource Score for feed manufacturer The farm does not have the manufacturer's letter of intent to commit to follow the requirment of FishSource Score.	Root Cause: Feed for farm feed supplier did not properly provide fish source scores information. Corrective Action: Ask feed manufacturers undertaking to meet the requirements of fish resources in the scores Timeframe: 2012/11/23 feed manufacturers committed to using the fraction of the fish source request undertaking has been made	prior to certification	ok	done
5.2.1		1		Feed Supplier List of feed suppliers is available. There is one feed suppliers : POMP SHINE. Besides the approved feed which has been evaluated for principle 5, also empty feed bags from UNI-President were found on site during the audit. Apparently this feed is no longer used but the bags recycled by the feed supplier Pomp Shine (PSEC).	Root Cause: Sources of feed are commissioned to process feed, so feed suppliers to use the recycled bags to reduce the need for new bags with a goal of environmental protection. Corrective Action: NYAA has requested feed suppliers to use feed bags printed with the proper feed suppliers Timeframe: 2012/12	Verification on next audit	ok	open
5.3.1	1			Recommendation - energy budget worksheet The energy budget worksheet was completed and submitted to IMO prior to the audit. Due to a translation error, some electricity values were listed under gasoline. Please assure that the translation is correct/clear.		na	na	na

6.1.1			1	% recovery Calculation results for recovery of the past 12 months was submitted prior to the audit, however, the wrong data was used for the calculations. No request for a different calculation method and justification was submitted to IMO before the audit. Calculations were not carried out according to the instructions. The farm can not calculate from 100g as fish are not weighed /counted during grow-out or during transfer (pond to pond). The farm can only calculate recovery from stocking to harvest. However, fry from the hatchery is not always received directly. Sometimes, fry is stocked at another farm (nursery) and transferred to the farm under assessment at around 60-150g. Again, numbers are not counted. This point was not really clear to NYAA, who was mainly using an old version of the audit manual and not all parts (instructions, footnotes etc) had been translated. In general the data as it is recorded at the time of the audit does not allow an exact verification of recovery rates. It is dificult to calculate and interpret the recovery rates. Since the production cycle is 12-18months, many of the ponds are not yet harvested and the calculation can not be completed for the last 12 months. In addition, some ponds were previously stocked with milkfish and have only recently been stocked with tilapia, which are still wihtin their first months of grow-out and can hence not be used for the calculation.	Root Cause: Fry purchasing habits can vary since purchasing breeding grounds for fry (born 2 to 3 inches). NYAA started breeding adult fish, in part, the purchase of seedlings (fish size of about 60-150g) breeding, production cycles vary from 6 -18 months may, calculation and interpretation of survival is difficult and complex. Corrective Action: Lists fit the way we calculate: (1)Fish fry (60 ~ 150g) the number of purchase by the listing of the number of months - (12 ~ 18) - (12 ~ 18) months of uncollected inventory divided by fry (60 ~ 150g) the number of purchase * 100% = A --- - (to harvest before the listing of mortality in fish from fry purchase) Note: Assuming farmers harvest period of 15 months, you need to first statistics harvest the number listed and 15 months 15 months Total memory remain unharvested inventory amount, calculated in accordance with the formula fish from fry purchase to harvest before death listed rate. (2) A The average fish harvested listed only weight (g) - The average fish fry purchase only the weight (g) = a ------ (the farmed total construction process of the fish only average mortality rate per gram (3) If the purchase fry the average weight of less than or equal to 100g (100 - average fish fry purchase only the weight) * a = B1 ---- purchased the fry reach 100g estimate of mortality If the purchase of the average weight greater than 100g then fry: (fry purchase Modest fish only weight -100) * a = B2 --- estimate mortality before purchase fry 100g (4) The survival rate (B)	prior to certification	ok	done
6.2.1		1		Banned substances There are 13 medecines that can be used in the farm according to the No. 1001474006- Seafood Animal Medecine used Regulation issued by the Council Agriculture in Oct 17, 2011, Tawain. However, the list of other subtances that may be used in the farm beside the medecine is not available. For export countries , there is no list of subtances banned available.	Root Cause: Banned substances list has only the domestic substances. There is no list of banned chemicals for domestic and export countries. Corrective Action: Query exports of chemicals and related provisions prohibited by the state (see attachment). Ensure the farm does not use chemicals banned by domestic and export countries and that there is an annual check of the relevant provisions. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	prior to certification	ok	done
6.2.5	1			Recommendation - Antibiotics application not according to prescription, but less and up to dosage recommended. Treatment should be applied according to vet prescription, however, the vet is familiar with this practice and accepts it. The grams antibiotics per kg of fish is often less due to price, which may lead to re-occurence of the disease.		na	na	na
6.3.2		1		Disposal of deadfish The policy of deadfish does not mention the purpose of use of the dead fish after collection by trash car.	Root Cause: Handling of dead fish discarded but not written handling policy. Corrective Action: Set of dead fish processing policies: A small amount of the garbage truck (incineration, landfill) processing, handling a large number of dead fish by the environmental company. Timeframe: 2012/11/27	Verification on next audit	ok	open
Total	3	8	5	examples:	see report (for minors)	see report	ok	open
					corrective measure implemented (for majors)		na	done

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC TILAPIA STANDARD
Created by the Tilapia Aquaculture Dialogue

Scope: Species of the Family Cichlidae commonly referred as Tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus, O. mossambica, O. aureus and O. hybrids)

add "1" per criteria in applicable column below

PRINCIPLE 1. OBEY THE LAW AND COMPLY WITH ALL NATIONAL AND LOCAL REGULATIONS				Evaluation results			
1.1 Criteria: Evidence of legal compliance		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**	**Description**	**ok**	**minor**	**major**
1.1.1	**Indicator:** Presence of documents proving compliance with local and national authorities on land and water use (e.g., permits, evidence of lease, concessions and rights to land and/or water use) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Maintain copies of applicable land and water use laws.	A. Review compliance with applicable land and water use laws.	Land fish pond aquaculture registration licenses are applied including the water sources allowed to be used issued by Tainan City Goverment: River and others. The expiry date is 20.9.2014.	1		
		b. Maintain original lease agreements or land titles on file.	B. Confirm client holds original lease agreements or land titles.	The land is owned by the farmer. The farm manager names are mentioned in the "Land fish pond aquaculture registration licenses".	1		
		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).	C. Review inspection records for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (as applicable).	The licenses mention aquaculture and the species approved for farming : Tilapia.	1		
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	D. Verify facility does not conflict with national preservation areas.	No national preservation areas in the region.	1		
1.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence of documents proving compliance with all tax laws **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Keep records of tax payments.	A. Verify client has records of tax payments to appropriate jurisdiction(s).	The farmers do not have to pay the tax according to the Value-added and non-value-add Bussiness Tax Act issued 23.11.2011 - Article 8, part 11.	1		
		b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	B. Confirm client has a basic knowledge of tax requirements for farm.	NA	1		
		c. Register with national or local authorities as an "aquaculture activity".	C. Verify client is registered with local or national authorities.	NA	1		
1.1.3	**Indicator:** Presence of documents proving compliance with all labor laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm.	A. Confirm client has specified documentation.	SG			
		b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	B. Review inspection records for compliance with national labor laws and codes (as applicable).	SG			
1.1.4	**Indicator:** Presence of documents proving compliance with regulations or permits concerning water quality impacts **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.	A. Verify that client obtains permits as applicable.	The hatchery follows the water effluent regulation No. 0980065341 issued by Enviromental Protection Agency-The Republic of China in 28.7.2009 - for Aquaculture Industry. SS, BOD and COD are required to be tested in the aquaculture industry, no frequency required.The agency does not issue a permit.	1		
		b. Comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	B. Review evidence of compliance with discharge laws or regulations.	NYAA takes over the responsibility for this compliance for all farms and one hatchery in the association and the test was done at farm NYT1 for water discharge done in 2010 with SS, BOD and COD which exceeded the limit. The frequency and the compliance of testing are not verified by the Agency.	1		
		c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	C. Verify that records show compliance with discharge laws and regulations.	See b	1		
PRINCIPLE 2. MANAGE THE FARM SITE TO CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT AND LOCAL BIODIVERSITY							
2.1 Criteria: Site information		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
2.1.1	**Indicator:** Site location, history and stewardship activities matrix located in Appendix 1, Table 1 is completed and validated **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Complete the Receiving Water Information Checklist in Audit Reference 2 (Table 1 in Appendix 1 of the Standard).	A. Do not schedule on-site audit of client until checklist review is complete.	Most of the information was submitted prior to scheduling the audit. Some was submitted after scheduling but prior to the actual on-site audit. Submission was late due to travelling of the responsible person from NYAC and not due to information not being complete.	1		
		b. Submit checklist and attachments to CB before the on-site audit.	B. Review client submission for completeness, accuracy, and currency of information. Request clarification if needed.	some information from the IMO operator profile on the description of the farm/receiving water was missing prior to the audit but this was provided during the audit. This was mainly due to information going lost when the template was translated.		1	

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

		-	C. Verify client information by cross-checking with independent sources (e.g. local authorities).	client information cross-checked with permits and stakeholder information and found to be ok.	1		
2.2 Criteria: Presence of natural or established tilapia species		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
2.2.1	**Indicator**: Demonstration that the tilapia species cultured is established[1] and naturally reproducing in the receiving waters[2], of the operation on or before 1 January 2008[3] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farm locations outside Africa (see 2.2.2), Farm-Wide	a. Collect documentary evidence that cultured species was established in receiving waters on or before 1 January 2008, or Collect first hand accounts showing evidence for natural reproduction of tilapia species in receiving waters on or before 1 January 2008. Submit evidence with checklist (Audit Reference 2).	A. Review evidence for compliance with the Requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature; verifiable Environmental Impact Assessment; and government certification. Acceptable first hand accounts: community testimonials and direct evidence for multiple size classes of tilapia species in receiving waters captured with cast nets, trapping devices or fishing.	Peer-reviewed literature is available listing cichlids (*Oreochromis niloticus, Oreochromis mossambicus and Tilapia zillii*) as exotic species in Taiwan. The distribution is shown on various graphics and shows tilapia distributed throughout Taiwan in the canal/river systems. However, it does not specifically mention if these exotic species are established, however, it can be assumed that they are based on the species characteristics and their wide distribution. however, the species farmed is a hybrid of *O.aureus* and *O.niloticus* which is not listed in the peer-reviewed article.		1	
		b. If system does not have receiving waters according as defined in this requirement[2] then the requirements of Indicator 2.2.1 are not applicable.	B. Auditor response to 2.2.1A is "not applicable" (NA).	NA	1		
		c. If water is discharged into municipal water systems, show that there is a mechanism for treating effluent to eradicate/eliminate macro-biological organisms such as fish.	C. Review evidence to confirm compliance.	NA	1		
Footnote	[1] "A non-indigenous species is considered established if it has a reproducing population within the basin, as inferred from multiple discoveries of adult and juvenile life stages over at least two consecutive years. Given that successful establishment may require multiple introductions, species are excluded if their records of discoveries are based on only one or a few non-reproducing individuals whose occurrence may reflect merely transient species or unsuccessful invasions." (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)						
Footnote	[2] "Receiving water" is defined as all distinct bodies of water that receive runoff or waste discharges, such as streams, rivers, ponds, lakes and estuaries (adapted from World Health Organization). This does not include farm-constructed water courses, impoundments or treatment facilities.						
Footnote	[3] Where there are no-discharge systems, or no discharge to receiving waters, requirements 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are not applicable.						
2.2.2	**Indicator:** In Africa, demonstration that the tilapia species and strain cultured is established and naturally reproducing in the receiving waters of the operation or before 1 January 2008 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** Farms located in Africa only (see 2.2.1), Farm-Wide	a. Collect documentary evidence that cultured species and strain was present in receiving waters on or before 1 January 2008 or Collect first hand accounts showing evidence for natural reproduction of tilapia species and strain in receiving waters on or before 1 January 2008. Submit evidence with checklist (Audit Reference 2).	A. Review evidence for compliance with the Requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature; verifiable Environmental Impact Assessment; and government certification. Acceptable first hand accounts: community testimonials and direct evidence for multiple size classes of tilapia species in receiving waters captured with cast nets, trapping devices or fishing.	NA	1		
		b. If system does not have receiving waters as defined in this Requirement[2] then the requirements of Indicator 2.2.2 are not applicable.	B. Auditor response to 2.2.2A is "not applicable" (NA).	NA	1		
		c. If water is discharged into municipal water systems, show that there is a mechanism for treating effluent to eradicate/eliminate macro-biological organisms such as fish.	C. Review evidence to confirm compliance.	NA	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

2.3 Criteria: The effects of eutrophication		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
2.3.1	**Indicator:** The percent change in diurnal dissolved oxygen of receiving waters relative to dissolved oxygen at saturation for the water's specific salinity and temperature **Requirement:** ≤ 65% **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.3.1 - Diurnal Difference in Dissolved Oxygen (DDDO)** - Sampling for DDDO is done at least once per month and is measured only at Receiving Water Farm Afar (RWFA) site. - Measure dissolved oxygen (DO), conductivity (or salinity), and temperature at 0.3 m depth. Take all three measurements at the same time. - For each monthly sampling of DDDO, take measurements two times: 1 hour before sunrise and 2 hours before sunset. - Equations for calculating DDDO are given in Audit Reference 6 (also Equation 1 in Appendix III of the Standard). Note 1: For farms located in temperate zones, audits will occur during the 4-month window of peak primary productivity in receiving waters. Note 2: For farms where thermal destratification occurs (a natural event when oxygen is depleted due to mixing of deep waters with surface waters), the detection of low oxygen concentration will be recorded but will not be considered a non-conformance. Note 3: The pre-sunset measurements are taken at the same time that samples are collected for water quality monitoring (see Instructions for 2.5.1) at the day of the audit.					
		a. Collect ≥ 12 months of DDDO samples if farm was built after December 2009 (farms built before December 2009 need only 6 months of data).	A. Do not schedule on-site audit until client provides baseline DDDO data.	6 months data was submitted prior to the audit.	1		
		b. Calibrate all equipment at the frequency and by the method recommended by the manufacturer. Calibrate daily if there is no manufacturer's recommendation.	B. Verify that client calibrates equipment as required.	A Walklab digital dissolved oxygen meter (trans instruments) was used. In the manual, calibration is advised before a series of measuremens are carried out. The calibration procedure is described. The meter has a swith that can be slid from cal to read. During the audit, no calibration was carried out and the readings were taken on the cal setting for the morning values. In the evening, the first reading by the farm was initially taken on the cal setting again, after which the auditor proposed to switch to read. The reading shifted from the standard calibration value given in the manual of around 20 to 4.4. All evening readings were then carried out on read. The audit day data is not within range and significantly different to the DDDO value of the last 6 months. It is unclear if the 6 months data series is incorrect or what went wrong during the monitoring during the audit.			1
		c. Adjust DO at saturation to reflect temperature, salinity and altitude during calibration or in calculations (see Audit Reference 6).	C. Verify that client adjusts for temperature, salinity and altitude through calibration or in calculations (Audit Reference 6).	Temperature, salinity and altitude was correcte for through calculation.	1		
		d. Calculate DDDO using equation 1 (Audit Reference 6) and oxygen saturation values (Audit Reference 5). Enter DDDO values into Water Quality Monitoring Matrix (Audit Reference 4).	D. Review Water Quality Monitoring Matrix. Verify that all DDDO measurements from the receiving water comply with the Requirement.	The 6 months monitoring data complies with the standard.	1		
		e. Calculate average annual DDDO for the prior 12-month period. Enter result into Water Quality Monitoring Matrix (Audit Reference 4).	E. Review monitoring matrix and confirm that mean annual DDDO ≤ 65 %.	The mean annual DDDO, even including the audit data, is compliant, however, see also b.	1		
		f. Arrange to take DO measurements while the auditor is at the farm.	F. Witness client measuring DO. On-site values should fall within range of farm data for DDDO. If an out of range measurement is observed, raise a non-conformity.	On-site values both from the auditor and the farm are around twice the previous 6 month data as the readings were not taken correctly, and results are hence out of range.			1
2.4 Criteria: Water quality in oligotrophic receiving waters		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
2.4.1	**Indicator:** Secchi disk visibility[4] limit above which production is not certifiable **Requirement:** 10 meters **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.1 - Upper Limit of Secchi Disk Visibility (SD)** The TAD concluded that "Water bodies with an average annual Secchi disk visibility at or above 10 meters are not permitted to be used as receiving waters under the ISRTA because of their ecological uniqueness and rarity." Thus, Indicator 2.4.2 sets an upper limit on eligibility for certification: SD ≤ 10 m. - Testing of the upper limit of SD is done only at the RWFA sampling station. - When depth at RWFA station is < 10 meters, the Requirement does not apply. - The required methods and equipment for measuring SD are given in Audit Reference 1.					
		a. Collect ≥ 12 months of SD readings at RWFA station (for first audits, farm must have ≥ 6 months of data). Enter SD values into Water Quality Monitoring Matrix (Audit Reference 4).	A. Review matrix to verify that average annual SD < 10 m. If average annual SD equals or exceeds 10 m, production is not certifiable.	SD readings for a 6months period were received prior to the audit. All values and the average are well below 10m.	1		
		b. Arrange to take SD measurements at RWFA during the audit of the farm. The auditor will witness and replicate your SD measurements.	B. Witness client measuring SD. Repeat the SD measurement yourself at the same time and location. Record both sets of values.	Measurements were witnessed and repeated by the auditor. Readings were almost identical. Due to strong currents, it was difficult to estimate the depth.	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

		-	C. Calculate percent error of farm data using Equation 2 (Audit Reference 6). If < 5% difference is observed between auditor and farm min and max SD readings, then accept the annual average from farm data. If > 5% difference is observed between auditor and farm min and max SD readings, then raise a non-conformity (see Audit Reference 3).	significantly more than 5% difference was calculated between the auditor and farm min and max SD readings. This was apparently due to heavy rain and increased erosion/turbidity. As this effect of weather on the readings was obvious during the audit, no non-conformity is raised.	1		
Footnote	[4] Measurements shall be taken at the Receiving Water Farm Afar (RWFA) sampling station. See Appendix II for RWFA definition.						
2.4.2	**Indicator:** Compliance with Requirements 2.4.3. & 2.4.4. when Secchi disk visibility[4] ≤ 5.0 meters **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Decision about Oligotrophy using SD** The TAD concluded that it was necessary to protect oligotrophic waters from excessive nutrient loading. They imposed strict limits on concentration of Total Phosphorus (Indicator 2.4.3) and Chlorophyll a (Indicator 2.4.4). To decide whether a given waterbody is oligotrophic or not, the TAD mandated a functional definition: "Oligotrophic receiving waters are characterized as those that have a Secchi disk visibility equal to or greater than 5.0 meters." Thus, the Secchi disk measurement (SD) will determine whether Standard nutrient limits shall apply to a given receiving water. The flow chart in Audit Reference 7 shows how to make decisions using SD measurements. A few points about the logic of the decision-making process must be noted: - Highly oligotrophic waters (i.e. where the average annual SD is > 10 m) are automatically ineligible from certification because they do not comply with Indicator 2.4.1. - The decision about oligotrophy is made based solely on SD measurements taken at RWFA (i.e. SD measures from RWRP, RWFO or other locales are not considered). - The auditor will verify accuracy of farm SD measurements while on site. Where farm and auditor measurements differ, the auditor's SD measurement shall prevail. - When deciding if Requirement nutrient limits apply to a receiving water body, the auditor shall also compare the annual average SD to the on-site SD measurement. - If water depth at RWFA is < 5.0 meters and the SD measurement is to 'bottom' then 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 are not applicable. Note: If the client suspects that an abrupt reduction in SD as measured by the auditor (e.g. case D below) was caused by natural seasonal variations (i.e. summer blooms or rainy season turbidity), the client may request exemption from 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 but only if it can be shown annual average SD has not decreased by > 5% over the previous 2 years.					
		a. If auditor measurement shows SD > 5.0 m and annual mean SD < 5.0 m, then (see next column -->)	A. Proceed to Indicator 2.4.3 and 2.4.4.	NA	1		
		b. If auditor measurement shows SD > 5.0 m and annual mean SD > 5.0 m, then (see next column -->)	B. Stop	NA	1		
		c. If auditor measurement shows SD ≤ 5.0 m and annual mean SD < 5.0 m, then (see next column -->)	C. Stop	ok, all values are well below 5m.	1		
		d. If auditor measurement shows SD ≤ 5.0 m and annual mean SD > 5.0 m, then (see next column -->)	D. Proceed to Indicator 2.4.3 and 2.4.4.	NA	1		
2.4.3	**Indicator:** Total phosphorus concentration limit in receiving waters[4] **Requirement:** ≤ 20 µg/L **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. If required under Indicator 2.4.2, collect water samples at RWFA. Determine total phosphorus concentration.	A. Take duplicate water sample at RWFA. Have sample analyzed by a qualified independent laboratory for total phosphorus concentration (for handling, see Indicator 2.5.1)	NA	1		
		b. Report results to CB.	B. Calculate percent error of farm data using Equation 2 (Audit Reference 6). If > 5% difference is observed between auditor data and farm min/max, raise a non-conformity (see Audit Reference 3).	NA	1		
		c. Analyze total phosphorus concentrations in all subsequent water samples from monthly water quality monitoring. Continue until instructed otherwise by the CB.	C. Verify that samples from receiving waters comply the Requirement.	NA	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

2.4.4	**Indicator:** Chlorophyll a concentration limit in receiving waters[4] **Requirement:** ≤ 4.0 µg/L **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. If required under Indicator 2.4.2, collect water samples at RWFA. Determine chlorophyll a concentration.	A. Take duplicate water sample at RWFA. Have sample analyzed by a qualified independent laboratory for chlorophyll a concentration (for handling, see Indicator 2.5.1)	NA	1		
		b. Report results to CB.	B. Calculate percent error of farm data using Equation 2 (Audit Reference 6). If > 5% difference is observed between auditor data and farm min/max, raise a non-conformity (see Audit Reference 3).	NA	1		
		c. Analyze chlorophyll a concentrations in all subsequent water samples from monthly water quality monitoring. Continue until instructed otherwise by the CB.	C. Verify that samples from receiving waters comply the Requirement.	NA	1		
2.5 Criteria: Receiving water monitoring		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
2.5.1	**Indicator:** Receiving water quality monitoring matrix completed and validated (Appendix II) **Requirement:** Yes (6 months data, pre-audit, required) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.5.1 - Water Quality Monitoring** - Required parameters for the water quality monitoring program are shown in Appendix II of the Standard. - Samples are collected from each of the 3 sampling stations: RWRP; RWFO; and RWFA. - A minimum of one sample is taken per station but the TAD encourages multiple sampling to investigate waterbody dynamics. - Water samples are taken from a 1-meter column of water or deeper. - Water samples are taken 2 hours before sunset. - Water samples must be kept in sealed coolers and kept at a temperature of less than 10ºC. Note 1: Laboratories used by the auditor for analyses not performed on site with auditor equipment will use ISO methods as described in Audit Reference 1, and farms are suggested to periodically send water samples to these laboratories to assure farm analyses are within a 5% level of error. Note 2: Water samples from RWFA should be taken at the same time that DO is measured for the calculation of DDDO (see Instructions for Indicator 2.3.1) at the day of the audit.					
		a. Conduct ≥ 6 months of water quality monitoring before first audit.	A. Do not schedule the on-site audit until client has monitoring dataset.	water monitoring data was received prior to scheduling the first audit.	1		
		b. Complete the Water Quality Monitoring Matrix (Audit Reference 4) and submit to CB.	B. Review Matrix to verify that client monitored all required parameters at the required frequency.	all water quality parameters were monitored monthly as required except for chla (requirement given in 2.5.1e). A dataseries starting January 2012 is available, giving >6months data prior to the first audit. Chla: it is very difficult to understand from the audit manual, that chla needs monitoring independent of the outcome of 2.4.2. The farm had interpreted that as the outcome of 2.4.2 did not require compliance with chla metrics given in 2.4.4, chla monitoring was not required. water monitoring stations RWRP, RWFO, RWFA: according to the original intention of the ASC standard, these monitoring points have not been located correctly. however, this background information is no longer in the current version of the audit manual or guidance documentation, therefore, it is very difficult for farms to have this knowledge or for different farms/CABs to interpret this correctly/in the same way. RWRP: located in artificial effluent canal upstream of the farms. However, SW moves up the estuary up to RP -> should be in natural water body/springs RWFO: located in artificial effluent canal at the height of the farms-> should be in natural water body/mixing zone estuary RWFA: located in artificial effluent canal at the height of the farms-> should be in natural water body/mixing zone estuary The map given to the auditors at the start of the audit indicating the monitoring stations was not correct.			1
		c. Calibrate all equipment at the frequency and by the method recommended by the manufacturer. Calibrate daily if there is no manufacturer's recommendation.	C. Verify that client calibrates equipment as required.	Equipment was not calibrated on site during the water monitoring during the audit. There are DO, Salinity, Turbidity, Conductivity, Temperature equipment used. For Conductivity equipment: No requied from manufacturer for each measurement. OK For DO quipment: Not rquired by manufacturer. The staff did not calibrate when measured. Not OK Turbidity equipment: Not rquired by manufacturer. The staff did not calibrate when measured. Not OK For Salinity equipment: No instruction found during the audit. Not OK For temperature equipment: Calibration is done every two year. Calibration done in 17.08.2012 by the external lab - Cheng Hong Science Instriment CO.,LTD		1	
		d. During the audit of the farm, arrange to conduct water quality monitoring. The auditor will witness and replicate water sampling.	D. Witness client conducting water quality monitoring. Repeat on-site measurements at the same time and location. Record both sets of values.	water quality monitoring was carried out during the audit. It was witnessed and repeated by the auditor.	1		
		e. Collect water samples and prepare them for shipment as applicable.	E. Collect duplicates of water samples for independent analyses performed by either the CB or an independent laboratory (i.e. not by farm staff). At a minimum, the independent analyses shall include determination of: chlorophyll a (ug/L), phosphate-phosphorus (ug/L), ammonia-nitrogen (ug/L), and turbidity (NTU). Keep samples in a sealed cooler at < 10ºC.	water samples were prepared as follows: analysis in lab by auditor: turbidity water sample sent to external independent lab: phosphate-phosphorus, ammonio-nitrogen for chla see 2.5.1b	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

		f. Perform routine analysis of water samples (i.e. done in the same manner as for previous months of water quality monitoring).	F. Keep samples under auditor control until analyses are complete or until samples are placed into custody of a qualified independent laboratory.	samples were analysed by auditor and sent to independent lab as required. Evening water samples were in the custody of the auditor until analysis/shipping.	1		
		g. Record values for each parameter and submit results to CB.	G. Calculate percent error of farm data using Equation 2 (Audit Reference 6). If > 5% difference is observed between auditor and farm data, raise a non-conformity (see Audit Reference 3).	>5% error was observed between farm and auditor data for some of the water parameters. However, for some of the measurements the background noise/precision is higher than 5% and all variation can be easily/logically explained. Together with the assessment of reasons leading to percentage variation between the different data sets, this criteria is judged to be adequately compliant. Exception: - DO readings (see 2.3.1) - P&N results not yet received from external lab - turbidity results very different depending on handling of the sample (shaking prior to analysis)	1		
2.6 Criteria: Wetland conservation		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
2.6.1	**Indicator:** Hectares of allowable wetland[5] conversion since 1999[6] **Requirement:** 0 ha **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Provide a map delineating all wetlands currently within a 5-km radius of the farm.	A. Evaluate whether there is evidence for any wetland conversion occuring within a 5-km radius of the farm since 1999.	No wetland map available showing a 5km radius of the farm or showing pre or post-1999 wetland coverage.			1
		b. Prepare a map showing pre- and post-1999 wetland coverage at farm site.	B. If evidence shows that farm siting or related activities have resulted in loss of wetland habitat since 1999, then the client is not certifiable.	No evidence showing that farm siting or related activities resulted in loss of wetland habitat since 1999. The farm was build prior to 1999.	1		
Footnote	[5] "Wetland is defined as lands where saturation with water is the dominant factor determining the nature of soil development and the types of plant and animal communities living in the soil and on its surface." (United States Environmental Protection Agency)						
Footnote	[6] The year Ramsar contracting parties adopted strategic framework for the development of the Ramsar List						
PRINCIPLE 3. CONSERVE WATER RESOURCES							
3.1 Criteria: Nutrient utilization efficiency		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
3.1.1	**Indicator:** The total amount of phosphorus added to the culture system per metric ton of fish produced per year. Use equations from Appendix III. **Requirement:** ≤ 27 kg **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only Clients may omit/delete pricing details from purchase documents.	a. Calculate total weight of feed used. Keep invoices.	A. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of feed used.	Total weight of feed confirmed during on-site visit.	1		
		b. Calculate total weight of all fish purchased. Keep invoices.	B. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish purchased.	NA. Hatchery	1		
		c. Calculate total weight of fish produced. Keep invoices for all fish sold or shipped.	C. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish sold or shipped.	Total weight of fry sold confirmed during on-site visit.	1		
		d. Obtain a signed letter from feed manufacturer stating phosphorus content of the feed.	D. Confirm that a letter from the feed manufacturer states phosphorus content.	Letter from the feed manufactures states phosphorus content - Feed for Brookstock is supplied by None Peng manufacturer - Feed for fry is supplied by Pomp Shine feed supplier	1		
		e. Complete nutrient budget worksheet (Audit Reference 8).	E. Review nutrient budget worksheet for accuracy.	Reviewed the nutrient worksheet. OK	1		
		-	F. Confirm that total phosphorus added does not exceed requirement.	Compared with the requirement. OK	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

3.1.2A	**Indicator:** The total amount of phosphorus released from the culture system per metric ton of fish produced per year. Phosphorus loading will be either calculated using equations from Appendix III or measured in effluent if there is post-culture treatment. **Requirement:** ≤ 20 kg **Applicability:** Farms with no post-culture treatment for phosphorus, Unit of Certification Only Clients may omit/delete pricing details from purchase documents.	*Farms without post-culture treatment for phosphorus*	*Farms without post-culture treatment for phosphorus*				
		a. Calculate total weight of feed used. Keep invoices.	A. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of feed used.	Total weight of feed confirmed during on-site visit.	**1**		
		b. Calculate total weight of all fish purchased. Keep invoices.	B. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish purchased.	NA. Hatchery	**1**		
		c. Calculate total weight of fish produced. Keep invoices for all fish sold or shipped.	C. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish sold or shipped.	Total weight of fish sold confirmed during on-site visit.	**1**		
		d. Complete nutrient budget worksheet (Audit Reference 8)	D. Review nutrient budget worksheet for accuracy.	Checked the nutrient worksheet. OK	**1**		
		-	E. Confirm that phosphorus released does not exceed requirement.	Compared with the requirement. OK	**1**		
3.1.2B	**Indicator:** The total amount of phosphorus released from the culture system per metric ton of fish produced per year. Phosphorus loading will be either calculated using equations from Appendix III or measured in effluent if there is post-culture treatment. **Requirement:** ≤ 20 kg **Applicability:** Farms that use post-culture treatment for phosphorus, Unit of Certification Only Clients may omit/delete pricing details from purchase documents.	*Farms with post-culture treatment for phosphorus*	*Farms with post-culture treatment for phosphorus*				
		f. Complete steps a-d (above) for Indicator 3.1.2A.	F. Complete steps A-D (above) for Indicator 3.1.2A.	NA. No post culture treatment for phosphorus	1		
		g. Describe method for treatment (e.g. sludge removal for fertilizer, water treatment facilities, etc.) and means of quantifying phosphorus capture.	G. View evidence for effective post-culture treatment.	NA. No post culture treatment for phosphorus	1		
		h. Keep records of the quantity of phosphorus captured by treatment.	H. Review records for phosphorus capture.	NA. No post culture treatment for phosphorus	1		
		i. Subtract net phosphorus captured in treatment facility from total output of phosphorus, expressed as kg P/mt fish produced over prior 12-month period.	I. Review calculations for accuracy.	NA. No post culture treatment for phosphorus	1		
		-	J. Confirm that the total amount of phosphorus released does not exceed requirement.	NA. No post culture treatment for phosphorus	1		
3.1.3	**Indicator:** Calculation and verification of the total amount of nitrogen applied to the culture system. Use equations from Appendix III. **Requirement:** Measured in kg nitrogen/mt fish/year **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only Clients may omit/delete pricing details from purchase documents.	a. Calculate total weight of feed used. Keep invoices.	A. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of feed used.	Total weight of feed confirmed during on-site visit.	**1**		
		b. Calculate total weight of all fish purchased. Keep invoices.	B. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish purchased.	NA. Hatchery.	**1**		
		c. Calculate total weight of fish produced. Keep invoices for all fish sold or shipped.	C. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish sold or shipped.	Total weight of fish sold confirmed during on-site visit.	**1**		
		d. Obtain a signed letter from feed manufacturer stating nitrogen content of the feed.	D. Confirm that a letter from the feed manufacturer states nitrogen content.	Letter from the feed manufactures states nitrogen content.	**1**		
		e. Complete nutrient budget worksheet (Audit Reference 8)	E. Review nutrient budget worksheet for accuracy.	Checked the nutrient worksheet. OK	**1**		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

3.1.4	**Indicator:** Calculation and verification of the total amount of nitrogen released from the farming activity. Use equations from Appendix III. **Requirement:** Measured in kg nitrogen/mt fish/year **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only Clients may omit/delete pricing details from purchase documents.	a. Calculate total weight of feed used. Keep invoices.	A. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of feed used.	Total weight of feed confirmed during on-site visit.	1		
		b. Calculate total weight of all fish purchased. Keep invoices.	B. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish purchased.	Receipt of fry purchased are kept.	1		
		c. Calculate total weight of fish produced. Keep invoices for all fish sold or shipped.	C. Review invoices to confirm the total weight of fish sold or shipped.	Total weight of fish sold confirmed during on-site visit.	1		
		d. Use equation from Audit Reference 6 to calculate total amount of nitrogen released.	D. Confirm calculation.	Calculation checked. OK	1		
		e. Complete nutrient budget worksheet (Audit Reference 8)	E. Review nutrient budget worksheet for accuracy.	Reviewed the nutrient budget worksheet. OK	1		
3.2 Criteria: Groundwater salinization		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
3.2.1	**Indicator:** Percent change in specific conductance of freshwater from a drilled well at the time of drilling and the time of audit. This is required when freshwater wells are used in combination with brackish surface water for the culture of tilapia. Freshwater aquifers are defined as having a specific conductance less than 1,300 µS/cm. **Requirement:** ≤ 10 % **Applicability:** Only farms where brackish water is used for tilapia culture, Farm-Wide	a. Inform CB if brackish water is used for tilapia culture (3.2.1 applies only to farms where surface water is > 1,300 µS/cm or initial well water is < 1,300 µS/cm).	A. Confirm whether client uses brackish water for tilapia culture. If not, then auditor response to 3.2.1B-E is "not applicable" (NA).	NA. Over the last years, the groundwater levels have sunk significantly in Taiwan and it is no longer allowed to use wells/groundwater for farming. Only rain water is used to fill ponds, rarely (not in the last years), water can be extracted from the constructed canals which carries water from the reservoir for all farming activities.	1		
		b. Show well locations on map of farm.	B. Confirm well locations.	NA	1		
		c. Record date of drilling and initial specific conductance (µS/cm) at each well.	C. Retain a record of location and initial specific conductance for wells.	NA	1		
		d. Measure specific conductance of all wells less than 4 weeks before audit.	D. Review updated measurements of specific conductance. Compare values to initial measurements taken from the same wells.	NA	1		
		-	E. Verify that specific conductance at wells did not change by > 10 %.	NA	1		
PRINCIPLE 4. CONSERVE SPECIES DIVERSITY AND WILD POPULATIONS							
4.1 Criteria: Escapes from aquaculture facilities		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
4.1.1	**Indicator:** Presence of net mesh or grills/screens, barriers on inlets and outlets of culture vessels (e.g., tanks, ponds and raceways), and mesh on all netted confinement units (e.g., cages and impoundments), appropriately sized to retain the stocked fish **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Install net mesh, screens and barriers in required locales.	A. Inspect site to verify that net mesh, screens and barriers are in place.	Ponds are not connected by pipes/canals/gates. If water needs to be transferred/released it is pumped using a mobile pump/pipes. When pumping occurs, a double net around a grid is used. The size of the net is very small and adequately sized to retain fry.	1		
		b. Use meshes that are appropriately sized to retain stocked fish.	B. Inspect site to verify meshes are appropriately sized to retain stocked fish.	see 4.1.1 a	1		
4.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence of net mesh, or grills/screens and permanent barrier inspection register recording dates, findings and actions taken, including mitigation or fish containment structure repairs **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Establish program for regular inspection of permanent barriers.	A. Inspect site to verify effectiveness of inspection program.	There are daily records of mesh inspection, which does not always seem to coincide with the actual practices on site.	1		
		b. Record the dates, findings and actions taken in an 'Inspection Register'.	B. Review records.	The inspection records include information of dates, findings and actions taken/maintenance.	1		
			C. Do not schedule the first audit until client submits 6 months of inspection data.	An example scan was sent to IMO which was accepted as adequate as it does not seem feasible/helpful to submit a scan of daily records over 6 months prior to scheduling the audit.	1		
4.1.3	**Indicator:** Presence of trapping devices placed in effluent/drainage canals or in between cages to sample for escapees, and a record of findings and actions taken **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Establish program for monitoring escapes with trapping devices.	A. Inspect farm to verify that trapping devices are used in an effective and representative way for monitoring escapees.	The ASC intent of trapping fish has been somewhat misunderstood. Nets between ponds and between ponds and the canal are inspected daily and if in need for repair, maintenance/action taken is recorded, in theory. 6 months data is available for the farm, however, no recorded repairs have occured in this period. The nets refered to are really escape prevention under 4.1.2 and not trapping systems.		1	
		b. Record all traps used, findings and actions taken.	B. Review records.	There are recordings for the mesh status and any actions taken in respect to repairs. However, the "trapped" fish for escape monitoring are presumably not trapped in these meshes.		1	
		C. Collect data for 6 months before first audit.	C. Do not schedule the first audit until client submits 6 months of monitoring data.	6 month data is available.	1		
4.1.4	**Indicator:** In cage culture systems, the minimum distance between the bottom of the cage and the bottom of the receiving waters where the cage is placed **Requirement:** ≥ 3.0 m **Applicability:** Cage systems only, Farm-Wide	-	A. For cage systems, confirm that distance between cage bottom and bottom sediment is ≥ 3 m.	NA, ponds	1		
4.1.5	**Indicator:** The minimum percentage of males or sterile fish in a culture unit **Requirement:** 95 % **Applicability:** Land-based systems only, Farm-Wide	*If the farm is a land-based system, the client shall arrange to have tilapia cultures sampled for percentage of male fish (or sterile fish) as follows:*	*For land-based systems, the auditor shall confirm that clients follow requirements for determination of percentage of male fish (or sterile fish) in culture.*				
		a. Select three (3) culture vessels at random.	A. Verify samples were selected at random.	NA, hatchery.	1		
		b. Capture 40 fish from each culture vessel for a total of 120 fish.	B. Verify that fish originated from different culture vessels.	NA, hatchery.	1		
		c. Determine the number of fish in the sample that are male (or sterile).	C. Verify method used to determine sex (or sterility).	NA, hatchery.	1		
		d. Calculate the percentage of male fish (or sterile fish) in culture.	D. Review results to confirm compliance with the requirement.	NA, hatchery.	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

		e. Alternate approach when farm has fewer than 3 culture vessels: capture a total of 100 fish and determine the percentage male fish (or sterile fish).	E. As for 4.1.5D.	NA, hatchery.	1		
4.2 Criteria: Transporting live tilapia		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
4.2.1	**Indicator:** Presence and evidence of use of fish transport containers that have no escape path for fish **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. For transport of live fish to the farm (e.g. fry), ensure that containers do not provide escape paths for fish.	A. Inspect site to verify containers do not provide escape paths for live fish transported to the farm.	Fry are transported in plastic bags filled with fry, water and oxygen. Fry can not escape from the bags unless the bags burst.	1		
		b. For transport of live fish away from the farm (e.g harvested fish), ensure that containers do not provide escape paths for fish.	B. Inspect site to verify containers do not provide escape paths for live fish transported from the farm.	The transport is carried out by a contracted service provider who moves fish from pond to pond when reguired. The tranfer is done in an open container containing water, ice and oxygen. At harvest, closed containers are used containing water, ice and oxygen. Unless the containers break or are handled incorrectly, there is no escape path for fish. Escaped fish during loading would fall back into the pond or onto the bank but not into natural water bodies.	1		
4.3 Criteria: Transgenic fish		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
4.3.1	**Indicator:** Allowance for the culture of transgenic tilapia **Requirement:** No (None allowed) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	A. Review records to confirm compliance with the requirement				
		b. Purchase documents must confirm that culture stock is not transgenic.	B. If the auditor suspects that transgenic fish are in culture, test stock identity by collecting 3 fish and sending to an ISO 17025 certified laboratory for genetic analysis.	ok			

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

4.4 Criteria: Predator control		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
4.4.1	**Indicator:** Use of lethal[7] predator control **Requirement:** No (None allowed) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.	A. Review list.	There are no lethal predator control devices used. Only predators are individual birds. Ponds are not protected against birds for tilapia, only the eel ponds have predator nets.	1		
		-	B. Inspect sites to verify no use of lethal predator controls.	On-site inspection confirms that no lethal predator control devices are in use.	1		
Footnote	[7] The use of lethal predator control is prohibited, unless a predator becomes impinged in netting and is required to be euthanized.						
4.4.2	**Indicator:** Mortality of IUCN red listed species **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.4.2 - Presence of IUCN Red List Species** Determine whether IUCN red list species are present in the region as follows: - go to http://www.iucnredlist.org/ - follow to "other search options" - select "Taxonomy" - select "Animalia" - indicate appropriate "Location", "Systems", "Habitat", - click on "run search" and record species listed and whether they are threatened by the farming activity. Note: The IUCN Red List uses nine categories for ranking species according to threat, and search results may include species that are not currently threatened. For the purposes of determining whether a farm complies with indicator 4.4.2, species in the following IUCN categories may be excluded from further analyses: "Not evaluated", "Data Deficient", and "Least Concern".					
		a. Perform analysis. Record all IUCN red list species and farm-related threats.	A. Repeat analysis to verify that client obtained an accurate result.	The company showed the IUCN list whith 10 species found in Tawain, none of which are found in Tainan. Checked the result. OK.	1		
		b. If an IUCN Red List species is identified in region of the farm (including receiving and source waters), take appropriate precautions.	B. Verify that client takes appropriate precautions as required.	N/A. No endangered species according to IUCN list found in Tainan.	1		
PRINCIPLE 5. USE RESOURCES RESPONSIBLY							
5.1 Criteria: Use of wild fish for feed (fishmeal and oil)		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
5.1.1	**Indicator:** Feed Fish Equivalence Ratio (FFER). See Appendix IV for feed calculations. **Requirement:** ≤ 0.8 **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	a. Obtain a signed letter from feed manufacturer stating percentage of fish meal and/or fish oil (Audit Reference 9) in feed used during the past 12 months.	A. Verify that values are stated in a letter from the feed manufacturer.	Letter showing the percentage of fishmeal and fish oil from POMP SHINE and NONE PENG feed suppliers are available.	1		
		b. For FFER calculations, exclude fish meal and fish oil derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the 'trimmings' from a human consumption fishery).	B. Verify client excludes rendered seafood byproducts from calculation of FFER.	N/A. No fish meal derived from rendered seafood byproducts.	1		
		c. Calculate FFER using equations in Audit Reference 6 (also Appendix IV of Standard).	C. Verify that FFER calculations were done correctly.	FFER calculation were done conrrectly. Cross check with the formula.	1		
		-	D. Confirm that FFER complies with the Requirement	FFER complies with the requirement	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

5.1.2	**Indicator:** Allowance for the use of fishmeal and fish oil in tilapia feed containing products from fisheries that are listed on the IUCN's Red List or the species list maintained by the Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	a. Obtain a signed letter from feed manufacturer identifying the origin (genus, species and region harvested) of fish used in fish meal/oil (Audit Reference 9).	A. Verify that species used in fishmeal are identifed in a letter from the feed manufacturer.	There are anchovy (*Engraulis Japonnicus*) and sardine (*Sardina pichardus*) used in the fishmeal at POMP SHINE feed manufacturer. No fishoil. There is anchovy (*Engraulis Japonnicus*) used in the fishmeal at NONE PENG feed manufacturer. No fishoil.	1		
		b. Determine if any of the species used in fish feed are on the IUCN's Red List following the instructions given for Indicator 4.4.2.	B. Repeat search of IUCN database to verify that client obtained an accurate result.	Comparing with the list in IUCN. OK	1		
		c. Determine if any of the species used in fish feed are listed by CITES as follows: - go to http://www.cites.org/eng/resources/species.html - select option "Species" and click "find it"	C. Repeat search of CITES database to verify that client obtained an accurate result.	There is no list of CITES database available during the audit to verfiy if the species used in fishmeal are listed by CITES.		1	
5.1.3	**Indicator:** Timeframe for producers to source feed containing fishmeal or fish oil originating from fisheries deemed sustainable by an ISEAL member's accredited certification scheme **Requirement:** 5 years following the date of ISRTA publication **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	a. Prepare a policy stating the organization's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers to an ISEAL-accredited certification scheme for fish meal/oil origins.	A. Verify that the client's policy supports sustainable feed sourcing (e.g. programs at http://www.isealalliance.org/portrait/full%20member).	There is no policy of company to support feed manufacturers shifting to an ISEAL-accredited certfication scheme for fish meal/oil origins.		1	
		b. Prepare a letter stating the organization's intent to source feed containing fishmeal or fish oil originating from fisheries deemed sustainable by an ISEAL member's accredited certification scheme by 19 December 2014.	B. Obtain a copy of client's letter of intent.	Letters stating the farmer's intent to source feed containing fish meal and fish oil originateing from fisheries deemed sustainable by an ISEAL member's accredited certification scheme by 19 December 2014 are available.	1		
		c. Affirm support of the process through internal and external communications (e.g. correspondence with feed manufacturers).	C. Confirm client's support with documented evidence (letters, communications).	Letter of farmer's intent is available.	1		
5.1.4	**Indicator:** Prior to achievement of 5.1.3, the average FishSource score characterizing the fishery(ies) from which the fishmeal or fish oil is derived. See Appendix V for explanation of FishSource scoring. **Requirement:** ≥ 6.0 with no individual score < 6.0 or an N/A in the stock assessment category **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	**Instructions to Clients for Indicator 5.1.4 - FishSource Scores of Feed Species** For species from which fishmeal or fish oil is derived, determine FishSource scores as follows: - go to http://www.fishsource.org/ - select "Species" drop down tab to the left and enter relevant species - select the top tab that reads "Scores"					
		a. Record FishSource scores for each species from which fishmeal or fish oil is derived.	A. Confirm that client has recorded scores for each species. Repeat FishSource analysis to verify that client obtained an accurate result.	NA, first audit. POMP SHINE feed supplier has two kind of fish species used in the fishmeal. These are Anchovy (*Engraulis Japonnicus*) sourced from Chile and *Sardina pilchardus* sourced from Argentina. NONE-PENG feed supplier uses Anchovy (*Engraulis Japonnicus)* sourced from Chile in the fish meal. Anchovy (*Engraulis Japonnicus*) sourced from Chile has a score.	1		
		b. Confirm that average score is ≥ 6.0 with no individual score < 6.0.	B. If any scores is < 6.0 then the feed does not comply with the Requirement. If the average score is < 6.0 then the feed does not comply with the Requirement.	NA, first audit. The question "Do managers follow scientific advice" applied for Anchovy (Engraulis Japonnicus) sourced from Chile has 0.4 score. The others are >=6.	1		
		c. Confirm that there is no 'N/A' in a stock assessment category.	C. If an 'N/A' appears in the sock assessment category then the feed does not comply with the Requirement.	NA, first audit. No N/A appear in the sock assessment category for Anchovy (Engraulis Japonnicus) sourced from Chile.	1		
		d. If the species is not on the website it means that a FishSource assessment is not available. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as a priority for assessment.	D. If the species does not have a FishSource score then the fish feed does not comply with the Requirement.	NA, first audit. *Sardina pilchardus* that are sourced from Argentina do not have scores.	1		
		e. In lieu of FishSource scores, a farm undergoing a first audit may substitute a signed letter of intent from their feed manufacturer stating commitment to provide feed complying with FishSource scoring requirements. However at the second audit, all farms shall demonstrate that they have used feed that complies with the FishSource scoring requirements for a minimum of 6 months.	E. Verify that client has manufacturer's letter of intent as applicable to first audits. Thereafter, client must demonstrate that all feeds used are in compliance with the Requirement.	The farm does not have the manufacturer's letter of intent to commit to follow the requirment of FishSource Score.			1

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

Criteria 5.2 Criteria: Preference for better feed manufacturers		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
5.2.1	**Indicator:** Timeframe for producers to provide evidence of preferential sourcing of feed products from feed manufacturers that have a sustainable sourcing policy for feed ingredients, and traceability of feed ingredients **Requirement:** 2 years following the date that the ISRTA are published **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	a. Compile a list of all feed suppliers with contact information.	A. Review feed supplier list and cross-check against feed purchases.	List of feed suppliers is available. There are two feed suppliers : POMP SHINE and NONE PENG	1		
		b. Prepare a letter of intent to preferentially source feed from suppliers who have a traceability and sustainability policy by 19 December 2011 (Audit Reference 9; also see Indicator 5.1.3B).	B. Verify that client has prepared the letter (it must cover traceability; see Indicator 5.1.3B).	Letter showing the communication between the farms and the feed suppliers in traceability is available.	1		
		c. Communicate your oganization's policy to each feed supplier.	C. Verify that client communicated policy to feed supplier.	Checked the declaration for POM SHINE and NONE PENG	1		
		d. Request a traceability policy from each feed supplier (or letter of intent to establish one) before 19 December 2011.	D. Verify client requested documents from each supplier.	Checked the declaration for POM SHINE and NONE PENG	1		
		e.Request sustainability policy from each feed supplier (or letter of intent to establish one) before 19 December 2011.	E. Verify client requested documents from each supplier. Auditors shall allow clients one year (until 19 December 2012) to demonstrate full compliance with 5.2.1c-e in accordance with forthcoming ASC guidelines.	Checked the declaration for POM SHINE and NONE PENG	1		
5.3 Criteria: Energy use		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
5.3.1	**Indicator:** Identification of the energy sources and calculation and verification of total energy used at the culture facility **Requirement:** Measured in kilojoules/mt fish/year **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	**Instructions to Clients for Indicator 5.3.1 - Calculating Total Energy used by Farm** Calculate the total energy consumption of the farm over the prior 12-month period by completing the Energy Budget Worksheet (Audit Reference 10). Include all sources of energy consumption on the farm site such as aeration, boat engines, electricity for housing, etc. Do not include off-site energy consumption such as transport of personnel to or from the farm, or transport of fish to or from the farm. Report energy consumption in kilojoules (Note: 1 megajoule = 1,000 kiojoules). The different energy units can be converted to kilojoules using the following website: http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=about). Report the grand total energy used as kilojoules/mt fish produced/year.					
		a. Complete the Energy Budget Worksheet (Audit Reference 10).	A. Verify that client completed the Energy Budget Worksheet.	The energy budget worksheet was completed and submitted to IMO prior to the audit. Due to a translation error, some electricity values were listed under gasoline.	1		
PRINCIPLE 6 MANAGE FISH HEALTH AND WELFARE IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER							
6.1 Criteria: Stocked tilapia recovery							
6.1.1	**Indicator:** Percent recovery of fish stocked in production stages after they have attained a size of 100 grams **Requirement:** ≥ 65						

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

	Applicability: All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	a. Collect 12 months of data on recovery before the first audit.	A. Make sure client has collected 12 months of data on recovery before first audit.	Calculation results for recovery of the past 12 months was submitted prior to the audit, however, the wrong data was used for the calculations.		1
		b. If the farm proposes to modify the formula for calculating percent recovery, submit written justification to the CB before the first audit.	B. Review justification for using an alternate calculation if applicable.	No request for a different calculation method and justification was submitted to IMO before the audit.		1
		c. Calculate percent recovery according to the instructions above.	C. Review calculations and verify that client's production records support the conclusions.	Calculations were not carried out according to the instructions. The farm can not calculate from 100g as fish are not weighed /counted during grow-out or during transfer (pond to pond). The farm can only calculate recovery from stocking to harvest. However, fry from the hatchery is not always received directly. Sometimes, fry is stocked at another farm (nursery) and transferred to the farm under assessment at around 60-150g. Again, numbers are not counted. This point was not really clear to NYAA, who was mainly using an old version of the audit manual and not all parts (instructions, footnotes etc) had been translated. In general the data as it is recorded at the time of the audit does not allow an exact verification of recovery rates.		1
		-	D. Verify that percent recovery complies with Requirement.	It is dificult to calculate and interpret the recovery rates. Since the production cycle is 12-18months, many of the ponds are not yet harvested and the calculation can not be completed for the last 12 months. In addition, some ponds were previously stocked with milkfish and have only recently been stocked with tilapia, which are still wihtin their first months of grow-out and can hence not be used for the calculation.		1
6.2 Criteria: Chemicals		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**			
6.2.1	**Indicator:** Allowance for the use of chemicals and therapeutants for disease and pest control that are banned in the importing or producing country **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Prepare a list of all chemicals used on the farm in the previous 12 months. [Note: The TAD considers any substance added by the producer to culture system - aside from water and feed - to be a chemical.]	A. Review list. Cross-check against purchases (6.2.2) and health events (6.2.4).	The list of chemical given in the OP was cross checked onsite and it is correct.		1
		b. Prepare a list of suppliers of all chemicals or therapeutants used.	B. Review supplier list to identify the country of origin for each chemical.	The countries of origin of each medecine are known.	1	
		c. Prepare a list of all the countries where the product has been exported to in the prior 12-month period.	C. Review list and cross-check against documentary evidence (e.g. sales documents).	List of countries of export in the last 12 months are mentioned in the OP. OK	1	
		d. Prepare a list of banned substances for the producing and exporting country and the national authority or regulating body in producing country (contact information required).	D. Review evidence and cross-check against published information.	There are 13 medecines that can be used in the farm according to the No. 1001474006- Seafood Animal Medecine used Regulation issued by the Council Agriculture in Oct 17, 2011, Tawain. However, the list of other subtances that may be used in the farm beside the medecine is not available. For export countries , there is no list of subtances banned available.		1
		e. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from prior 12-month period.	E. Verify records.	Once a year, Council of Agriculture come to do grow-out fish quality testing for GAP certified in every farm. Inspection reports were kept. The parameters tested are Chloramphenicol, total malachite green, Leucomalachite green, Malachite Freen, Aninohydantoin, semi carbazide, AOZ and AMOZ. The results are Non Detected. No conclusion or inform from Council of Agriculture for the test result.	1	
6.2.2	**Indicator:** Allowance for the prophylactic use of antibiotics, prior to any evidence of a disease problem **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) .	A. Review purchase records and calculate total amount procured by client. Inspect storage area to verify quantities on site.	Whenever there is disease on the farm, the vet will come and give the prescription. Famers will send it to the feed manufacturers to buy and mix in the feed used. The purchase records are kept with the quantity used. There are 13 antibiotics allowed according to the No. 1001474006- Seafood Animal Medecine used Regulation issued by Council Agriculture in Oct 17, 2011, Tawain.	1	
		b. Maintain a log of all health related events. For each event record the duration and the requirements for use of antibiotics or therapeutants (see also 6.2.4).	B. Review log of health events to verify that the quantity of antibiotic applied by the client does not suggest prophylactic use.	Check the prescriptions about the quantity used. No prophylactic use.	1	
		c. Determine the total amount of antibiotics used in prior 12-month period.	C. Verify total amount of antibiotics used is equal to total amount prescribed.	Checked the quantity mentioned in the prescription with the receipt. OK	1	

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

6.2.3	**Indicator:** Minimum hold time required before any water in which fish have been fed with feed containing methyl or ethyl testosterone can be released **Requirement:** ≥ 48 hours **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	*This indicator applies only to farms where the hatchery is located at the grow-out site (e.g. the grow-out facility owns and operates the hatchery) and where the hatchery discharges into the receiving waters. During the holding period, there shall be no risk of exposure of humans or livestock to methyl or ethyl testosterone.*		NA, no use of hormones in the hatchery.	1		
		a. Hatchery facility must have the capacity to retain any water that contains hormones for sex reversal for a period of ≥ 48 hours .	A. Inspect hatchery to verify effectiveness of the systems to retain any water that contains hormones for sex reversal.				
6.2.4	**Indicator:** Health records proving all therapeutants were used or are being used as prescribed by a veterinary or accredited fish health professional **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Keep a record of all therapeutants used for prior 12-month period.	A. Review record of therapeutant usage.	N/A. No therapeutant usage	1		
		b. Maintain all prescriptions for therapeutants for prior 12-month period.	B. Verify that therapeutants were used only under prescription.	N/A. No therapeutant usage	1		
		c. If prescriptions are made by health professionals who are not veterinarians, obtain evidence of competency (e.g. accreditation) in the diagnosis of fish disease and drug therapy.	C. If a non-vetrenarian wrote prescriptions, confirm that the individual is qualified as an accredited fish health professional.	N/A. No therapeutant usage	1		
6.2.5	**Indicator:** Calculation and verification of the total amount of each antibiotic (active ingredient) used per mt fish produced per year. **Requirement:** Measured in kilograms of active ingredient of individual antibiotic/mt of fish produced/year **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Determine total amount of antibiotic used for prior 12-month period.	A. Verify against record of antibiotic use (see 6.2.2C).	The prescription made by Vet - Mr.Lin Yu-Zhaa, Veternerian with the registration No.302 issued by the Tainan Government every applying the antibiotics. Records of antibiotics used were kept.	1		
		b. Adjust total weight of antibiotic by the fraction of active ingredient.	B. Verify fraction of active ingredient in antibiotic with manufacturer's data.	Fraction of active ingredient in antibiotics with manufacturer data are verified. OK			
		c. Determine total weight of fish produced for prior 12-month period. Calculate kg active ingredient/mt of fish produced/year.	C. Verify that calculations are accurate.	Calculations are accurate.			
6.3 Criteria: Mortalities		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
6.3.1	**Indicator:** Presence of records demonstrating that fish mortalities are removed consistently on a minimum daily basis **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Unit of Certification Only	a. Ensure that fish mortalities are removed from cultures on a daily basis.	A. Do site inspection to confirm there are no dead fish in cultures whose advanced state of decomposition would suggest mortality is > 1 day.	Dead fish is collected daily and taken by the trash car from local government. Only dead fish in the middle of the ponds may be left for some hours until they float to the side where they can be picked up easily.	1		
		b. Maintain records of daily removals of fish mortalities.	B. Verify client's records show daily removals of fish mortality for prior 12-month period.	Daily records are kept.	1		
6.3.2	**Indicator:** Evidence proving acceptable disposal of dead fish, (i.e., landfill receiving receipts, sales receipts, permits or approvals for onsite burial, and assurance if converted to animal meals not destined for the culture of tilapia) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Prepare a farm policy that addresses all requirements of the Standard in regards to the acceptable disposal of dead fish.	A. Review policy to verify it addresses all requirements of 6.3.2 of the Standard.	The policy of deadfish does not mention the purpose of use of the dead fish after collection by trash car.		1	
		b. Maintain records of mortality disposals as evidence of compliance.	B. Review disposal records to verify compliance.	The records of deadfish are kept everyday.	1		
		-	C. Do site inspection to confirm that farm policy towards mortality is implemented and mortality records are accurate.	Onsite checking	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

6.4 Criteria: Fish health management		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CB Actions):**				
6.4.1	**Indicator:** Presence and evidence of implementation of a fish health plan that is site-specific and contains effective methods for 1) Protecting the farm from introduction of pathogens, 2) Preventing the spread of pathogens within the farm and to the receiving waters and 3) Reducing the potential for development of disease resistance by ensuring responsible therapeutant use **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Prepare a fish health plan that addresses all requirements of the Standard, including: 1) Protecting the farm from introduction of pathogens, 2) Preventing the spread of pathogens within the farm and to the receiving waters, and 3) Reducing the potential for development of disease resistance by ensuring responsible therapeutant use	A. Review fish health plan to verify it addresses all requirements of Indicator 6.4.1 of the Standard and that the plan is site-specific.	The Fish health management plan is reviewed by Mr.Lin Yu-Zhaa, Veterinarian No.302 issued by the Tainan Government. The content of plan is about protecting the farm from pathogen, from receiving water, and using the antibiotics according to the Vet prescription.	1		
		b. Obtain review and written approval of the fish health plan by the farm's veterinarian or health professional.	B. Confirm that the farm's veterinarian or health professional has reviewed and approved the fish health plan.	The Fish health management plan is approved by Mr.Lin Yu-Zhaa, Veterinarian.	1		
		-	C. Do site inspection to verify that fish health plan is effectively implemented and understood by farm staff.	Onsite visit. OK	1		
				Total	**126**	**14**	**5**

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC TILAPIA STANDARD
Created by the Tilapia Aquaculture Dialogue

Scope: Species of the Family Cichlidae commonly referred as Tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus, O. mossambica, O. aureus and O. hybrids)

add "1" per criteria in applicable column below

PRINCIPLE 7. BE SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE			Evaluation results			
7.1 Criteria: Child labor		**Compliance Criteria:**	**Description**	**ok**	minor	major
7.1.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of child[8] labor[9] **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (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 less than 18): have no conflicts between work and schooling; do not spend more than 10 hours/day on transportation time, school and work; do not perform hazardous work. d. Equal treatment for children of migrant workers.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there were related procedures about hiring workers above 15 years old and young worker's work limitation.	1		
Footnote	[8] A "child" is defined as any person less than 15 years of age. A higher age would apply if the minimum age law stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling. If, however, the local minimum age law is set at 14, in accordance with developing country exceptions under ILO Convention 138, the lower age will apply.					
Footnote 10	[9] "Child labor" is defined as any work by a child younger than the age specified in the definition of a child, except for light work as provided for by ILO Convention 138, article 7.					
7.2 Criteria: Forced, bonded, compulsory labor		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.2.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of forced[10], bonded[11] or compulsory labor **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Contracts clearly stated and understood by employees, no 'pay to work' schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs. b. Employees free to leave workplace and manage their own time. c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity papers. d. Employer shall not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer. e. Employees not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there were related policies which clearly stated that employees were free to leave, without depositing of identity papers or money.	1		
Footnote	[10] "Forced (compulsory) labor" is defined as all work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty for which a person has not offered him/ herself voluntarily or for which such work or service is demanded as a repayment of debt. "Penalty" can imply monetary sanctions, physical punishment, or the loss of rights and privileges or restriction of movement (e.g., withholding of identity documents).					
Footnote	[11] "Bonded labor" is defined as when a person is forced by the employer or creditor to work to repay a financial debt to the crediting agency.					

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

7.3 Criteria: Discrimination in the work environment		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.3.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of discrimination[12] **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	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. 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. c. Company has a policy in place protecting pregnant and lactating mothers. d. Company has a policy in place against HIV discrimination.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there were related anti-discrimination policies maintained onsite 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.	1		
Footnote	[12] "Discrimination" is defined as any distinction, exclusion, or preferences, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment. Not all distinction, exclusion, or preference constitutes discrimination. For instance, a merit- or performance-based pay increase or bonus is not by itself discriminatory. Positive discrimination in favor of people from certain underrepresented groups may be legal in some countries.					
7.3.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of proactive anti-discrimination practice **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Verification of clear and transparent company procedures are outlined to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints. b. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective. c. Comparison of workforce diversity with demographics of host community updated regularly by management.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there were related policies and procedures about how to raise, file and respond to discrimination complaints.	1		
7.4 Criteria: Health and safety of workers		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.4.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices/ procedures/ policies **Requirement:** 100 % **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	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 conducted on a regular basis (once a year and immediately for all new employees), including training on potential hazards and risk minimization. d. Potentially dangerous chemicals are stored properly and as prescribed.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there were related procedures and policies to prevent workplace hazards and risks.	1		
7.4.2	**Indicator:** Percentage of health- and safety-related accidents and violations recorded and mitigated through corrective actions **Requirement:** 100 % **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Documentation is generated with regards to occupational health and safety violations. b. Corrective action plan 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. c. Workers involved in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps taken/improvements made.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm.	1		
7.4.3	**Indicator:** Employer responsibility and proof of insurance (accident/ injury) for employee costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law **Requirement:** 100 % **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Documentation maintained by management confirms that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover annual check-ups and costs related to occupational accidents or injuries. Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm.	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

7.5 Criteria: Wages, overtime and working hours		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.5.1	**Indicator:** The percentage of employees who are paid fair and decent wages **Requirement:** 100 % **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	*Applicable to employees, workers and contractors* 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, cover basic needs of personnel and provide some discretionary income. c. Labor conflict resolution policy in place to track conflicts & complaints raised, and responses to conflicts & complaints. d. Ratio of lowest wage rate to basic needs wage always exceeds 100%. e. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there were related policies about equal pay for equal work, minimum wage and basic wages should be paid.	1		
7.5.2	**Indicator:** Incidences of abuse of working hours and/or overtime laws **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. No deductions in pay for disciplinary actions. 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[13] or false apprenticeship schemes[14] 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 of majority of the time) exceed 48 hours. Only if allowed by law, variations (to the 48-hour regular work week) based on seasonality may apply. f. Personnel shall be provided with at least on day off in every seven day period. g. All overtime shall be paid at a premium and should not exceed 12 hours per week. h. Overtime work shall always be voluntary.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm.	1		
Footnote	[13] Labor-only contracting arrangement: The practice of hiring workers without establishing a formal employment relationship for the purpose of avoiding payment of regular wages or the provision of legally required benefits, such as health and safety protections					
Footnote	[14] False Apprenticeship Scheme: The practice of hiring workers under apprenticeship terms without stipulating terms of the apprenticeship or wages under contract. It is a "false" apprenticeship if its purpose is to underpay people, avoid legal obligations, or employ children.					
7.6 Criteria: Freedom of association and right to collective bargaining		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.6.1	**Indicator:** Incidences of employees denied freedom to associate, ability to bargain collectively[15] or denied access to representative(s) chosen by workers **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	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. ILO specifically prohibits "acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control or employers or employers' organizations. 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).	N/A. There were no worker in the farm.	1		
Footnote	[15] "Bargain collectively" is defined as a voluntary negotiation between employers and organizations of workers in order to establish the terms and conditions of employment by means of collective (written) agreements.					
7.7 Criteria: Disciplinary Actions		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.7.1	**Indicator:** Incidences of abusive disciplinary actions **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. There is never any use of or support for (e.g. subcontractors using) corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, or verbal abuse. 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).	N/A. There were no workers in the farm.	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

7.7.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of non-abusive disciplinary policies and procedures **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. 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).	N/A. There were no workers in the farm.	1		
7.8 Criteria: Action response plans/policies		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.8.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of implementation of a corrective action plan (updated annually) that addresses unintended problems associated with labor relations and internal monitoring of labor activities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Copy of corrective action plan for prior 12-month period (first audit requires previous 3-month period) and employer testimonial that these plans have been implemented. b. Workers are aware of the action plans and their results.	N/A. No such case happened before.	1		
7.8.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of implementation of an emergency action plan and annual (or more frequent) internal monitoring activities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Copy of emergency (examples include earthquakes, fires, storms, etc.) action plan for prior 12-month period (first audit requires previous 3-month period) and employer testimonial that these plans have been implemented. b. Worker competency in the appropriate actions required during an emergency response.	N/A. No such case happened before but the farm provided an emergency action plan for review.	1		
7.8.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of implementation of a verifiable conflict resolution policy for conflicts and complaints tracked transparently, and proof that conflicts and complaints from employees are responded to within three months after being received **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Copy of conflict resolution policy for prior 12-month period (first audit requires previous 3-month period) and employer testimonial that this plan has been implemented. b. Three month time-frame from employee conflict filing and response upheld. c. Records of complaint cases, related actions and resolution maintained as well as worker evaluation of the resolution. d. Worker actions and testimony confirms they understand this process and are comfortable raising complaints.	N/A. There were no worker in the farm but there was a copy of conflict resolution policy maintained.	1		
7.9 Criteria: Living conditions for employees		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.9.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that living conditions are clean, sanitary and safe for habitation **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Evidence that potable/safe drinking water available. b. Evidence that sanitary conditions for disposal of human waste are in practice. c. Evidence that human waste is not discharged into the environment. d. Employee housing is constructed of material to sustain local conditions in the event of storms or other natural events that could endanger lives.	N/A. There were no workers in the farm but there was potable drinking water and sanitary conditions in the farm.	1		

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

7.10 Criteria: Community relations and interaction		**Compliance Criteria:**				
7.10.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that farms are not inhibiting or restricting local community access to public land, freshwater resources or public fishing grounds **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Testimonials from surrounding community members that farms have not blocked access to public property or public natural resources.	As per the surrounding community members interview, the farm had not blocked access to public property or public natural resources.	1		
7.10.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of implementation of a verifiable conflict resolution policy for conflicts and complaints tracked transparently, and proof that conflicts and complaints from communities are responded to within three months after being received 实施可验证的冲突解决策略的冲突，并跟踪透明的投诉的证据，并证明了来自社区的冲突和投诉作出回应，后三个月内，被接收 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Farms, Farm-Wide	a. Verification of community conflict resolution policy and actions for prior 12-month period (first audit requires previous 3-month period) and community testimonials that this plan has been implemented and there is a shared understanding of procedures for filing complaints. b. Three month time-frame from community member conflict filing and response evidenced by community testimonials. c. Verification that farm management communicates with the community on the impact of its activities. d. If environmental impact assessment has been performed, it is made easily accessible to community members. e. If a socio-economic impact assessment has been performed, it is made easily accessible to community members. f. Economic impacts of the farm activities reported – at least annually – to the community.	No community conflict had ever happened in this farm for prior 12-month period. But the farm provided community conflict resolution policy for review. It was noted no environmental impact assessment or socio-economic impact assessment had been performed by the farm.	1		
			Total	**18**	**0**	**0**

Copyright © 2012 Aquaculture Stewardship Council. All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council

ASC Social for farm NYT04

criteria	recomen-dation	minor NC	major NC	NC	action plan	deadline	action plan approved by IMO	status
				none				
Total	0	0	0					