DNV·GL

ASC SALMON STANDARD AUDIT REPORT

ASC Initial Audit Final Report

Marine Harvest Norway Skipningsdalen site

Report No.: 01, Rev. 01
Date: 11.11.2014

Project name:	ASC Salmon Standard Audit Report	DNV GL - Business Assurance
Report title:	ASC Initial Audit Final Report	Veritasveien 1
Customer:	Marine Harvest Norway Skipningsdalen site ,	1322 Høvik
	4432 Hidrasund, Norway	Norway
Contact person:	Ingrid Lundamo	
Date of issue01	11.11.2014	Tel: +47 67 57 99 00
Project No.:	PRJC-505006-2014-MSC-NOR	
Organisation unit:	11861 Skipningsdalen Site	
Report No. 01	01, Rev 01	
	01-14	

Prepared by:	Verified by:	
Kjell Bekkevold	J.Rios	
Darius Pamakstys	[Name]	
SA8000 auditor	[title]	

☐ Draft report (client's review)
☐ Public comment draft report (stakeholders review)
☒ Final report

☒ Initial audit
☐ Surveillance audit
☐ Recertification audit

Rev. No.	Date	Reason for Issue	Prepared by	Verified by	Approved by
01	10.11.2014	First issue	KRBE	Jorge Rios (TRW)	KIMAK

Table of contents

1 SUMMARY

The Report
This report covers the results of the Initial audit of Marine Harvest Norway AS (hereafter in the report called "The Organisation "or "The Company") "**Skipningsdalen**" farm, with the aim of the company to certify "**Skipningsdalen**" on-growing-site, under the ASC Salmon Standard, V1, June 2012.

The Audit The audit was held over four days. The first three days of the audit were held in the company's area head office, focussing on technical and legal matters, mainly, with relevant operational and administrative staff present. The second part of the audit comprised a site visit to **Skipningsdalen** taking place the second part of the audit, covering remaining technical and administrative issues and completed the social responsibility issues. The audit was conducted as document reviews (digital and hard-copy information) as well as interviews conducted with relevant staff including **Skipningsdalen** staff, typically a combination of document reviews and staff interviews. Demonstrations of equipment and processes took place, relevant to the scope of the audit, according to the ASC Salmon Standard v1.0 and following guidelines in the ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.0

Reference is made to ASC Farm certification and Accreditation Requirement 17.4.2 and 17.4.3. As the fish were not at harvest size during the audit, harvest was not overseen by the auditor. Harvest is planned to be observed/assessed during surveillance audit.
The harvest plant, "**MHN Ryfisk plant**", located at Hundsnes, 4131 Hjelmeland, Norway, holds an ASC CoC certificate, Ref. to WWW.asc-aqua.org where updated information can be found.

The interviews pertinent to the Social Responsibility Section of the ASC Salmon Standard were held in conditions allowing for confidentiality of the dialogues and under no constraints of free speech of the interviewees. These interviewees are not named in the report for the same reason.

Preliminary Results
The evaluation of the company`s compliance of the requirements in the ASC Salmon Standard is described in detail later in this report. The findings are documented in detail in section 5, 8 and Annex 2 of this report
Furthermore, there are references to all the 7 (8) Principles of the ASC Salmon Standard and corresponding indicators, criteria, and sub-points of the ASC Salmon Audit Checklist for the Non-conformances (Section 5 –List of findings),

The principles where full compliance was found are:
Principle 1; "*Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations*"
Principle 2 *"Conserve natural habitats, local biodiversity and ecosystem function"*
Principle 4 *"Use resources in an environmentally efficient and responsible manner"*
Principle 7 *"Be a good neighbour and conscientious citizen"*
Principle/section 8 *"Standard for suppliers of smolts".*

For the other principles; 3, 5, and 6, full compliance was not found, although these were to a large extent compliant. The audit hence resulted in a limited number of Minor category Non-Conformances, with the conclusion that; **certification, based on the outcome of this initial audit, is recommended. There were no stakeholders` submissions in response to the publication of the draft report within the designated period of time, with the conclusion that certification is now recommended.**

A satisfactory response by the applicant to close Minor non-conformances, by means of documented corrective actions, is expected to be in place before next Periodic Audit.

Details of compliance and compliance criteria, and evidence references are found in The Initial Audit Check-list (Appendix #2)

2 THE APPLICANT FARM

Name of applicant farm site	**MHN on-growing site 11861 SKIPNINGSDALEN**
Description of applicant farm	Skipningsdalen is a conventional floating cage salmon farm. The production cages are circular floating plastic rings. Central on the farm is a feed barge, with centralised feeding system and UV camera controls of feeding. All installations are certified after "NYTEK" regulations standard. For details see; www.Fiskeridirektoratet.no/akvakulturregisteret
Expected production volume at slaughtering	3500 mt
Description of receiving water body	The farm is located at Hidra, in the Listafjorden basin. Sites` receiving water-body is «Listafjorden». Regional water-body authority is Vest Agder Fylkes-kommune. This is a coastal water area. Categorised as a coastal fjord, of Euhaline nature (>30o/ooS). Ecological quality is assumed to be good. Chemical condition is not defined in public documentation. Details @ WWW.Vannportalen.no The site is under voluntary ABM system. MHN is the only operator in the area, hence the area is managed by MHN only. There is other salmon farming activity in the area, including nearby farms, all belonging to MHN AS. There are wild salmonids present naturally in this area, although rivers within a 50 km radius do not, to our knowledge, have status as salmon carrying waterways (Lakseførende vassdrag).
Certificates held by the applicant farm	IFA GLOBAL GAP, ISO 9001, ISO 14001, ISO 22 000
Contact person	Mrs. Ingrid Lundamo/Catarina Martins

3 SCOPE

Standard	**ASC Salmon Standard Version 1.0 June 2012**
Activity	Initial Audit
Species	Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)
Legal name of company	Marine Harvest Norway AS

Legal address	Sandviksboder 77A, 5035 Bergen, Norway
Name of site	**11861 Skipningsdalen**
Address of site	4432 Hidrasund, Norway

4 AUDIT PLAN

4.1 Audit team

Role	Name
Lead auditor	Mr. Kjell Bekkevold DNVGL. Also in audit team Mr. Kim A. Karslen DNVGL
SA8000 auditor	Mr Darius Pamakstys, DNVGL.

4.2 Audit activities

Activity	Date
Pre-audit document review	Week 27-31, 2014
On-site audit	22.09.2014-25.09.2014
Publication of public comment draft report	20.10.2014
Publication of final report	11.11.2014

4.3 Previous audits (Not applicable)

4.4 Individuals involved in the audit

Role	Name / affiliation
Representative of the client	Kjeltil Hansen, ASC Reponible/Planning Manager MHN Sør Ingrid Lundamo, MHN Env. & Authorities contact Robin Scotland, MHN Sør Area Manager Espen Larsen, MHN Sør Site Manager Eirik Hoel MHN Sør Fish Health Manager
Employee	Site staff
Contractor	NA

Stakeholders	See list below
Observers participating in the audit	Mr. Phil Crocombe, auditor ASI

4.5 Stakeholder submissions

The following stakeholders, as defined by the Auditee, were contacted at audit notification. No comments have been received prior to the audit, nor in the designated period for publication of the draft report.

Local:

Flekkefjord kommune – mail: post@flekkefjord.kommune.no
Flekkefjord Fiskarlag v/Ole Roald Danielsen – mail: oleroald@norgespost.no
Andabeløy Velforening v/Tommy Danielsen – mail: andabeloy@norgespost.no
Hidra Velforening v/Åge Syvertsen – mail: post@hidravel.no
Flekkefjord og Omegn Jeger- og Fiskerforbund v/Svein Arne Skailand – mail: nhjenss@online.no

•

National:

Mattilsynet – mail: postmottak@mattilsynet.no
Vest-Agder Fylkeskommune – mail: postmottak@vaf.no
Kystverket Sørøst – mail: post@kystverket.no
Fylkesmannen i Vest-Agder – mail: fmvapostmottak@fylkesmannen.no
Fiskeridirektoratet region sør – mail: postmottak@fiskeridir.no

5 FINDINGS

The following tables include a summary description of NCs raised during this audit. The full NC reports are in section 8 of this report.

5.1 Summary Major NCs

N	Standard reference	NC Summary description	Status*
		No Major NC found in audit	

*__O__ Open; __C__ Closed

5.2 Summary Minor NCs

N	Standard reference	NC Summary description	Status*
1	3.1.4.d	The requirement is frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing. Results are submitted to Altinn and NFSA publishes in public reports when data are processed, but data are not easily publicly available. **Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.**	Open
2	3.1.4.e	Record of above mentioned publications is required. No records available.	Open
3	3.4.3.c	The requirement is "Estimated unexplained loss" [59] of farmed salmon is to be made publicly available. Results are submitted to Altinn and NFSA publishes in public reports when data are processed, but not publicly available. **Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.**	Open
4	6.2.2.d	Local legislation requirements and internal company's procedures are not followed for duration of work week and overtime for young worker: 7 days and 9 days of work in a row were identified.	Open
5	6.7.2 b	No criteria present for evaluation of suppliers and contractors against	Open

		requirements in clause 6 of the standard.	
6	6.7.2 c	No records are available of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2	Open

*__O__ Open; __C__ Closed; __A__ Corrective action accepted, effectiveness to be verified at next periodical audit

5.3 Summary Observations

N	Standard reference	Observation summary description
7	5.4.4.a	Int. procedure in TQM on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Beredskapsplan MH" page 12, Required steps not clearly defined in procedure to publish in e.g MHN web-site for ASC issues. MHN Sør has all sites in area - hence ABM notification need reduced.
8	6.5.2 b	The radio check is applied every 20 minutes. Obs.: No documenting of ongoing checks for life-vests according the procedures, which stays recording 4 time a year. No dates on training record.
9	6.7.2.a	The requirements in contracts are to follow CoC. Obs.: Second party audits applied, the H&S part is covered, but no relative check of application of MH CoC principles.

On the basis of the audit evidences and relevant follow up activities, the lead auditor does recommend the organisation for certification.

6 DETERMINATION OF START OF CHAIN OF CUSTODY

The products included in the scope of this audit and of the relevant ASC Certificate

- May enter further certified chains
- Are eligible to apply to carry the ASC label

The determination is based on the considerations of the items described in the following table.

Item	Evaluation
Tracking, tracing and segregation systems within the aquaculture operation	All stages of fish live cycle within the scope of this certification standard are traceable. Documents describe a satisfactory control with incoming products, from own and external freshwater sites, and corresponding documentation of production site, suppliers lists and reception control, both in harvesting and processing. Digital information is handled in Mercatus Aqua Farmer for all freshwater stages and on-growing phase in seawater. Subsequent harvest, processing and sales are handled in Maritech system. It comprises sufficient information of traceability from Broodstock and ova to harvestable fish, purchases, invoices and suppliers registers.
Use of transhipment	Only approved harvest ship/well-boats, like “Tauranga” used. Transports are always identifiable on production unit level (cage). All information is kept both in electronic system Mercatus AquaFarmer and Marel Innova for Harvest/Post-harvest operations and hard copies. (Example: hardcopy of transportation documents
Eligible operators and point(s) of landing	Harvesting operations commence when “M/S Tauranga” pumps live fish from production cages. The fish is then stunned and killed onboard and the fish is then transported to Ryfisk Plant for further steps in the harvest and processing activities.

The opportunity of substitution of certified with non-certified product within the unit of certification.	ASC CoC certified plant will be used
Point from which Chain of Custody certification is required	Products are authorised to enter an ASC Chain of Custody certification at the point where the fish leave production cages. At this point the farms practical and direct control of the fish stops and farm ASC Salmon Standard certificate scope ends. When the harvest process starts, the Harvest plant MSC CoC certificate takes over. This is the case for harvest of fish from MHN Skipningsdalen site.

7 DECISION

Certification status of the applicant	**The final certification decision has been taken after needed activities, as per ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements Version 1 March 2012.** **The organization described in section 3 of this report for the activities described in the section 3 itself is:** • **Compliant and thus certified.**
Date of certificate issue	11.11.2014
Date of certificate expiry	11.11.2017
Scope of certificate	Production (on-growing) of Atlantic salmon (*S. Salar) in sea-cages, and subsequent transport to harvest site waiting cages.* *Unloading from wellboat/live fish carrier and the stay in waiting cages is under the harvest plant ASC CoC certificate.*
Start of Chain of custody	Products are authorised to enter an ASC Chain of Custody certification at the point where the fish is moved from the wellboat/live fish carrier and pumped into the waiting cages.

The outstanding minor non-conformities are listed in the relevant table of section 5 of this report. The relevant corrective actions plan has been approved and the implementation of corrective actions will be verified at next periodical audit.

8 EVALUATION RESULTS

This section presents the results of the audit of the operation against the specific elements in the standard and guidance documents, including audit evidence that demonstrates reliable and reproductive conclusions.

NC number	NC source audit activity	Standard reference	Description of Non conformity	Root cause analysis	Corrective action report	Accepted date	Major	Minor	Observation
1	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	3.1.4.d	The requirement is frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing. Results are submitted to Altinn and NFSA publishes in public reports when data are processed, but not easily publicly available. **Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.**					**MI**	
2	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	3.1.4.e	Record of above mentioned publications is required. No records available.					**MI**	
3	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	3.4.3.c	The requirement is "Estimated unexplained loss" [59] of farmed salmon is to be made publicly available. Results are submitted to Altinn and NFSA publishes in public reports when data are processed, but not publicly available. **Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH**					**MI**	

			ASC website. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.						
4	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	6.2.2.d	Local legislation requirements and internal company's procedures are not followed for duration of work week and overtime for young worker: 7 days and 9 days of work in a row were identified.					**MI**	
5	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	6.7.2 b	No criteria present for evaluation of suppliers and contractors against requirements in clause 6 of the standard.					**MI**	
6	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	6.7.2 c	No records are available of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2					**MI**	
7	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	5.4.4.a	Int. procedure in TQM on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Beredskapsplan MH" page 12, Required steps not clearly defined in procedure to publish in e.g MHN web-site for ASC issues. MHN Sør has all sites in area - hence ABM notification need reduced.						**OBS**
8	**Head office and site document reviews and staff interviews.**	6.5.2 b	The radio check is applied every 20 minutes. Obs.: No documenting of ongoing checks for life-vests according the procedures, which states recording 4 time a year. No dates on training record.						**OBS**
9	**Head office**	6.7.2.a	The requirements in contracts to						**OBS**

	and site document reviews and staff interviews.		follow CoC.(Code of Conduct) Obs.: Second party audits applied, the H&S part is covered, but no relative check of application of MH CoC principles.						

9 CONFIDENTIAL COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

To enhance transparency the company decided to leave all submitted information open and accessible.

APPENDIX 1: STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS

There were no stakeholder`s submissions in the pre-audit period nor in the defined period of publication of draft report.

APPENDIX 2: CHECKLIST (EVALUATION RESULTS)

About DNV GL

Driven by our purpose of safeguarding life, property and the environment, DNV GL enables organizations to advance the safety and sustainability of their business. We provide classification and technical assurance along with software and independent expert advisory services to the maritime, oil and gas, and energy industries. We also provide certification services to customers across a wide range of industries. Operating in more than 100 countries, our 16,000 professionals are dedicated to helping our customers make the world safer, smarter and greener.

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard **Created by the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue**						
Scope: species belonging to the genus *Salmo* and *Oncorhynchus*		**11861 Skipningsdalen**				
INSTRUCTION TO FARMS/AUDITORS: This audit manual was developed to accompany the version of the ASC Salmon Standard developed through the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue, dated June 13, 2012. **References in this Audit Manual to Appendices can be found in the ASC Salmon Standard document.** The manual is complemented by a separate pre-audit checklist that outlines the minimum information that a client must have prior to the first audit. Prior to audit, the client and their conformity assessment body (CAB) shall reach agreement on whether the audit requires visits to both the client headquarters and the farm site, which information is held at each location, and the acceptable format of records (e.g. electronic or hard copy files).		CONFIRMITY				COMMENTS
PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS		CONFIRM	Minor NC	Major NC	NA	
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
1.1.1	A. Review compliance with applicable land and water use laws.	Y				Laws and regs in Lovdata with updates. Goverened by int. proc.
	B. Confirm client holds original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements or land titles.	Y				F.kommunen i VA dt29.09.10 change of area use permit. F mannen dicharge permit for site dt 12..04.12 for expandint to 4680 t MTB .NFSA -local Municipality, F. Dir Approved Ops. Plan dt 04.12.13.
	C. Review inspection records for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (as applicable).	Y				Ex: NFSA inspection report 06.10.12 and 14.03.14
	D. Verify facility does not conflict with national preservation areas and has required operational permits if sited in such an area (see 2.4.2).	Y				Seen map from "Naturbase" with bird protected area. Int declaration on site vs HVCAs. And F. Komm approval dt 29.09.10
1.1.2	A. Verify client has records of tax payments to appropriate authorities. Do not disclose client tax information which is confidential. An independently audited company annual report may be used to confirm tax status.	Y				Authorised auditor report/statement for Org. Nr 959352887 dt 29.04.14 Ernst &Young
	B. Confirm client has a basic knowledge of tax requirements for farm.	Y				Lovdata access to updated versions in TQM system
	C. Verify client is registered with local or national authorities.	Y				F.kommunen i VA dt29.09.10 change of area use permit. F mannen dicharge permit for site dt 12..04.12 for expandint to 4680 t MTB .NFSA -local Municipality, F. Dir Approved Ops. Plan dt 04.12.13. And Brønnøysundregisteret reg for activity of org.
1.1.3	A. Confirm client has specified documentation.	Y				Lovdata access to updated versions in TQM system
	B. Review inspection records for compliance with national labor laws and codes (as applicable).	Y				No inspections nor incidents regsitered

1.1.4	A. Verify that client obtains permits as applicable.	Y				F.kommunen i VA dt29.09.10 change of area use permit. F mannen dicharge permit for site dt 12..04.12 for expanding t to 4680 t MTB .NFSA -local Municipality, F. Dir Approved Ops. Plan dt 04.12.13. And Brønnøysundregisteret reg for activity of org. MOM-b dt 13.09.13 bi Bioconsult. Reprot 108-13.
	B. Review evidence of compliance with discharge laws or regulations.	Y				As described in above permits.
	C. Verify that records show compliance with discharge laws and regulations.	Y				MTB reported to Altinn end of month. Seen Aug.2014 report filed in Altinn. No indications of non compliance.
PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION						
Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[1] Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standards under Criterion 2.1.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 2.1 - Modification of the Benthic Sampling Methodology For farms located in a jurisdiction where specific benthic sampling locations are required under law, clients may request to modify the benthic sampling methodology prescribed in Appendix I-1 to allow for sampling at different locations and/or changes in the total number of samples. Where modifications are sought, farms shall provide a full justification to the CAB for review. Requests for modification shall be supported by mapping of differences in sampling locations. In any event, the sampling locations must at a minimum include samples from the cage edge and samples taken from inside and outside of a defined AZE. CABs shall evaluate client requests to modify benthic methodology based on whether there is a risk that such changes would jeopardize the intent and rigor of the ASC Salmon Standard. If the CAB determines that proposed modifications are low risk, the CAB shall ensure that details of the modified benthic sampling methodology are fully described and justified in the audit report.						
2.1.1	Note: Under Indicator 2.1.1, farms can choose to measure redox potential (Option #1) or sulphide concentration (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values.					
	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (Appendix I-1) and evidence (if applicable) to justify use of a site specific AZE.	Y				Seen Olex map with 5 points. Modified MOM-C (doubled). Point adapted to bathuymetric conditions. Performed by Rådgivende Biologer, Bergen,performed 08.04.14 report dt 2.09.14 2 parallel form ech point on fauna and 1 from each on chemicals.
	B. Review evidence of benthic type and confirm whether to proceed to 2.1.1c.	Y				Soft bottom apart form point C2 8
	C. Record which option the client chose.	Y				Opt# 1
	D. Review documentary evidence (notes, GPS coordinates) showing sampling time, stations, and frequency. Cross-check against farm maps and harvest records.	Y				Performed as 23% BM (max biomass oct-14)
	E. Review results to verify that redox potential of sediments complies with the requirement at each sampling station outside the AZE. Confirm that the testing method used by the farm is appropriate.	Y				Redox potential variable between stations, ranging from 10 to 160 outside AZE (C4 and C5). MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665)
	F. Review results to verify that sulphide concentration in sediments complies with the Standard at each sampling station outside the AZE. Confirm that the testing method used by the farm is appropriate.	Y				Redox potential
	G. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC. Report arrived 22.09.14

Footnote	[2] Farm sites can choose whether to use redox or sulphide. Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both.						
Footnote	[3] Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) is defined under this standard as 30 meters. For farm sites where a site-specific AZE has been defined using a robust and credible modeling system such as the SEPA AUTODEPOMOD and verified through monitoring, the site-specific AZE shall be used.						
2.1.2	Notes: - Under Indicator 2.1.2, farms can choose one of four measurements to show compliance with the faunal index Requirement: AMBI (Option #1); Shannon-Wiener Index (Option #2); BQI (Option #3); or ITI (Option #4). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet all four threshold values. - If a farm is exempt due to hard bottom benthos (see 2.1.1b), then 2.1.2 does not apply and this shall be noted in the audit report.						
	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (see 2.1.1).	Y				Redox potential variable between stations, ranging from 10 to 160 outside AZE (C4 and C5). MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665)	
	B. Record which option the client chose for scoring faunal index.	Y				#2 Shannon Wiener used	
	C. Confirm sample collection followed Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).	Y				Van Veen grab used according to site specific MOM-C (NS9410)	
	D. Review results (as applicable) to verify that AMBI score of sediments is ≤ 3.3 at each sampling station outside the AZE.	Y				(ambi score 2,7 at C5 and 3,19 at C 4)	
	E. Review results (as applicable) to verify that Shannon Wiener score of sediments is > 3 at each sampling station outside the AZE.	Y				Shannon Wiener index at 3.13 at point C4 and 3,314 at point C5	
	F. Review results (as applicable) to verify that BQI score of sediments is ≥ 15 at each sampling station outside the AZE.				NA	SW used	
	G. Review results (as applicable) to verify that ITI score of sediments is ≥ 25 at each sampling station outside the AZE.				NA	SW used	
	H. Confirm that an approved method was used or that a qualified independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.	Y				MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665 on faunal)	
	I. Confirm that client submitted faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC 22.09.14	
Footnote	[4] "Good" Ecological Quality Classification: The level of diversity and abundance of invertebrate taxa is slightly outside the range associated with the type-specific conditions. Most of the sensitive taxa of the type-specific communities are present.						
Footnote	[5] http://www.azti.es/en/ambi-azti-marine-biotic-index.html.						
2.1.3	A. Confirm appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c or exemption as per 2.1.1b.	Y				Evaluated after ISO 16665 -2013	
	B. Confirm that an appropriate method was used or that a suitably qualified independent laboratory performed the analysis.	Y				AMBI class for C1= 27 and and for C3=3	
	C. Confirm that all samples from within the AZE have ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa (exclusive of pollution indicator species).	Y				27 +3 higly anbundant taxa, evaulated by indepnedent lab. R.Biol -2014	
	D. Confirm that a suitable method was used or that a suitability qualified independent laboratory performed the scoring of faunal index.	Y				Evaluated after ISO 16665 -2013	
	E. Confirm that client has submitted scores to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC 22.09.14	

Footnote	[6] Highly abundant: Greater than 100 organisms per square meter (or equally high to reference site(s) if natural abundance is lower than this level).					
2.1.4	Note: Farms may define a site-specific AZE at any time before this date as long as they demonstrate full compliance by June 13, 2015.					
	A. Review documentation to confirm that the farm has undertaken an analysis before the required date.	Y				Site specific approach as described above
	B. Confirm that the farm used a robust and credible modeling system to define the site-specific AZE.	Y				Site specific approach as described above
	C. Confirm that farms have validated the general applicability of the site-specific AZE using monitoring data (i.e. 'ground truthing').	Y				Site specific approach as described above
Footnote	[7] Robust and credible: The SEPA AUTODEPOMOD modeling system is considered to be an example of a credible and robust system. The model must include a multi-parameter approach. Monitoring must be used to ground-truth the AZE proposed through the model.					
Footnote	[8] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.					
Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [12]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
2.2.1	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.1 - Monitoring Average Weekly Percent Saturation of Dissolved Oxygen** Appendix I-4 presents the required methodology that farms must follow for sampling the average weekly percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO). Key points of the method are as follows: - measurements may be taken with a handheld oxygen meter or equivalent chemical method; - equipment is calibrated according to manufacturer's recommendations; - measurements are taken at least twice daily: once in the morning (6 -9 am) and once in the afternoon (3-6 pm) as appropriate for the location and season; - salinity and temperature must also be measured when DO is sampled; - sampling should be done at 5 meters depth in water conditions that would be experienced by fish (e.g. at the downstream edge of a net pen array): - each week, all DO measurements are used in the calculation of a weekly average percent saturation. If monitoring deviates from prescribed sampling methodology, the farm shall provide the auditor with a written justification (e.g. when samples are missed due to bad weather). In limited and well-justified situations, farms may request that the CAB approve reduction of DO monitoring frequency to one sample per day. Exception [see footnote 15] If a farm does not meet the minimum 70 percent weekly average saturation requirement, the farm must demonstrate the consistency of percent saturation with a reference site. The reference site shall be at least 500 meters from the edge of the net pen array, in a location that is understood to follow similar patterns in upwelling to the farm site and is not influenced by nutrient inputs from anthropogenic causes including aquaculture, agricultural runoff					
	A. Do not schedule audit until client provides a minimum of 6 months of DO data.	Y				Records submitted for cycle to date with automatic measurements in cage (5 &10m).GPRS logger. (Oxybox Nortec)
	B. Review records for completeness and conformity with methodology in Appendix 1-4.	Y				No missed data
	C. Review calculation and confirm all weekly averages ≥ 70%.	Y				All and weekly values above 70%. (90-95). Lowest recorede (one day) 70,6%. From contiuous measurements
	D. As needed, review DO data from reference site and document in the audit report (see instruction).	Y				All above limit
	E. Witness DO monitoring and verify calibration while on site. On-site values should fall within range of farm data for DO. If an out of range measurement is observed, raise a nonconformity.	Y				All above limit
	F. Confirm that client has submitted DO results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted 19.09.14- reconfirmed by applicant.

Footnote	[13] Percent saturation: Percent saturation is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sample compared to the maximum amount that could be present at the same temperature and salinity.					
Footnote	[14] Averaged weekly from two daily measurements (proposed at 6 am and 3 pm).					
Footnote	[15] An exception to this standard shall be made for farms that can demonstrate consistency with a reference site in the same water body.					
2.2.2	A. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that ≤ 5% of weekly samples fall under 2 mg/l DO.	Y				All above limits.
	B. Confirm that client has submitted results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted i files dt 19.09.14.
2.2.3	A. Record whether indicator is applicable.	Y				EU Water Directive 2000 gives WQ objectives for area. (ref "vannportalen.no/Agder") økologisk tilsdtad anttat "god" . Ecological conditions assumed god.
	B. Confirm that there has been a recent third-party analysis (within two years prior to the audit) to classify areas according to national or regional water quality targets.	Y				EU Water Directive 2000 gives WQ objectives for area. (ref "vannportalen.no/Agder") økologisk tilsdtad anttat "god" . Ecological conditions assumed god.
	C. Confirm that the analysis and classification shows the farm is located in an area where the water quality complies with the requirement.	Y				Ecological quality is "good" in "Vannportalen.no" for this are. According to general terminology applied by water monitoring authorities (regional level) "Assumed "("antatt" in Norwegian) is used when there are no indication of reduced quality or negative effects of nutrients accoding to the compiled information available to the Regional Water Authorities. "Assumed to be good". (ref "vannportalen.no") is the term used for thewater area in the actual portal, NOTE: Comment/evidence in checklist is not stating that the auditor ussumes water quality to be "good" merely referring to classification done by the mentioned Water Quality Authorities.
Footnote	[16] Related to nutrients (e.g., N, P, chlorophyll A).					
Footnote	[17] Within the two years prior to the audit.					
Footnote	[18] Classifications of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classification from other water quality monitoring systems in other jurisdictions are acceptable.					
Footnote	[19] Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt from standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.					
2.2.4	A. Review the farm's monitoring plan and verify that the farm has collected monitoring data for N and P following the methodology in Appendix I-5.				NA	Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives WQ objectives for area. (ref "vannportalen.no/Agder") økologisk tilsdtad anttat "god" . Ecological conditions assumed god.
	B. Verify that client calibrates equipment as needed.				NA	Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives WQ objectives for area. (ref "vannportalen.no/Agder") økologisk tilsdtad anttat "god" . Ecological conditions assumed god.
	C. Confirm that client has submitted N and P data to ASC (Appendix VI).				NA	Covered by EU Water Directive 2000 gives WQ objectives for area. (ref "vannportalen.no/Agder") økologisk tilsdtad anttat "god" . Ecological conditions assumed god.
Footnote	[20] Farms shall monitor total N, NH4, NO3, total P and Ortho-P in the water column. Results shall be submitted to the ASC database. Methods such as a Hach kit are acceptable.					

2.2.5	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand** Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) can be calculated based on cumulative inputs of N and C to the environment over the course of the production cycle. BOD = ((total N in feed – total N in fish)*4.57) + ((total C in feed – total C in fish)*2.67). • A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient wasted. In this equation, "fish" refers to harvested fish. In this case, farm must submit breakdown of N & C captured/filtered/absorbed to ASC along with method used to estimate nutrient reduction. • Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting; Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html. Note 1: Calculation requires a full production cycle of data and is required beginning with the production cycle first undergoing certification. If it is the first audit for the farm, the client is required to demonstrate to the CAB that data is being collected and an understanding of the calculations.					
	A. Review calculation, cross-check data used with feed and harvest records.	Y			NA	Next surveillance audit
	B. Confirm that client has submitted calculated BOD a to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y			NA	Next surveillance audit
Footnote	[21] BOD calculated as: ((total N in feed – total N in fish)*4.57) + ((total C in feed – total C in fish)*2.67). A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient wasted. In this equation, "fish" refers to harvested fish. Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting; Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html.					
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
2.3.1	Note: The methodology given in Appendix I-2 is used to determine the fines (dust and small fragments) in finished product of fish feed which has a diameter of 3 mm or more.					
	A. Review timing and location of testing. If testing off-site, verify rationale and ensure consistent with [23].	Y				According to reqs. Ranging from 0,16 to 0,2%,
	B. Verify that client has appropriate testing technology on site and that, if applicable, it is calibrated as required.	Y				As per ASC
	C. Review testing results and confirm that the pooled sample for each quarter has a percent fines of <1%.	Y				According to reqs. Ranging from 0,16 to 0,2%,
Footnote	[22] Fines: Dust and fragments in the feed. Particles that separate from feed with a diameter of 5 mm or less when sieved through a 1 mm sieve, or particles that separate from feed with a diameter greater than 5 mm when sieved through a 2.36 mm sieve. To be measured at farm gate (e.g., from feed bags after they are delivered to farm).					
Footnote	[23] To be measured every quarter or every three months. Samples that are measured shall be chosen randomly. Feed may be sampled immediately prior to delivery to farm for sites with no feed storage where it is not possible to sample on farm. Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients and > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt.					
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
	Note: If a farm has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may use such documents as evidence to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 2.4.1 as long as all components in Appendix I-3 are explicitly covered.					

2.4.1	A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I-3.	Y				Impacts consequence assement performed by third party service "Rådginvende Biologaer" dt feb 2009-2011. report dt Feb 2012. Marginal impcts only.
	B. Verify the farm has a plan to address all potential impacts identified in the assessment.	Y				No dnegative impacts identified.Impacts consequence assement performed by third party service "Rådginvende Biologaer" dt feb 2009-2011. report dt Feb 2012.
	C. Verify that the farm implements the plan(s).	Y				No negativeimpacts identified. Impacts consequence assement performed by third party service "Rådginvende Biologaer" dt feb 2009-2011. report dt Feb 2012.
2.4.2	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to Requirements that Farms are not sited within Protected Areas or HCVAs** The following exceptions shall be made for Indicator 2.4.2: Exception #1: For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management). Exception #2: For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVA. Exception #3: For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected. **Definitions** Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with					
	A. Review map and cross-check against independent information sources (e.g. 1.1.1d) to determine if the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA.	Y				DN Naturbase map with all known protected areas defined. - site opertaion is not in conflictwith protected areas. HCVA or CAs. Also considered in Rådgivende Biologer Impact Aseessment report Feb-2012.
	B. Obtain a copy of the farm's declaration stating that the farm is not sited in a protected area or HCVA (as applicable).	Y				Ref "Forvaltinngsplan Landskpavernområde" from Fylkesmannen VA, dt 2010. on maitenance and operation of aquaculture installations.
	C. Review the applicability of the exception requested by the farm together with the supporting evidence to determine if the farm is eligible. If yes, Indicator 2.4.2 is not applicable.				NA	Not within CAs
	D. Review evidence to determine whether the farm is allowed to be sited in a protected area or HCVA and hence eligible for ASC certification.				NA	Not within CAs
Footnote	[24] Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." Source: Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008), Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 86pp.					

Footnote	[25] High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA): Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVA are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical conservation values—both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high conservation values are maintained or enhanced (http://www.hcvnetwork.org/).					
Footnote	[26] The following exceptions shall be made for Standard 2.4.2: • For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management). • For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVA. • For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected.					
Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[27] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.6.					
2.5.1	A. Confirm that farm management has prepared a written statement of commitment.				NA	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used. Ref statment 19.06.14 on deviced not used.
	B. Review documentary evidence (e.g. predator management policies, records of predator incidents) and cross-check against interviews with farm staff and local community members (applicable only after the date specified in 2.5.1a).				NA	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used
	C. During the on-site audit, inspect the farm to confirm that no ADDs or AHDs are present at the facilities (applicable only after June 13, 2015).				NA	Verified not in use
Footnote	[28] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.					
2.5.2	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.5.2 - Percentage of Days that ADDs or AHDs were used** Farms must calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that ADDs or AHDs were operated using data from the most recent complete production cycle. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 2.5.2 for the most recent complete production cycle if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that: - the client understands how to accurately calculate percentage of days the devices were operational; - the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate the percentage of operational days based on > 6 months of data for the current production cycle; and - the client can show how plans for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. devices in operation <40% of days).					
	A. Review log and cross-check with records of predator incidents.				NA	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used. Ref statment 19.06.14 on deviced not used.
	B. Verify calculations and cross-check against records for the duration of the production cycle.				NA	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used
	C. Confirm devices were operational ≤ 40% of the days of the production cycle.				NA	Verified not in use
	D. Confirm that client has submitted data on ADDs/AHDs to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC
Footnote	[29] Day: 24-hour cycle.					
	A. Review list.	Y				Birdnets only
	B. Review farm records of predator incidents and cross-check against relevant records (e.g. escapes).	Y				No regs from site

2.5.3	C. Review records for completeness. Cross-check mortality records against interviews with farm staff and community representatives.	Y				Verified on site
	D. Review list for consistency with 2.4.1	Y				Red list from "Norsk Rødliste for arter-2010" - fra Artsdatabanken" New list 2015.
	E. Compare results from (a) through (d) above to confirm that there were no mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on farm.					No morts of RL registered on site.
Footnote	[30] Mortalities: Includes animals intentionally killed through lethal action as well as accidental deaths through entanglement or other means.					
Footnote	[31] Species listed as endangered or critically endangered by the IUCN or on a national endangered species list.					
2.5.4	A. Review list of lethal actions taken by the farm and cross-check against 2.5.3b.				NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked.
	B. Review documentation to confirm that the farm shows evidence of compliance with requirements in steps 1-3.				NA	No lethl actions taken. Int records checked. Governed by Int. Procedure ID 33 0 37 and ID 31 8 80 on handilng of these issues.
	C. Review documentary evidence to verify actions, permissions, and approvals were taken prior to taking lethal action. If client requests exemption due to human safety, review evidence to verify [33].				NA	No lethl actions taken. Int records checked. Governed by Int. Procedure ID 33 0 37 on handlng of these issues.
Footnote	[32] Lethal action: Action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds.					
Footnote	[33] Exception to these conditions may be made for a rare situation where human safety is endangered. Should this be required, post-incident approval from a senior manager should be made and relevant authorities must be informed.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Indicators 2.5.5, 2.5.6, and 2.5.7 - Clarification about the ASC Definition of "Lethal Incident" The ASC Salmon Standard has defined "Lethal incident" to include all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids [footnote 35]. For the purpose of assisting farms and auditors with understanding how to evaluate compliance with Indicators 2.5.5, 2.5.6, and 2.5.7, ASC has clarified this definition further: Total number of lethal Incidents = sum of all non-salmonid deaths arising from all lethal actions taken by the farm during a given time period There should be a 1:1 relationship between the number of animal deaths and the number of lethal incidents reported by the farm. For example, if a farm has taken one (1) lethal action in past last two years and that single lethal action resulted in killing three (3) birds, it is considered three (3) lethal incidents within a two year period. The term "non-salmonid" was intended to cover any predatory animals which are likely to try to feed upon farmed salmon. In practice these animals will usually be seals or birds.						
2.5.5	A. Check farm records for publicizing lethal actions against the actions listed in 2.5.4a to confirm that the farm made information available within 30 days.				NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked. Hence nothing to publish ref 2.4 4a
	A. Check farm records for publicizing lethal actions against the actions listed in 2.5.4a to confirm that the farm made information available within 30 days.	Y				Registration in QTM
	B. Verify that required information is easily publicly available.				NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked. Hence nothing to publish ref 2.4 4a
Footnote	[34] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available." Shall be made available within 30 days of the incident and see Appendix VI for transparency requirements.					
	A. Review log.	Y				No registration for last 6 months.

2.5.6	B. Verify that over the previous two years there were < 9 lethal incidents in total and that ≤ 2 of those incidents were marine mammal deaths.	Y				No registration for last 6 months.
	C. Confirm that data on all lethal incidents has been submitted to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC 19.09.14
Footnote	[35] Lethal incident: Includes all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids.					
Footnote	[36] Standard 2.5.6 applicable to incidents related to non-endangered and non-red-listed species. This standard complements, and does not contradict, 2.5.3.					
2.5.7	A. Review farm records to confirm that all the farm performs an appropriate risk assessment following all lethal incidents (see list 2.5.4a).	Y				No LA experienced
	B. Verify that the farm implements steps to reduce risk of lethal incidents.	Y				No LA experienced
PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS						
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [38,39]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[38] Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.					
Footnote	[39] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1 According to footnote [38], farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the requirements under Criterion 3.1. More specifically, farms are only eligible for exemption from Criterion 3.1 if it can be shown that either of the following holds: 1) the farm does not release any water to the natural environment; or 2) any effluent released by the farm to the natural environment has been effectively treated to kill pathogens (e.g. UV and/or chemical treatment of water with testing demonstrating efficacy). Auditors shall fully document the rationale for any such exemptions in the audit report.						
3.1.1	A. Review records of farm participation in ABM scheme. Contact other ABM participants as necessary to confirm the accuracy of client records.	Y				Approved Ops.Plan by F. Dir. and F. Dir overview over Flekkefjord Local Municipality, stating MHN in sole operator in Area..Records and overview over ABM in zones defined by NFSA. Wwekly updates to AltInn, where info is available for all farms in zone. 100% of farms included. Records from "Lusenettverket" treatnents and disease notfocation, if any, included.
	B. Review description of ABM to verify that the management activities address each of the four element from Indicator 3.1.1.	Y				Weekly on sealice to Altinn. MHN sole operator and manages 100 % of farms in area. (6SW and 1 FW)
	C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with Appendix II-1.	Y				Weekly on sealice to Altinn. MHN sole operator and manages 100 % of farms in area. (6SW and 1 FW)
	D. Confirm that client has submitted dates of fallowing periods to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC dt 11.09.14 as "MHN operations calendar" for site.

	Note: Indicator 3.1.2 requires that farms demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks. If the farm does not receive any requests to collaborate on such research projects, the farm may demonstrate compliance by showing evidence of commitment through other proactive means such as published policy statements or directed outreach to relevant organizations.					
3.1.2	A. Review evidence that the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups to agree on areas of research about possible impacts on wild stocks and is tracking and responding to research requests.	Y				Cooperation agreement with WWF, signed Feb 2011. Also non financila support to: Fiskefellen i Etne, Hardeanger Pilt project, Vossalauget, Genetical studies, Sealice monitoring in Romsadlsfj. Also "PD in Romsdal", HS i Ålesund planned, in cooperation with farming companies and academia. Salmon trap project in Guddalselva in Kvinherad.
	B. Review how the farm and/or its operating company has provided non-financial support for research activities.	Y				Salmon step/tunnel in lyngdalproject in negotioations.
	C. As applicable, review the provided record of rejecting proposals to confirm that denials were justified and there is no consistent pattern to indicate that the farm and/or its operating company lacks a demonstrated commitment to collaborate on research activities.				NA	Denied projects not known by staff in audit.
	D. Verify that the farm's communications with researchers demonstrate a commitment to collaborate on relevant areas of research.	Y				In FHF PD projectmail dt 23.06.14 and aggrements as described in 3.1.2.a
Footnote	[40] Commitment: At a minimum, a farm and/or its operating company must demonstrate this commitment through providing farm-level data to researchers, granting researchers access to sites, or other similar non-financial support for research activities.					
3.1.3	A. Review records to confirm compliance.	Y				NFSA set limits and govern treteatment regime, reported vi AltInn. Also Int proc. In TQM "Lakselus- forbygging kontroll og behandling" ID 24.98.5. Registered on farm in AquaFarmer.
	B. Confirm that sea lice load is reviewed annually and, if applicable, the review incorporates information from monitoring of wild salmon.	Y				NFSA set limits and govern treteatment regime, reported vi AltInn. Continous review by NFSA and Luse -nettverket monthly review. Report for 02.02.14 to 27.08.14 with details
	C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with requirements of Appendix II-2 for establishing and reviewing maximum sea lice loads.	Y				NFSA set limits and govern treteatment regime, reported vi AltInn. Continous review by NFSA and Luse -nettverket monthly review. Sensitive periods for wild salmon migtration condisedered and monitoring intesnified,
	D. Confirm that client has submitted the ABM maximum lice load to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC
	A. Review sea lice testing schedule to confirm that weekly testing coincides with known sensitive periods for wild salmon (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles).					Weekly sampling and regs to NFSA by AltInn. Sensitievperiods for migration. Spring coordinated delicing set by NFSA for region.
	B. Review records to confirm that testing follows the farm's annual schedule. Review the rationale for any deviations from the schedule.	Y				To AltInn weekly. No deviations registered. (exempt form pwriods with temp below 04 degrees C.

3.1.4	C. Review the farm's methodology for testing sea lice. If practicable, observe testing while on-site. If farm is a closed system using an alternate testing method, document the distinction and review evidence of efficacy of the method.	Y				Weekly testing from NSFA predetrimned cages, according NFSA regulation. Sealice numbers and lifestage identified and recorded.	
	D. Test access from an offsite computer to confirm that results are easily publicly available. If applicable, confirm that the farm made hardcopies of test results easily available to stakeholders.	N	MI			To Altinn NFSA publishes in public reports when data is processed. **Direct access to data for actual site should be etsablished e.g on MH ASC website.**	N
	E. Review records for the past year to confirm the farm posted test results within 7 days of each test. Cross-check against testing schedule (see 3.1.4a).	N	MI			No records available	N
	F. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC	Y
Footnote	[41] Testing must be weekly during and immediately prior to sensitive periods for wild salmonids, such as outmigration of wild juvenile salmon. Testing must be at least monthly during the rest of the year, unless water temperature is so cold that it would jeopardize farmed fish health to test for lice (below 4 degrees C). Within closed production systems, alternative methods for monitoring sea lice, such as video monitoring, may be used.						
Footnote	[42] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available."						
3.1.5	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmonid Health and Migration** In writing this indicator, the SAD Steering Committee concluded that relevant data sets on wild salmonid health and migration are publicly available in the vast majority of, if not all, jurisdictions with wild salmonids. The information is likely to come from government sources or from research institutions. Therefore farms are not responsible for conducting this research themselves. However farms must demonstrate that they are aware of this basic information in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those wild stocks. This Indicator requires collection and understanding of general data for the major watersheds within approximately 50 km of the farm. A farm does not need to demonstrate that there is data for every small river or tributary or subpopulation. Information should relate to the wild fish stock level, which implies that the population is more or less isolated from other stocks of the same species and hence self-sustaining. A "conservation unit" under the Canadian Wild Salmon Policy is an example of an appropriate fish stock-level definition. However, it must be recognized that each jurisdiction may have slight differences in how a wild salmonid stock is defined in the region. For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere [43]. Potentially affected species in these areas are salmonids (i.e. including all trout species). Where a species is not natural						
	A. Review salmonid species list for accuracy and cross-check source references. Confirm whether 3.1.5 b and c are applicable.	Y				*S. salar and S. trutta* and *S(. Salvelinus)* naturally occurring in area.	
	B. Review the accuracy of the farm's information on local salmonid migratory patterns and stock productivity. Cross-check source references as necessary.	Y				Migratory routes as defined in wb site "enviornmenta lstatistics"(miljøstatatus,no) on salmonid carrying rivers, and Lakseregisteret form Miljødirektoratt. Also map from DN with rivers identified.	
	C. Confirm accuracy of farm's understanding. Cross-check against 'sensitive periods' listed in the farm's annual schedule for testing for sea lice.	Y				Intesified sealice monitoringperiod defined as from 01.02 to 31.05.	
	D. Confirm the farm's understanding of this information through interviews.	Y				Sufficient awarenes and also particiation related scientific projects by MH staff.	

Footnote	[43] For purposes of these standards, “areas with wild salmonids” are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere.						
Footnote	[44] Farms do not need to conduct research on migration routes, timing and the health of wild stocks under this standard if general information is already available. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level for salmonid populations in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those stocks.						
3.1.6	A. Confirm whether the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids based on results from 3.1.5a (above). If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.	Y				IMR/NINA/NOFIMA/VI 2.2014 Risk Assessment for Norw, fish Farming report 2013. where seallice issues are covered.. Nearest registrations from hellvik, Rogaland county on impact on wild stocks. Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law.	
	B. Review evidence to confirm farm's participation in monitoring.	Y				As above	
	C. Evaluate documents to confirm methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids complies with requirements of Appendix III-1.	Y				RA above is Assembly reports based on all available nformation.	
	D. Confirm that results are easily publicly available and that they were posted within the required timeframe.	Y				IMR/NNA/NOFIMA reports publicly available	
	E. Confirm that client has submitted monitoring results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Report above not submitted to ASC, althugh other information regardng this issue is publicly available.	
3.1.7	A. Confirm whether the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids based on results from 3.1.5a (above). If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.	Y				*S. salar and S. trutta* and *S.Salvelinus)* naturally occurring in area.	
	B. Review farm's designation of sensitive periods and cross-check against datasets presented in 3.1.4 and 3.1.5.	Y				Migratory routes as defined in wb site "environmental statistics"(miljøstatus.no) on salmonid carrying rivers, and Lakseregisteret form Miljødirektoratt. Also map from DN with rivers identified.	
	C. Review records from the farm's sea lice monitoring program to confirm that lice levels are in compliance with the requirement based on farm-wide average lice levels per farmed fish (not values from individual net-pens).	Y				Weekly testing form predetermined cages, according NFSA regulations. Sealice lifestage identified and recorded. (in aquafarmer and excel sheet for submittance to NSA via Altinn) Record of weekly testing for period 03.03.14 to 27.08.14 has one single sample with 0,004 mature female in avg. (dt 05.05.14 to 11.05.14). The remaining weekly samples have 0,000mature females per fish. i.e absent.	Få antallet
	D. Confirm that monitoring data for lice levels are used in a feedback loop as required by Appendix II-2.				NA	Continous wild fish sealice monitoring not possible, as describe above. Direct feedback loop hence impossible obtain.	
Footnote	[45] Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.						
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species							
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):						
	Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.1, "area" is defined as a contiguous body of water with the bio-chemical and temperature profile required to support the farmed species' life and reproduction (e.g. the Northern Atlantic Coast of the U.S. and Canada). Appendix II-1A elaborates further on this definition: "The boundaries of an area should be defined, taking into account the zone in which key cumulative impacts on wild populations may occur, water movement and other relevant aspects of ecosystem structure and function." The intent is that the area relates to the spatial extent that is likely to be put at risk from the non-native salmon. Areas will only rarely						

3.2.1	A. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species by comparing local species (results from 3.1.5a) to the species produced. Cross-check against record from smolt suppliers (e.g. 3.3.1b). If the farm only produces a native species, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	B. Review evidence to confirm when the non-native species was first brought into wide commercial production in the area of the farm.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	C. Review evidence to confirm that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish (N.B. at the time of this writing, the SAD Steering Committee was uncertain that any existing technology could reliably deliver 100% sterile fish). Cross-check against smolt purchase records (e.g. invoices).				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	D. Review evidence that the farm complies with each point raised in 3.2.1d and confirm by inspection during on-site audit. Cross check against related farm records for escapes (3.4.1), unexplained loss (3.4.2), and escape prevention (3.4.4).				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	E. Verify compliance.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
Footnote	[47] Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical barriers that are in place and well-maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.					
3.2.2	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.2.2 - Exceptions to Allow Production of Non-Native Species** Farms have five years to demonstrate compliance with this standard from the time of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017). Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior to farming activities in the area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining. Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.2, "jurisdiction" is defined the same as "area" in 3.2.1.					
	A. Confirm the farm has informed ASC which species is in production (Appendix VI).				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	B. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species as for 3.2.1. If the farm only produces a native species, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	C. Confirm that the scientific research included: multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species; used credible methodologies & analyses; and underwent peer review. If the farm requests an exemption then enter "NA" and proceed to 3.2.2d.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	D. As applicable, review the farm's request for exemption. Verify that the evidence shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified above.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
	E. Confirm the farm submits required evidence to ASC.				NA	*S. salar* native to region
Footnote	[48] The research must at a minimum include multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species, use credible methodologies and analysis, and undergo peer review.					
Footnote	[49] If the review demonstrates there is increased risk, the ASC will consider prohibiting the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction under this standard. In the event that the risk tools demonstrate “high” risks, the SAD expects that the ASC will prohibit the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction.					
Footnote	[50] Farms have five years to demonstrate compliance with this standard from the time of publication of the final SAD standards and accompanying auditing guidelines.					

Footnote	[51] Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior to farming activities in the area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining.					
3.2.3	A. Confirm whether the farms uses fish for sea lice control. If no, auditor response to 3.2.3A-C is "not applicable" (NA).				NA	Cleaning fish: Rognkjek, grønngylte, bergylte and bergnebb are all native to region
	B. Review purchase records to confirm the origin and identity of all species that are used for sea lice control on farm.				NA	Cleaning fish: Rognkjek, grønngylte, bergylte and bergnebb are all native to region
	C. Review evidence for compliance with the requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature, government documentation confirming species is not non-native to the region. Acceptable first hand accounts: community testimonials and direct evidence for historical presence of the species in the water body captured with cast nets, trapping devices, or fishing.				NA	Cleaning fish: Rognkjek (Lumpfish), and wrasses: grønngylte, bergylte and bergnebb are all native to region
Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
3.3.1	A. Verify declaration of no use of transgenic salmon.	Y				Statement dt Dec.2011, from genetics service provider Genomar on MOWI stock that conventional breeding and genetiss only, are applied.
	B. Review records to confirm compliance with the requirement.	Y				Internal genetics/ova provider Tveitevågen, suported by Genomar
	C. If the auditor suspects that transgenic fish are being cultured, test stock identity by collecting 3 fish and sending to an ISO 17025 certified laboratory for genetic analysis.	Y				Statement dt Dec.2011, from genetics service provider Genomar on MOWI stock that conventional breeding and genetis only, are applied.
Footnote	[53] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get that trait expressed in the offspring (http://www.csrees.usda.gov/nea/biotech/res/biotechnology_res_glossary.html).					
Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[55] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.					
3.4.1	A. Review client submission for completeness and accuracy of information. Cross-check with the estimate of unexplained loss, maintenance records for small tears in net, predator attacks, etc.	Y				No escapes registered for the last three prodcution cycles. Aquafarmer reports, In monthly env. Reports 2013- 2014. In int proc."Risk Ananlysis escapes" witth contingency plan
	B. Review the calculation and confirm compliance with the requirement.	Y				No escapes registered for the last three prodcution cycles. In monthly env. Reports 2013- 2014. As a rule, suspicions of escapes trigger net checks and altimately countingn of fish in cage.
	C. Confirm that farm documents show continuous monitoring of escapes.	Y				As above andin Aquafarmer and Fisheries Dir. reports
	D. Review the farm's request for a rare exception to the Standard for an escape event. Confirm no prior exceptional events were documented during the previous 10 years, or since the date of the start of the production cycle during which the farm first applied for certification. An example of an exceptional event is vandalization of the farm. Events that are not considered exceptional include failures in moorings due to bad weather, boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the farm, human error, and predation.				NA	No escapes registered for at least this sites. In monthly env. Reports 2013- 2014
	E. Confirm that client has submitted escape monitoring data to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC dt 18.09.14

Footnote	[56] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregate number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish. Data on date of escape episode(s), number of fish escaped and cause of escape episode shall be reported as outlined in Appendix VI.					
Footnote	[57] A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. See auditing guidance for additional details.					
3.4.2	A. Confirm that the farm keeps records of counting accuracy for the counting technology or method used on site at stocking and harvest.	Y				Counting performed at FW site, vaccination numbers used, manually or Vaki and Aquascan and finale check at stocking with well boat Aqausca. Final accurate nubers at harvest plant where individual fish in handled and regsitered. Statement from VAKI (WWW.VAKI.is) and Aquascan of 98-100% accuracy.
	B. Verify the client obtains information from smolt suppliers (if applicable).	Y				Vaccination numbers in FW used as accurate niumber stocked
	C. Verify that the farm calibrates counting equipment as recommended by the manufacturer.	Y				Live fish carrier procedure/manual on scanner calibration pg 15 . For stocking and any grading spilttili/counting operations on site.
	D. Confirm the stated accuracy of the farm's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98% at both stocking and harvest. Stated accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.	Y				Described in pt A and C above
	E. Confirm that client has submitted counting technology accuracy to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC dt 18.09.14
Footnote	[58] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.					
3.4.3	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss** The Estimated Unexplained Loss (EUL) of fish is calculated at the end of each production cycle as follows: EUL = (stocking count) - (harvest count) - (mortalities) - (recorded escapes) Units for input variables are number of fish (i.e. counts) per production cycle. Where possible, farms should use the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count. This formula is adapted from footnote 59 of the ASC Salmon Standard.					
	A. Review records for completeness.	Y				Reports from Aquafarmer
	B. Verify accuracy of farm calculations for estimated unexplained loss.	Y				2011G +2.91% and present cycle not established as cycle in not closed. (harevsted numbers used for closing)
	C. Verify that the farm makes the information available to the public.	N	MI			The requirement is "Estimated unexplained loss" [59] of farmed salmon is to be made publicly available. Results are submitted to Altinn and NFSA publishes in public reports when data are processed, but not publicly available. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.

	D. Confirm that client has submitted estimated unexplained loss to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC dt 19.09.2104
	E. Compare EUL values (3.4.3a) and counting accuracy (3.4.2a) to recorded escapes to check whether farm reporting is plausible. If EUL is greater than the combined margin of error related to fish counts, investigate potential sources of error as it could indicate the farm under reported mortalities or escapes.	Y				11G result outside stated counting error (positiv results). Elelvated mortality after stocking and miscalculation morts number plausibel cause of error.
Footnote	[59] Calculated at the end of the production cycle as: Unexplained loss = Stocking count – harvest count – mortalities – other known escapes. Where possible, use of the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count is preferred.					
3.4.4	A. Obtain and review the farm's escape prevention plan prior to scheduling the first audit.	Y				In central **RA** in escape prev section. **Contingeny plan.** Int proc. doc ID 27.01.7 and with contingeny plan. "Rømming". Doc ID 27259. Site specific contingency plan. Net idividually taggeg. Net regs in "Egersund log" demonstrated with stretch tests and certificates available. External training courses in escape prevention for all site staff. New FHL training course planned for June-14. Contingeny plan posted on site.
	B. Confirm the farm's Escape Prevention Plan contains all required elements for open (net pen) systems as applicable.	Y				In procedures as in pt 3.4.4a. Diving inspection after any net handling operations. All structures NYTEK certified. #AS 115, valid to 08.01.19
	C. Confirm the farm's Escape Prevention Plan contains all required elements for closed systems as applicable.				NA	Open system
	D. Review documentary evidence showing implementation of the plan.	Y				Records in site logs on routine checks and training activities in competency matrix.
	E. Review records (i.e. attendance records, meeting notes) to confirm that farm staff attend training on escape prevention planning.	Y				Escape prevention ptraning for sitemanagers and ohter members of site staff. New training planned .
	F. Interview farm workers to confirm that the plan is implemented.	Y				Implementation confirmed OK
PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					

Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds Farms must show that all feeds used by the farm are produced in compliance with the requirements of Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.4. To do so, farms must obtain documentary evidence that the feed producers (see note 1) are audited at regular intervals by an independent auditing firm or a conformity assessment body against a recognized standard which substantially incorporate requirements for traceability. Acceptable certification schemes include GlobalGAP or other schemes that have been ~~are~~ acknowledged by the ASC (see 4.1.1c below). Results from these audits shall demonstrate that feed producers have robust information systems and information handling processes to allow the feed producers to be able to bring forward accurate information about their production and supply chains. Declarations from the feed producer that are provided to the farm to demonstrate compliance with these indicators must be supported by the audits. Farms must also show that all of their feed producers are duly informed of the requirements of the ASC Salmon Standard relating to sourcing of responsibly produced salmon feed (see 4.1.1b below). In addition to the above, farms must also show that their feed suppliers comply with the more detailed requirements for traceability and ingredient sourcing that are specified under indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2. The ASC Salmon Standard allows farms to use one of two different methods to demonstrate compliance of feed producers: Method #1: Farms may choose to source feed from feed producers who used only those ingredients allowed under the ASC Salmon Standards during the production of a given batch of feed. For example, the farm may request its feed supplier to produce a batch of feed according to farm specifications. Audits of the feed producer will independently verify that manufacturing processes are in compliance with ASC requirements. Method #2: Farms may choose to source feed from feed producers who demonstrate compliance using a "mass-balance" method. In this method, feed producers show that the balance of all ingredients (both amount and type) used during a given feed production period meets ASC requirements. However, mixing of ingredients into the general silos and production lines is allowed during manufacturing. Audits of the feed producer will independently verify that manufacturing processes are in compliance with ASC requirements. The mass balance method can be applied, for example, to integrated feed production companies that handle all steps of feed manufacturing (purchasing of raw materials, processing to finished feed, and sales) under the management of a single legal entity. Note 1: The term "feed producer" is used here to identify the organization that produces the fish feed (i.e. it is the "feed manufacturer"). In most cases, the organization supplying feed to a farm (i.e. the feed supplier) will be the same organization that produced the feed, but there may be					
4.1.1	A. Review feed records for completeness and confirm the number of feed suppliers to the client.	Y				Records of purchase and use in AquaFarmer period 01.03.14 to 28.08.14 and Biomar report.
	B. Review farm records to verify that the farm has informed all of its feed suppliers of relevant ASC requirements for feed production.	Y				In mail to Biomar dt dt 22.08.14
	C. Verify that the farm obtains current audit reports from all relevant feed producers, that these audits were performed by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme, and that audit results demonstrate compliance with requirements.	Y				Biomar statment/certification overview 1for plants 005202 and 1005018 dt 09.09.14 incl Global GAP CoC by BV.
	D. Review which method the farm will use and confirm that independent audit results (4.1.1c) show compliance of feed producers.	Y				Biomar Report from BV form audit 17-19.06.14 on GGCoC. Certifcate # 40 503738100300 BV valid to20.08.15
	E. Review declaration from each feed supplier to confirm the company assures traceability to the level of detail required by Standard.	Y				Statement from BiomarNorway on complete traceability dt 09.09.14
	F. Cross-check the declarations against results from audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) to verify evidence of required levels of traceability .	Y				Ok Statement/certifcate
Footnote	[62] Traceability shall be at a level of detail that permits the feed producer to demonstrate compliance with the standards in this document (i.e., marine raw ingredients must be traced back to the fishery, soy to the region grown, etc.). Feed manufacturers will need to supply the farm					
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[63] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.					
	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.2.1 - Calculation of FFDRm Farms must calculate the Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ration (FFDRm) according to formula presented in Appendix IV-1 using data from the most recent complete production cycle. Farms must also show that they have maintained sufficient information in order to make an accurate calculation of FFDRm as outlined below. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 4.2.1 for the most recent complete production cycle (i.e. if the FFDRm of the most recent crop was > 1.35) if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that: - the client understands how to accurately calculate FFDRm; - the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate FFDRm (i.e. all feed specs for > 6 months) for the current production cycle; and - the client can show how feed used for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. FFDRm < 1.35).					

4.2.1	A. Verify completeness of records and that values are stated in a declaration from the feed manufacturer.	Y				Feed useage 01.04.14 to 22.08.14. of 2300mt.Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assement dt 18.09.14.
	B. Verify that the client excludes from the FFDRm calculation any fishmeal rendered from seafood by-products.	Y				Feed useage 01.03.14 to 15.09.14. In Eco- efficiency assement dt 18.09.14. attachemnt: fish source overview Q1&Q2 2014
	C. Verify that eFCR calculation was done correctly.	Y				in Biomar reprot: Biomar toTAL ffdrM 0,94 AND SkipningsdaleN 0,51. OK
	D. Verify that FFDRm calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the requirement.	Y				0,51
	E. Confirm that client has submitted FFDRm to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				19.09.2014
4.2.2	Note: Under Indicator 4.2.2, farms can choose to calculate FFDRo (Option #1) or EPA & DHA (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values. Client shall inform the CAB which option they will use.					
	A. Verify completeness of feed records as in 4.2.1A.	Y				Feed useage 01.04.14 to 22.08.14. of 2300mt.Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assement dt 18.09.14.
	B. Verify client excludes fish oil rendered from byproducts from the FFDRo or (EPA + DHA) calculation.	Y				Feed useage 01.04.14 to 22.08.14. of 2300mt.Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assement dt 18.09.14.
	C. Record which option the client chose.	Y				Option #1(FFDR) used. Feed useage 01.03.14 to 15.09.14. In Eco- efficiency assement dt 18.09.14. attachemnt: fish source overview Q1&Q2 2014
	D. Verify that FFDRo calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the standard.	Y				in Biomar report: Biomar total FFDRo 1,26 and Skipningsdalen 1,30. OK
	E. Verify that (EPA+DHA) calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the standard.				NA	Opt 1
	F. Confirm that client has submitted FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC (Appendix VI)				NA	Op t1
Footnote	[64] Calculation excludes DHA and EPA derived from fisheries by-products and trimmings. Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption. Fishmeal and fish oil that are produced from trimmings can be excluded from the calculation as long as the origin of the trimmings is not any species that are classified as critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org).					
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
4.3.1	Note: Indicator 4.3.1 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.					
	A. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible feed sourcing (e.g. programs at http://www.isealalliance.org/portrait/full%20member).				NA	2017
	B. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent.				NA	2017
	C. As of June 13, 2017, confirm that the farm has sufficient evidence for the origin of all fish products in feed to demonstrate compliance with indicator 4.3.1. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.3.1c does not apply.				NA	2017

	D. As of June 13, 2017, review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.3.1d does not apply.				NA	2017
Footnote	[65] This standard and standard 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.					
Footnote	[66] Meets ISEAL guidelines as demonstrated through full membership in the ISEAL Alliance, or equivalent as determined by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.					
Footnote	[67] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.					
4.3.2	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.2 - FishSource Score of Fish Used in Feed** To determine FishSource scores of the fish species used as feed ingredients, do the following: -go to http://www.fishsource.org/ -select "Species" drop down tab to the left and select the relevant species -confirm that the search identifies the correct species, then select the top tab that reads "Scores" For first audits, farms must have scoring records that cover all feeds purchased during the previous 6-month period. Note: Indicator 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.					
	A. Cross-check against 4.2.1a to confirm that client recorded a score for each species used in feed.	Y				Fish source score verifed in Biomar calculation and found above limits of 8
	B. Cross-check a sample of the farm's scores against the FishSource website to verify that no individual score is < 6 and no biomass score is < 8.	Y				Correspond OK Ind score >6 and BM score >8
	C. If the client provides an independent assessment, review the assessment and the qualifications of the independent third party to verify that the assessment was done in accordance with the FishSource methodology.	Y			NA	Data available
	D. If the species does not have a FishSource score then the fish feed does not comply with the requirement.	Y			NA	Data available
Footnote	[68] Or equivalent score using the same methodology. See Appendix IV-3 for explanation of FishSource scoring.					
4.3.3	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.3 - Third-Party Verification of Traceability** Indicator 4.3.3 requires that farms show that their feed producers can demonstrate chain of custody and traceability as verified through third-party audits. Farms may submit reports from audits of feed producers (see 4.1.1c) as evidence that traceability systems are in compliance. Alternatively, farms may show that their feed producers comply with traceability requirements of Indicator 4.3.3 by submitting evidence that suppliers, and the batches of fishmeal and oil, are certified to the International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organization's Global Standard for Responsible Supply or to the Marine Stewardship Council Chain of Custody Standard. For the first audit, a minimum of 6 months of data on feed is required and evidence shall relate to species used in said dataset.					
	A. Review evidence and confirm that a third party verified chain of custody or traceability program was used for the fishmeal and fish oil.	Y				Biomar Report from BV form audit 17-19.06.14 on GGCoC. Certifcate # 40 503738100300 BV valid to20.08.15
	B. Verify that demonstration of third-party verified chain-of-custody is in place for all species used.	Y				Biomar Report from BV form audit 17-19.06.14 on GGCoC. Certifcate # 40 503738100300 BV valid to20.08.15
	A. Review list and confirm consistent with 4.2.1a, 4.2.2a, 4.3.3b.	Y				Feed useage 01.04.14 to 22.08.14. of 2300mt.Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assement dt 18.09.14. Fish meals trimmings 13 avg for Q1&2% Fish oils from trimmings 35% avg for Q1&Q2. in Attachment to report.

4.3.4	B. Verify that the farm obtains declarations from feed suppliers.	Y				In Biomar raw materilas statement dt24.04.14. Biomar stement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.19.14
	C. Review declaration to confirm compliance. The International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organization's Global Standard for Responsible Supply and the Marine Stewardship Council standards are two options for demonstrating compliance with Indicator 4.3.4c	Y				In Biomar raw materilas statement dt24.04.14. Biomar stement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.09.14
	D. Review evidence to support exception (if applicable).	Y				Not from vulnerable fisheries
Footnote	[69] Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption.					
Footnote	[70] IUU: Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported.					
Footnote	[71] The International Union for the Conservation of Nature reference can be found at http://www.iucnredlist.org/static/introduction.					
Footnote	[72] For species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, an exception is made if a regional population of the species has been assessed to be not vulnerable in a National Red List process that is managed explicitly in the same science-based way as IUCN. In cases where a National Red List doesn't exist or isn't managed in accordance with IUCN guidelines, an exception is allowed when an assessment is conducted using IUCN's methodology and demonstrates that the population is not vulnerable.					
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
4.4.1	A. Review feed supplier list and cross-check against feed purchases. (See also 4.1.1a)	Y				Regular commercial contact info and website www.Biomar.no
	B. Review policies from each feed supplier to confirm required sourcing policy is in place.	Y				In Biomar raw materilas statement dt24.04.14. Biomar stement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.09.14
	C. Verify that the scope of third-party audits of feed suppliers includes review of policies and evidence of implementation.	Y				Global GAP CoC certifcate by BC valid to 2015 as above.
Footnote	[75] Moratorium: A period of time in which there is a suspension of a specific activity until future events warrant a removal of the suspension or issues regarding the activity have been resolved. In this context, moratoriums may refer to suspension of the growth of defined agricultural crops in					
Footnote	[76] Specifically, the policy shall include that vegetable ingredients, or products derived from vegetable ingredients, must not come from areas of the Amazon Biome that were deforested after July 24, 2006, as geographically defined by the Brazilian Soy Moratorium. Should the Brazilian Soy					
4.4.2	A. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible sourcing of soya or soya-derived feed ingredients.	Y				MH psotoion on sustainable sources ono-mariie raw materials i salmon feeds dt 29.11.13
	B. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent.	Y				MH postion on sustainable sources on-marine raw materials i salmon feeds dt 29.11.13
	C. Verify that farm notifies feed suppliers.	Y				In mial 01.12. 13
	D. Confirm that the farm has sufficient and supportive evidence for the origin of soya products in feed to demonstrate compliance with indicator 4.4.2	Y				Certificates from suppliers and Biomar statements dt 09.09.14
	E. As of June 13, 2017,- review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.4.2e does not apply.				NA	2017
Footnote	[77] Any alternate certification scheme would have to be approved as equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.					
Footnote	[78] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.					

	A. Review feed supplier declaration and ensure declarations from all suppliers are present (see also 4.4.1A).	Y				In Biomar raw materilas statement dt24.04.14. Biomar statement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.09.14 and NON-GMO analysis certifcates from soy suppliers
	B. Verify evidence of disclosure to all buyers, cross-checking with plant material list (4.4.3a) to see that all transgenic plant ingredients were disclosed	Y				MH syement on GMO non accepance and staement Biomar staing <0.9% GMO in soy/plant materilas in feed.
	C. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether feeds containing transgenic ingredients are used on farm (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted ASC in mail dt 19.09.14
Footnote	[79] The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product. This standard requires disclosure by the feed company to the farm and by the farm to the buyer of their salmon.					
Footnote	[80] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get that trait expressed in the offspring.					
Footnote	[81] See Appendix VI for transparency requirement for 4.4.3.					
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
4.5.1	A. Review policy to verify the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production in a manner consistent with best practice in the area.	Y				In MH Plan for håderng av søppel Skipningdlaen 2013-2014.
	B. Verify the client makes a declaration.	Y				In MH Plan for håderng av søppel Skipningdlaen 2013-2014. Sorce grading specified incl. Special wastes Approved service/receiver of waste required in plan
	C. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal.	Y				Weoden pallets, residual/domestic waste, decomm. Mooringseqipment.
	D. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client.	Y				Decommisioned Feed pipes and moorings equipment. Receipt /invoice form IRS miljø Iks dt 21.05.15 omn varoius types of waste received from farm base with refs to decl codes..
Footnote	[83] Proper and responsible disposal will vary based on facilities available in the region and remoteness of farm sites. Disposal of non-biological waste shall be done in a manner consistent with best practice in the area. Dumping of non-biological waste into the ocean does not represent “proper and responsible” disposal.					
4.5.2	A. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal. (See also 4.5.1C)	Y				Decomm. Fedpipes and decomm. nets by net provider Egersund Net. (kasserte nøter Agder) from Egersung Net overview/report.
	B. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client. (See also 4.5.1D)	Y				Decomm. Fedpipes and decomm. nets by net provider Egersund Net. (kasserte nøter Agder) from Egersung Net overview/report.
	C. Review infractions and corrective actions.	Y				No infractions identified.

	D. Review records to verify waste disposal and/or recycling is consistent with client description and policy.	Y				Nets disposal by Eg. Net in overview. Feed pipes disposal by IRS Miljø IKS. Example: Invoice March 2014 and 31.05.14 on 3000kg
Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[84] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.					
4.6.1	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.1 - Energy Use Assessment** Indicator 4.6.1 requires that farms must have an assessment to verify energy consumption. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational energy use for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. Boundaries for operational energy use should correspond to the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions (see Appendix V-1). Energy use corresponding to Scope 3 emissions (i.e. the energy used to fabricate materials that are purchased by the farm) is not required. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate energy use assessments across the board in the company. For the purposes of calculating energy consumption, the duration of the production cycle is the entire life cycle "at sea" - it does not include freshwater smolt production stages. Farms that have integrated smolt rearing should break out the grow-out stage portion of energy consumption if					
	A. Verify that the farm maintains records for energy consumption.	Y				Biom prod 4858 mt for 11G. 256 598,KJ. 13G calculated but cycle not closed.
	B. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	Y				Biom prod 4858 mt for 11G. 256, 598Kj
	C. Confirm that the farm accurately reports total weight of fish harvested per production cycle. Cross-check against other farm datasets (e.g. harvest counts, escapes, and mortalities).	Y				Biom prod 4858 mt for 11G. 256, 598Kj
	D. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	Y				Biom prod 4858 mt for 11G. 256, 598Kj Scope 1 and Scope 2 considered
	E. Confirm that client has submitted energy use calculations to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				OBS Incorrect calc Submitted to ASC
	F. Confirm that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the farm's energy consumption.	Y				Scope 1 Diesel) and scope 2 purchased el used
4.6.2	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.2 - Annual GHG Assessment** Indicator 4.6.2 requires that farms must have an annual Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment. Detailed instructions are presented in Appendix V-1 and references therein. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational boundaries for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate GHG accounting practices across the board in the company. Verification may be done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details). Note: For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto					
	A. Verify that the farm maintains records of GHG emissions.	Y				13 G scope 1 13999 kg Co2, Scope 2 145441, Total 1+2 = 168889 kg CO2
	B. Confirm that calculations are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1.	Y				13 G scope 1 13999 kg Co2, Scope 2 145441 kg CO2, Total 1+2 = 168889 kg CO2
	C. Verify that the farm records all emissions factors used and their sources.	Y				Scope 1 diesel from disel workboat and scope 2 is purchased el and purchase service boat diesle consumption
	D. Verify that the farm records all GWPs used and their sources.				NA	CO2 used
	E. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations to ASC (Appendix VI).				NA	CO2 used
	F. Confirm that the farm undergoes a GHG assessments annually and that the methods used comply with requirements of Appendix V-1.				NA	CO2 used
Footnote	[85] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO_2); methane (CH4); nitrous oxide (N_2O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6).					

Footnote	[86] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.					
4.6.3	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.3 - GHG Emissions of Feed** Indicator 4.6.3 requires that farms document the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) associated with any feeds used during salmon production. Farms will need to obtain this information from their feed supplier(s) and thereafter maintain a continuous record of Feed GHG emissions throughout all production cycles. This requirement takes effect on June 13, 2015 and it will apply across the entire previous production cycle. Therefore the SAD Steering Committee advises farms to inform their feed supplier(s) about this requirement long before the effective date. Specifically, the SC recommends that… - the farm provides its feed suppliers with detailed information about the requirements including a copy of the methodology outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2; - the farm explain what analyses must be done by feed suppliers; and - the farm explains to feed suppliers what documentary evidence will be required by the farm to demonstrate compliance. Note1: Farms may calculate GHG emissions of feed using the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) rather than using feed composition on a lot-by-lot basis.					
	A. Verify declaration from feed supplier(s) and confirm client has declarations from all feed suppliers.				NA	2017
	B. Verify calculations cross-checking with feed purchase and use records.				NA	2017
	C. Verify calculations.				NA	2017
	D. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations for feed to ASC (Appendix VI).				NA	2017
Footnote	[87] GHG emissions from feed can be given based on the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) and not as documentation linked to each single product used during the production cycle. Feed manufacturer is responsible for calculating GHG emissions per unit feed. Farm site then shall use that information to calculate GHG emissions for the volume of feed they used in the prior production cycle.					
Footnote	[88] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.					
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [89,90]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[89] Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.					
Footnote	[90] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.7.1, 4.7.3 and 4.7.4.					
4.7.1	A. Review procedure for completeness.	Y			NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	B. Review documentary evidence and records for completeness, including traceability records of the nets where available.	Y			NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle
	C. Verify whether copper-based treatments are used. If no, Indicator 4.7.1d does not apply to the client. If yes, proceed to 4.7.1D.	Y			NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle
	D. Review evidence and interview farm manager to confirm that farm does not do any heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ.	Y			NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle
	E. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (Appendix VI).	Y			NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle

Footnote	[91] Under the SAD, "copper-treated net" is defined as a net that has been treated with any copper-containing substance (such as a copper-based antifoulant) during the previous 18 months, or has not undergone thorough cleaning at a land-based facility since the last treatment. Farms that use nets that have, at some point prior in their lifespan, been treated with copper may still consider nets as untreated so long as sufficient time and cleaning has elapsed as in this definition. This will allow farms to move away from use of copper without immediately having to purchase					
Footnote	[92] Light cleaning of nets is allowed. Intent of the standard is that, for example, the high-pressure underwater washers could not be used on copper treated nets under this standard because of the risk of copper flaking off during this type of heavy or more thorough cleaning.					
4.7.2	A. Review declaration and cross-check with records from 4.7.1b. If nets are not cleaned on land, Indicator 4.7.2 does not apply. If nets are cleaned on land, proceed to 4.7.2B.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	B. Review documentary evidence to confirm that each net-cleaning facility has effluent treatment in place.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	C. If applicable, review documentary evidence to confirm that land-based cleaning sites have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper in effluents and that they function as intended.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
Footnote	[93] Treatment must have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper if the farm uses copper-treated nets.					
4.7.3	Note: If the benthos throughout and immediately outside the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from Indicator 4.7.3 (see 2.1.1c).					
	A. Review declaration and cross-check against declaration from 4.7.1c. Record whether Indicator 4.7.3 is applicable to the client.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	B. As applicable, verify the farm tested sediment samples for copper from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	C. Verify the measurements were taken using appropriate equipment and testing methods.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
4.7.4	A. Document and verify applicability of 4.7.4 to client (see also 4.7.3A)				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	B. Verify that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg sediment. If no, proceed to 4.7.4C.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	C. If applicable, review evidence to confirm that farm followed Appendix I-1 for testing copper levels at reference sites.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	D. As applicable, review data to confirm that copper levels fall within the range of background concentrations as measured at reference sites.				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
	E. Confirm that farm has submitted to ASC data on copper levels in sediment (Appendix VI).				NA	CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13
Footnote	[94] According to testing required under 4.7.3. The standards related to testing of copper are only applicable to farms that use copper-based nets or copper-treated nets.					
	A. Review list of biocides and cross-check against treatment records (see 4.7.2b) and purchase records.	Y				CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" bt Steen hansen ref safety shhet dt 11.12.13

4.7.5	B. Review documentary evidence to confirm compliance.	Y				Net coatiing is regsieterd by DEBIO as safe for ecological production (EU reg 2092/91)
PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [95]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[95] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.6.					
5.1.1	A. Obtain and review the farm's fish health management plan.	Y				Seen FHMP covering relevant issues of fish health and pathogens. Doc ID,24886 dt13.01.14 in TQM. 3 components plan:1) Regoinal,2) site general and 3)site specific.. Signed by resp vet 13.02.14
	B. Verify there is evidence to show that the farm's designated veterinarian [96] reviewed and approved the current version of the plan.	Y				Signed by resp vet 13.02.14
5.1.2	A. Review documentary evidence of site visits to confirm a minimum number of visits as outlined in 5.1.2. Or review risk assessment.	Y				Visits schedule in plan and deocumented in reprots list.
	B. Confirm visits in 5.1.2a were performed by the farm's designated health professionals.	Y				Robin Scotland Vet Erirk Hoel
	C. Review evidence for qualifications of the farm's health professionals.	Y				Seen CV s for relevany perosnnel.
Footnote	[96] A designated veterinarian is the professional responsible for health management on the farm who has the legal authority to diagnose disease and prescribe medication. In some countries such as Norway, a fish health biologist or other professional has equivalent professional qualifications and is equivalent to a veterinarian for purposes of these standards. This definition applies to all references to a veterinarian throughout the standards document.					
Footnote	[97] A fish health manager is someone with professional expertise in managing fish health, who may work for a farming company or for a veterinarian, but who does not necessarily have the authority to prescribe medicine.					
5.1.3	A. Review records of mortality removals to confirm completeness and accuracy. Cross-check against 5.1.4 and calculations of escapes and unexplained loss.	Y				Daily in AquaFarmer reports for daily retrieval. All morts to silage. Scanbio on silage collection. Contract signed dt 26.02.13 after int. proc. Mortality handling ...in TQM system. Example is Scanbio Invoice on retr. of 7500 kg silage dt 03.08.14. Invoice of last retieval not arriveed.
	B. Review client submission. Inspect the farm's system for mortality removals and disposals during the on site audit.	Y				As above
	C. Review the farm's justification for any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis (this situation should be a rare occurrence).				NA	No exceptional morts
Footnote	[98] The SAD recognizes that not all mortality events will result in dead fish present for collection and removal. However, such situations are considered the exception rather than the norm.					
	Note: Farms are required to maintain mortality records from the current and two previous production cycles. For first audit, records for the current and prior production cycle are required. It is recommended that farms maintain a compiled set of records to demonstrate compliance with 5.1.3 - 5.1.6.					

5.1.4	A. Review records of mortalities to verify completeness and to confirm that post-mortem analyses were done by qualified individuals or labs.	Y				Morts categorised for last 3 G, from AquaFarmer13G (2,11%dd) present cycle (11G), (16,2,1% unspec +viral 00). For 09G 13,0% total.
	B. Review records to confirm the farm had post-mortem analysis done for each mortality event and that a statistically relevant number of fish were analyzed from each mortality event.	Y				All morts diagnoes (ref unspecicifed numbers above). Lab analyses routinely.
	C. Review records to confirm that any inconclusive on-site diagnoses were sent to an off-site laboratory for further testing.	Y				Ex Patogen report dt 16.07.14 and Vet visit reports
	D. Review mortality events to confirm the farm's classification was consistent with results from post-mortem analyses. Where cause was not determined verify that classification was plausible given available info.	Y				Record is in AquaFarmer, categorised
	E. Review evidence to confirm compliance with requirements.	Y				Record is in AquaFarmer, categorised
	F. Confirm that client has submitted data from post-mortem analyses and cause and number of mortalities to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC 19.09.14
Footnote	[99] If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive, this standard requires off-site laboratory diagnosis. A qualified professional must conduct all diagnosis. One hundred percent of mortality events shall receive a post-mortem analysis, not necessarily every fish. A statistically relevant number of fish					
5.1.5	A. Review and confirm the calculated number of viral disease-related mortalities.	Y				0,0% viral related/diagnosed. Total viral + Unspec=10,1%
	B. Verify that the sum of confirmed viral disease-related mortalities plus unspecified & unexplained mortalities is ≤ 10% of the total number of fish produced during the most recent production cycle.	Y				11G 15,4 % of total MORTALITY Viral related/diagnosed. Total viral + Unspec=2,5% on initial number
	C. Confirm that client has submitted data on mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC 19.09.14
Footnote	[100] Viral disease-related mortality count shall include unspecified and unexplained mortality as it could be related to viral disease.					
5.1.6	A. Review, confirm, and document whether 5.1.6 is applicable to the client. If applicable, proceed to 5.1.6B.				NA	Below 6%, (2.3%)
	B. Review and confirm that ≤ 40% of total mortalities were from unexplained causes for each of the two previous production cycles				NA	As above
	C. Confirm that client has submitted data on unexplained mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).				NA	Submitted to ASC
	Note: Farms have the option to integrate their farm-specific mortality reduction program into the farm's fish health management plan (5.1.1).					
	A. Confirm that the farm used mortalities records to assemble a detailed dataset on mortality rates which covers the required timeframe (see 5.1.4).	Y				Mortality rate reduction programme (Corporate level on <5% morts). Specified in FHMP, on iste level with concrete objectives for actions to reduce to less than 5%.

5.1.7	B. Review program to confirm that targets for mortality reduction are reasonable and based on historical data.	Y				Mortality rate reduction programme (Corporate level on <5% morts). Specified in FHMP, on iste level with concrete objectives for actions to reduce to less than 5%.
	C. Interview workers to confirm their understanding of mortalities recording, classification, and annual targets for reduction (see also 5.1.1, 5.1.3).	Y				Confirmed during interviews
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[101] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.2.1, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.10.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs for Criterion 5.2 - Records Related to Therapeutic Treatments Indicator 5.2.1 requires that farms maintain detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use. Those records maintained for compliance with 5.2.1, if all consolidated into a single place, can be used to demonstrate performance against subsequent Indicators (5.2.1 through 5.2.10) under Criterion 5.2.						
5.2.1	A. Review records of chemical and therapeutant use. Verify accuracy through cross-check with purchase orders and sales records, inventories, documentation from feed manufacturer for any in-feed treatment, and veterinary records.	Y			NA	No treatments used.
	B. Confirm that farm has detailed records for chemical and therapeutant use that covers the previous two production cycles.				NA	No treatments used.
	C. Confirm that client has submitted therapeutant information to ASC (Appendix VI).				NA	No treatments used.
Footnote	[102] Chemicals used for the treatment of fish.					
5.2.2	A. Review list and supporting evidence. If ASC has agreed to maintain a list of relevant therapeutants, farm can demonstrate that they have this list.	Y				MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined
	B. Verify records.	Y				NFSA mandatory testing by NIFES on site and/or at harvest line. Example report dt16.09.14. with NIFES certificate In OK programme. Also voluntary MRL testing from 2009-2013.
	C. Cross-check records of therapeutant use (5.2.1a) against the list of banned therapeutants to verify compliance with requirements.	Y				Correspond with reports and usage.
Footnote	[103] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance. A substance banned in any of the primary salmon-producing or importing countries, as defined here, cannot be used in any salmon farm certified under the SAD, regardless of country of production or destination of the product. The SAD recommends that ASC maintain a list of a banned therapeutants.					
Footnote	[104] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.					

5.2.3	A. Review documentary evidence (on-farm records, veterinary records, and prescriptions) to confirm all therapeutants were prescribed by a qualified individual. See [96] for definition of veterinarian.	Y				In Prescription register for site.Ex: Seen prescription for anaesthetics used used for Tricaine dt05.09.14 By Vet. Hoel
	B. Cross-check with results from chemical residue testing provided under 5.2.2b.	Y				Original prescr, in site folder and regsiter
5.2.4	A. Review the farm's fish health management plan to confirm inclusion of withholding periods and interview farm staff to verify implementation.	Y				In AquaFarmer, automatically notified/blocked according to degreedays in prescription. According to FHMP/VHP on witthholding periods defined in Aquafarmer and specific presecription.
	B. Review documentation for completeness and accuracy. Compare to records of therapeutant use (5.2.1a).	Y				In AquaFarmer, automatically notified according to degreedays in prescription.
	C. Review documentary evidence and, if applicable, results from chemical residue testing (5.2.2b), to confirm legal withholding periods were met for the most recent production cycle and harvest.	Y				In Fish CV, where tmt dates are specified and compared to harvest dates. According to FHMP/VHP on witthholding periods defined. Ex CV A1 treatment (aneaesthetics) dt 03.9.13.
5.2.5	A. Review the farm's calculations to verify that the PTI score was calculated correctly and that the scores are accurate. Cross-check with records of parasiticide use.	Y				No treatments performed on present cycle.
	B. Verify that the farm level cumulative PTI score ≤ 13.	Y				No treatments performed on present cycle.
	C. Confirm that client has submitted data on cumulative PTI score to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted to ASC 19.09.14
5.2.6	Note: Indicator 5.2.6 does not take effect until June 15, 2017. Nonetheless farms should start collecting data on parasiticide load beforehand in case farms have to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 5.2.6 at some point in the future using data from the two previous production cycles					
	A. Review farm's cumulative PTI score to determine if Indicator 5.2.6 is applicable.				NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.
	B. Review the farm's calculation of parasiticide load to verify accuracy.				NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.
	C. Review farm's calculations to verify that parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle is at least 15% less than that of the two previous cycles.				NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.
	D. Confirm that client has submitted data on parasiticide load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.				NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.
Footnote	[105] Parasiticide load = Sum (kg of fish treated x PTI). Reduction in load required regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined parasiticide load of the					
	A. Review purchase records and calculate total amount procured by client. Inspect storage areas to verify quantities on-site.				NA	No ABs used the recent cycles

5.2.7	B. Review log of medication events to verify that the quantity of antibiotic applied by the client does not suggest prophylactic use.				NA	No ABs used the recent cycles
	C. Verify that the total amount of antibiotics used in the current production cycle is equal to the total amount prescribed.				NA	No ABs used the recent cycles
Footnote	[106] The designated veterinarian must certify that a pathogen or disease is present before prescribing medication.					
5.2.8	Note 1: Farms have the option to certify only a portion of the fish or farm site when WHO-listed [107] antibiotics have been used at the production facility (see 5.2.8d). To pursue this option, farms must request an exemption from the CAB in advance of the audit and provide sufficient records giving details on which pens were treated and traceability of those treated fish. Note 2: It is recommended that the farm veterinarian review the WHO list [see 107] in detail and be aware that the list is meant to show examples of members of each class of drugs, and is not inclusive of all drugs.					
	A. Confirm that the farm has the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics.	Y				List presented v3, no ABs used
	B. During the on-site audit, verify that no antibiotics listed as "critically important" have been used on the farm through cross-check of records for 5.2.1 and 5.2.7.	Y				List presented, no ABs used
	C. Make note of the farm's antibiotic usage and do not schedule an on-site audit until the client provides additional information as specified in 5.2.8d.	Y				List presented, no ABs used
	D. Review the farm's exemption request and supporting documents to verify that the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate traceability [108] to merit an exemption.	Y				List presented, no ABs used
Footnote	[107] The third edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/CIA_3.pdf.					
Footnote	[108] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.					
5.2.9	Note: for the purposes of Indicator 5.2.9, "treatment" means a single course of medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days and be applied in one or more pens (or cages).					
	A. Review documents to confirm that the client maintains a record of all treatments of antibiotics. Cross-check against records of on-farm chemical & therapeutant use (5.2.1a), medication events (5.2.3a), and prescription records (5.2.3b).				NA	No ABs used
	B. Confirm that the client used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.				NA	No ABs used
Footnote	[109] A treatment is a single course medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days.					
5.2.10	Note: Indicator 5.2.10 requires that farms must demonstrate a reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites. Indicator 5.2.10 does not take effect until June 13, 2017. Nonetheless farms should start collecting data on antibiotic load beforehand in case farms have to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 5.2.10 at some point in the future using data from the two previous production cycles.					
	A. Review results to confirm whether 5.2.10 is applicable to the client. Record the results and, if applicable, proceed to 5.2.10B.				NA	2017
	B. Review farm's calculations for accuracy and completeness of coverage. Cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a).				NA	2017

	C. Review evidence to verify that farm complies with requirement.				NA	2017
	D. Confirm that client has submitted data on antibiotic load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.				NA	2017
Footnote	[110] Antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotics used (kg).					
Footnote	[111] Reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites.					
5.2.11	A. Review the farm's procedure and confirm implementation based on relevant documentary evidence (e.g. sales records, invoices).	Y				In "Oppsett på produkt fra MOVEX" Int Proc in TQM. Fish CV follws fish automatically through to customer
	B. Review sales records for completeness and cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a) to verify that buyers were adequately informed about therapeutants used in production.	Y				Example is Følgeseddel 12.09.14 with tracng back to farm and cage#.
Footnote	[112] Buyer: The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product.					
Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
5.3.1	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.3.1 - Identifying the 'Expected Effect' of Medicinal Treatment** Indicator 5.3.1 requires that farms identify treatments that have not produced the expected effect. The SAD Steering Committee recognizes that the "expected effect" will vary with health condition and type of medicinal treatment. Therefore farms and auditors will need to review the pre- and post-treatment condition of fish in order to understand and evaluate the impact of treatment. Example: sea lice treatment with emamectin benzoate The SAD SC recommends that a typical baseline for effectiveness of emamectin benzoate is a minimum of 90 percent reduction in abundance of lice on the farmed fish. To determine whether treatment has produced the expected effect, farm and auditor must review pre- and post-treatment lice counts. If the calculated percent reduction in lice is < 90% then the treatment did not produce the expected effect and a bio-assay should be performed to determine whether sea lice have developed resistance.					
	A. Review farm records to confirm recording of all successive medicinal treatments.				NA	No ttreatments done in present cycle.
	B. If applicable, review how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.				NA	No ttreatments done in present cycle.
	C. Review farm records to confirm that bio-assays were done in every case where successive treatments did not produce the expected effect. Confirm that bio-assays were performed by a qualified independent laboratory.				NA	No ttreatments done in present cycle.
	D. Verify that farm maintains records from bio-assays (as applicable).				NA	No ttreatments done in present cycle.
5.3.2	A. Review evidence from bio-assay tests to determine whether Indicator 5.3.2 is applicable.				NA	No ttreatments done in present cycle.

5.3.2	B. If applicable, review records to verify that the farm either used an alternative treatment that is permitted in the area of operation or else harvested all fish on site.				NA	No ttreatments done in present cycle.
Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
Footnote	[113] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.4.2 and 5.4.4.					
5.4.1	A. Review records and verify fallow periods by cross-checking during interviews with farm staff and community representatives.	Y				F. Dir approval of ops. Plan dt 04.12.13 for all sites in area. (01.06.13 to 30.07.13) Last harvest date 11G 15.06.13, First stocking date 11.09.13.
	B. Review evidence to confirm there were no gaps in smolt inputs > 6 months. Inspect pens during the on-site audit to see if fish size (which may be variable) is consistent with the production of a single-year class.	Y				Smolt CVs for Kvingo withova /stripping/startfeeding dates defined fisrt stocking date 11.09.13 last stocking date 09.10.13.
	C. Verify that the available evidence shows that salmon on the site are from a single-year class.	Y				Smolt CVs for Kvingo withova /stripping/startfeeding dates defined fisrt stocking date 11.09.13 last stocking date 09.10.13.
Footnote	[114] Gaps of up to six months between inputs of smolts derived from the same stripping are acceptable as long as there remains a period of time when the site is fully fallow after harvest.					
Footnote	[115] Exception is allowed for: 1) farm sites that have closed, contained production units where there is complete separation of water between units and no sharing of filtration systems or other systems that could spread disease, or, 2) farm sites that have ≥95% water recirculation, a pre-entry disease screening protocol, dedicated quarantine capability and biosecurity measures for waste to ensure there is no discharge of live biological material to the natural environment (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of effluent) .					
5.4.2	A. Review evidence to confirm that the farm evaluated mortality events for statistically significant increases relative to background mortality rates (compare to farm's time-series dataset in 5.1.7a).	Y				Continuos evaluation. No events of this category Morts categorised for last 3 G, from AquaFarmer13G (2,29% - 2,54%dd) present cycle. No transmissable agents detected nor suspected.
	B. Determine if the farm suspected any unidentified transmissible agents associated with mortality events during the most recent production cycle. An abrupt increase in unexplained mortality should be cause for suspicion.	Y				Continuos evaluation. No events of this category Morts categorised for last 3 G, from AquaFarmer13G (2,29% - 2,54%dd) present cycle. No transmissable agents detected nor suspected.
	C. Confirm that the farm took the correct action based on results from 5.4.2a and 5.4.2b and whether 5.4.2d is applicable to the farm.				NA	No stat. sign elevation of morts.
	D. If applicable, verify that the farm keeps records to show how each of the required steps was completed.				NA	No stat. sign elevation of morts.
	E. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality as applicable.				NA	No stat. sign elevation of morts.
Footnote	[116] Increased mortality: A statistically significant increase over background rate on a monthly basis.					

Footnote	[117] Primary aim of monitoring and surveillance is to investigate whether a new or adapted disease is present in the area.						
Footnote	[118] Within one month.						
5.4.3	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.4.3 - Compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code** Indicator 5.4.3 requires that farms show evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (see http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171). Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code. For purposes of the ASC Salmon Standard, this means that the farm must have written procedures stating how the farm will initiate an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm ['exotic' = not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen)]. An aggressive response will involve, at a minimum, the following actions: - depopulation of the infected site; - implementation of quarantine zones (see note below)in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen; and - additional actions as required under Indicator 5.4.4. To demonstrate compliance with Indicator 5.4.3, clients have the to option to describe how farm practices are consistent with the intentions of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code by developing relevant policies and procedures and integrating them into the farm's fish health management						
	A. Verify that farm management is aware of practices described in the most current version of the code during interviews.	Y				Current version of lst presented	
	B. Review farm policies and procedures to verify that the farm has documented how its practices are consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code and Indicator 5.4.4.	Y				Int. procedure in TQM on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Described in FHVP, Notification of diseases. Beredskapsplan MH" page 12, Notification of diseases. ID 27017	
	C. During the on-site inspection look for evidence that policies and procedures in 5.4.3a are implemented. Cross-check in interviews with staff.	Y				Confirmed OK	
Footnote	[119] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Quarantine zones will likely incorporate mandatory depopulation of sites close to the infected site and affect some, though not necessarily all, of the ABM. Exotic signifies not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen).						
Footnote	[120] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171.						
5.4.4	A. Review farm policies and procedures (see 5.4.3A) to verify that the farm has documented actions in response to an OIE-notifiable disease.	Y				**OBS:** Int. procedure in TQM on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Beredskapsplan MH" page 12, **Required steps not clearly defined in procedure to publish in e.g MHN web-site for ASC issues**. MHSør has all sites in area - hence ABM notification need reduced.	**OBS**
	B. Record whether there were any OIE-notifiable diseases confirmed on the farm during the current or two previous production cycles.				NA	No occurance of notifiable diseases.	

	C. If applicable, review documentary evidence to verify the farm's response complied with the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4.				NA	No occurance of notifiable diseases.
	D. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm (as applicable).				NA	No occurance of notifiable diseases.
	E. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm, verify that notifications were made to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (122).				NA	No occurance of notifiable diseases.
Footnote	[121] At the time of publication of the final draft standards, OIE-notifiable diseases relevant to salmon aquaculture were: Epizootic haematopoietic necrosis, Infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN), Infectious salmon anemia (ISA), Viral hemorrhagic septicemia (VHS) and Gyrodactylosis (Gyrodactylus salaris).					
Footnote	[122] This is in addition to any notifications to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.					
Footnote	[123] Within one month.					
Social requirements in the standards shall be audited by an individual who is a lead auditor in conformity with SAAS Procedure 200 section 3.1.						
PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]						
Compliance Criteria						
Footnote	[124] Bargain collectively: 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.					
6.1.1	a. Workers have the freedom to join any trade union, free of any form of interference from employers or competing organizations set up or backed by the employer. Farms shall prepare documentation to demonstrate to the auditor that domestic regulation fully meets these criteria.	y				The information is presented in Code of conduct and personal handbook. No organised workers at site. Workers aware of their right.
	b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits "acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control or employers or employers' organizations."	y				Chosen by e-mail, because of resent sick leave of former worker representative.
	c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.	y				The new meeting of worker representative is planned in October. Company supporting this.
	d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				Interview confirms information above
6.1.2	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association.	y				The contract has link to Code of conduct of the Company.
	b. Employer communicates that workers are free to form organizations to advocate for and protect work rights (e.g. farm policies on Freedom of Association; see 6.12.1).	y				Communicated via training of Code of Conduct with following test
	c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				Interview confirms information above
6.1.3	a. Local trade union, or where none exists a reputable civil-society organization, confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees' freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.	y				No outstanding cases what are in conflict with standard requirements.
	b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.	y				Collective bargaining agreement in place as tariff agreement.
	c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).	y				Collective bargaining agreement in place as tariff agreement.
Criterion 6.2 Child labor						
Compliance Criteria						

6.2.1	a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions: - in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years (see footnote 125); or - in countries where the legal minimum age is set higher than 15 years, in which case the legal minimum age of the country is followed. If the farm operates in a country where the legal minimum ages is not 15, then the employer shall maintain documentation attesting to this fact.	y				Standard requirements apply
	b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).	y				17 years old.
	c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.	y				Records are in place.
Footnote	[125] Child: Any person under 15 years of age. A higher age would apply if the minimum age law of an area stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling. Minimum age may be 14 if the country allows it under the developing country exceptions in ILO convention 138.					
Footnote	[126] Child Labor: Any work by a child younger than the age specified in the definition of a child.					
6.2.2	a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.	y				General procedure for employees under 18 years old with risk assessment at each site.
	b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.	y				All young workers are identified. 2 young workers (16 and 17 years old) as part time employees on the site are employed for the on call help scheme.
	c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.	y				On site
	d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.	n	x			NC: Local legislation requirements and internal company's procedures are not followed for duration of work week and overtime for young worker: 7 days and 9 days of work in a row were identified.
	e. Young workers are not exposed to hazards [129] and do not perform hazardous work [130]. Work on floating cages in poor weather conditions shall be considered hazardous.	y				The general hazards that should be avoided are listed in procedure for employees under 18 years old..
	f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.	y				The site was inspected. No interviews with young workers conducted, as they were absent on the day of the audit.
Footnote	[127] Young Worker: Any worker between the age of a child, as defined above, and under the age of 18.					
Footnote	[128] Protected: Workers between 15 and 18 years of age will not be exposed to hazardous health and safety conditions; working hours shall not interfere with their education and the combined daily transportation time and school time, and work time shall not exceed 10 hours.					
Footnote	[129] Hazard: The inherent potential to cause injury or damage to a person's health (e.g., unequipped to handle heavy machinery safely, and unprotected exposure to harmful chemicals).					
Footnote	[130] Hazardous work: Work that, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of workers (e.g., heavy lifting disproportionate to a person's body size, operating heavy machinery, exposure to toxic chemicals).					
Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor						
	Compliance Criteria					
6.3.1	a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no 'pay to work' schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs).	y				The contract has link to Code of conduct of the Company.
	b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.	y				Confirmed by interview.
	c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.	y				No cases identified
	d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.	y				No cases identified
	e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.	y				No cases identified

	f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				Payroll records are available. The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[131] Forced (Compulsory) labor: All work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty for which a person has not offered himself/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					
Footnote	[132] Bonded labor: When a person is forced by the employer or creditor to work to repay a financial debt to the crediting agency.					
Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]						
	Compliance Criteria					
Footnote	[133] Discrimination: Any distinction, exclusion or preference that has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment. Not every 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.					
6.4.1	a. Employer has written anti-discrimination policy in place, stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual	y				The anti-discrimination policy is presented in Code of conduct.
	b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.	y				Whistle blowing procedure in place.
	c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.	y				The tariff agreement is the base of equal pay.
	d. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective.	y				The training for managers was conducted.
Footnote	[134] Employers shall have written anti-discrimination policies stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.					
6.4.2	a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.	y				No cases identified.
	b. Be advised that worker testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.	y				Interview has confirmed absence of discrimination cases.
Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety						
	Compliance Criteria					
6.5.1	a. Employer has documented practices, procedures (including emergency response procedures) and policies to protect employees from workplace hazards and to minimize risk of accident or injury. The information shall be available to employees.	y				Procedures are in place with relation to H&S risk assessment.
	b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	y				Employees understand the procedures. The last drills were conducted 2 years ago.
	c. Employer conducts health and safety training for all employees on a regular basis (once a year and immediately for all new employees), including training on potential hazards and risk minimization, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and effective use of PPE.	y				The trainings are conducted.
Footnote	[135] Health and safety training shall include emergency response procedures and practices.					
6.5.2	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals).	y				The register is maintained
	b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.	y				The radio check is applied every 20 minutes. Obs.: No documenting of ongoing checks for life-vests according the procedures, which states recording 4 time a year. No dates on training record.
	c. Employees receive annual training in the proper use of PPE (see 6.5.1c). For workers who participated in the initial training(s) previously an annual refreshment training may suffice, unless new PPE has been put to use.	y				Dedicated procedure and forms in place. Training is done together with OHS training.
	d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				The interviews has confirmed above information.

6.5.3	a. Employer makes regular assessments of hazards and risks in the workplace. Risk assessments are reviewed and updated at least annually (see also 6.5.1a).	y				Risk assessment is conducted annually. Last 2014-09-22
	b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).	y				Annual risk assessment scheme is used. Via Brain Safe training.
	c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.	y				The procedures are adapted in relation to risk assessment and H&S accidents investigation results.
6.5.4	a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.	y				The TQM system database is used.
	b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations	y				The TQM system database is used.
	c. Employer implements corrective action plans in response to any accidents that occur. Plans are documented and they include an analysis of root cause, actions to address root cause, actions to remediate, and actions to prevent future accidents of similar nature.	y				Corrective action plan for accidents are developed and implemented, Root cause analysis included.
	d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.	y				To accidents took place at this site. Information from other sites provided via e-m-mail.
6.5.5	a. Employer maintains documentation to confirm that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries (if not covered under national law). Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers. Written contract of employer responsibility to cover accident costs is acceptable evidence in place of insurance.	y				Insurance is provided.
6.5.6	Note: If the farm outsources its diving operations to an independent company, the farm shall					
	a. Employer keeps records of farm diving operations and a list of all personnel involved. In case an external service provider was hired, a statement that provider conformed to all relevant criteria must be made available to the auditor by this provider.	y				Evaluations of Diver companies are in place. The records of diving activities maintained.
	b. Employer maintains evidence of diver certification (e.g. copies of certificates) for each person involved in diving operations. Divers shall be certified through an accredited national or international organization for diver certification.	y				Copies of divers certificates are maintained.
Criterion 6.6 Wages						
	Compliance Criteria					
6.6.1	a. Employer keeps documents to show the legal minimum wage in the country of operation. If there is no legal minimum wage in the country, the employer keeps documents to show the industry-standard minimum wage.	y				Salaries are defined in protocols of collective bargaining agreements' with TU.
	b. Employer's records (e.g. payroll) confirm that worker's wages for a standard work week (≤ 48 hours) always meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. If there is no legal minimum wage, the	y				Timesheets are managed at sites.
	c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				Interview confirms fair salaries
Footnote	[136] Basic wage: The wages paid for a standard working week (no more than 48 hours).					
Footnote	[137] If there is no legal minimum wage in a country, basic wages must meet the industry-standard minimum wage.					
6.6.2	a. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and the use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages. Includes review of any national basic needs wage recommendations from credible sources such as national universities or government.	y				The BNW calculation based on statistical data.
	b. Employer has calculated the basic needs wage for farm workers and has compared it to the basic (i.e. current) wage for their farm workers.	y				Comparison is done.
	c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	y				It is paid above the BNW
Footnote	[138] Basic needs wage: A wage that covers the basic needs of an individual or family, including					
6.6.3	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.	y				The contracts refer to internal MH documents
	b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.	y				Method is understood by workers,
	c. Employer renders wages and benefits in a way that is convenient for the worker (e.g. cash, check, or electronic payment methods). Workers do not have to travel to collect benefits nor do they receive promissory notes, coupons or merchandise in lieu of payment.	y				Payments are made into personal bank accounts.
	d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[139] Payments shall be rendered to workers in a convenient manner.					

Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting						
	Compliance Criteria					
6.7.1	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.	y				Contracts are maintained
	b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.	y				No Labour-only contracting
	c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[141] Labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes are not acceptable. This includes revolving/consecutive labor contracts to deny benefit accrual or equitable remuneration. 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 underage workers. 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.					
6.7.2	a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible practices and policies.	y				The requirements in contracts to follow CoC. Obs.: Second party audits applied, the H&S part is covered, but no relative check of application of MH CoC principles.
	b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.	n	x			NC: No criteria present for evaluation of suppliers and contractors against requirements in clause 6 of the standard.
	c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.	n	x			NC: No records are available of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2
Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution						
	Compliance Criteria					
6.8.1	a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.	y				Policy is in place
	b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access.	y				Workers demonstrate good understanding
	c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. complaint or grievance filings, minutes from review meetings) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	y				No conflict cases identified.
6.8.2	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised.	y				No cases reported
	b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed.	y				No records, as were no cases.
	c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe.	y				No records, as were no cases.
Footnote	[142] Addressed: Acknowledged and received, moving through the company's process for grievances, corrective action taken when necessary.					
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices						
	Compliance criteria					
6.9.1	a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity.	y				No evidences of incorrect behaviour.
	b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors.	y				It is checked during OHS checks at the site. HR organised annual personnel surveys as well.
	c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.	y				The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[144] Mental Abuse: Characterized by the intentional use of power, including verbal abuse, isolation, sexual or racial harassment, intimidation or threat of physical force.					
6.9.2	a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [143].	y				Presented in Code of conduct
	b. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. worker evaluation reports) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that the disciplinary action policy is fair and effective.	y				The interviews has confirmed fair and effective disciplinary policy.
Footnote	[143] If disciplinary action is required, progressive verbal and written warnings shall be engaged. The aim shall always be to improve the worker; dismissal shall be the last resort. Policies for bonuses, incentives, access to training and promotions are clearly stated and understood, and not used arbitrarily. Fines or basic wage deductions shall not be acceptable disciplinary practices.					
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime						
	Compliance criteria					
	Note: Working hours, night work and rest periods for workers in agriculture should be in accordance with national laws and regulations or collective agreements (e.g. The Safety and Health in Agriculture Convention, 2001). Additional information can be found on the website of the International Labour Organization (www.ilo.org).					

6.10.1	a. Employer has documentation showing the legal requirements for working hours and overtime in the region where the farm operates. If local legislation allows workers to exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime) then requirements of the international standards apply.	y				The scheme 12-9 is used as agreed with Trade unions.
	b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law.	y				The working time is managed within legal requirements with exception to case in 6.2.2.
	c. If an employer requires employees to work shifts at the farm (e.g. 10 days on and six days off), the employer compensates workers with an equivalent time off in the calendar month and there is evidence that employees have agreed to this schedule (e.g. in the hiring contract).	y				The scheme 12-9 is used as agreed with Trade unions.
	d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	y				The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[145] In cases where local legislation on working hours and overtime exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime), the international standards will apply.					
6.10.2	a. Payment records (e.g. payslips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours.	y				Overtime is paid at premium rate
	b. Overtime is limited and occurs in exceptional circumstances as evidenced by farm records (e.g. production records, time sheets, and other records of working hours).	y				Overtime is limited ti exceptional circumstances
	c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that all overtime is voluntary except where there is a collective bargaining agreement which specifically allows for compulsory overtime.	y				The interviews has confirmed voluntary overtime with exception to cases agreed in collective bargaining agreement.
Footnote	[146] Compulsory overtime is permitted if previously agreed to under a collective bargaining agreement.					
Footnote	[147] Premium rate: A rate of pay higher than the regular work week rate. Must comply with national laws/regulations and/or industry standards.					
Criterion 6.11 Education and training						
Compliance criteria						
6.11.1	a. Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers. Company provides incentives (e.g. subsidies for tuition or textbooks, time off prior to exams, flexibility in work schedule) that encourage workers to participate in educational initiatives. Note that such offers may be contingent on workers committing to stay with the company for a pre-arranged time.	y				Policy in place. The financial support for training is given.
	b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).	y				Records available in personal files
	c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	y				The interviews has confirmed education encouraging by managers.
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility						
Compliance criteria						
6.12.1	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.	y				Company level policies in place
	b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located.	y				Approved
	c. The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covers all company operations relating to salmonid production in the region (i.e. all smolt production facilities, grow-out facilities and processing plants).	y				Applied in whole company
	d. The site that is applying for certification provides auditors with access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above).	y				Policies verified
Footnote	[148] Applies to the headquarters of the company in a region or country where the site applying for certification is located. The policy shall relate to all of the company's operations in the region or country, including grow-out, smolt production and processing facilities.					
Social requirements in the standards shall be audited by an individual who is a lead auditor in conformity with SAAS Procedure 200 section 3.1.						
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN						
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement						
Compliance Criteria						
7.1.1	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).	y				Meetings are held several meetings in 2013 and 2014
	b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.	y				Content of consultations meets requirements of the standard
	c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.	y				The participation of representatives ensured.

7.1.1	d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3).	y				Content of consultations meets requirements of the standard
	e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.	y				Minutes of meetings available
	f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.				N/A	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[149] Regular and meaningful: Meetings shall be held at least bi-annually with elected representatives of affected communities. The agenda for the meetings should in part be set by the community representatives. Participatory Social Impact Assessment methods may be one option to consider here.					
7.1.2	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations.	y				Procedure is developed for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders.
	b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder	y				No complains received.
	c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).	y				No complains received.
	d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complaintants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.				N/A	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[150] Effective: In order to demonstrate that the mechanism is effective, evidence of resolutions of complaints can be given.					
7.1.3	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (use of aneastatic baths is not regarded a therapeutant)	y				The signs will be used at the sites during the treatment.
	b. Notices (above) are posted where they will be visible to affected stakeholders (e.g. posted on waterways for fishermen who pass by the farm).	y				No application of sings were needed.
	c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1)	y				It was communicated during consultation meetings.
	d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.				N/A	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[151] Signage shall be visible to mariners and, for example, to fishermen passing by the farm.					
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories						
Compliance Criteria						
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 7.2 - Traditional Territories of Indigenous Groups						
7.2.1	a. Documentary evidence establishes that the farm does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]). If not then the requirements of 7.2.1 do not apply.				N/A	It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.
	b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.				N/A	
	c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR - farm confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence.				N/A	
	d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.				N/A	
7.2.2	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm.				N/A	
	b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.				N/A	
Footnote	[152] All standards related to indigenous rights only apply where relevant, based on proximity of indigenous territories.					
7.2.3	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm.				N/A	
	b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) reached a protocol agreement with the indigenous community and this fact is documented; or				N/A	
	c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.				N/A	
Footnote	[153] To demonstrate an active process, a farm must show ongoing efforts to communicate with indigenous communities, an understanding of key community concerns and responsiveness to key community concerns through adaptive farm management and other actions.					
Criterion 7.3 Access to resources						
Compliance Criteria						
	a. Resources that are vital [155] to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under Indicator 7.3.2).	y				It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.

7.3.1	b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.	y				It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.
	c. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has not restricted access to vital resources without prior community approval.				N/A	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[154] Vital community resources can include freshwater, land or other natural resources that communities rely on for their livelihood. If a farm site were to block, for example, a community's sole access point to a needed freshwater resource, this would be unacceptable under the Dialogue					
7.3.2	a. There is a documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources. Can be completed as part of community consultations under 7.1.1.	y				It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.
	b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.				N/A	No interview were used with stakeholders
INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION A farm seeking certification must have documentation from all of its smolt suppliers to demonstrate compliance with the following standards. The requirements are, in general, a subset of the standards in Principles 1 through 7, focusing on the impacts that are most relevant for smolt facilities. In addition, specific standards are applied to open systems (net pens), and to closed and semi-closed systems (recirculation and flow-through).						**13482 Kvinge**
Footnote	[155] The SAD SC proposes this approach to addressing environmental and social performance during the smolt phase of production. In the medium term, the SC anticipates a system to audit smolt production facilities on site. In the meantime, farms will need to work with their smolt suppliers to generate the necessary documentation to demonstrate compliance with the standards. The documentation will be reviewed as part of the audit at the grow-out facility.					
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT						
Standards related to Principle 1						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
8.1	A. Review the farm's list of smolt suppliers. Confirm that the client submitted to ASC information on the type of production system used by smolt suppliers (Appendix VI).	Y				Submitted ASC. Confirmed by ASC in mail 24.09.14
	B. Verify that client obtains copies of legal authorisation from smolt suppliers (if applicable).	Y				F. Mannen loc #13482 Kvinge permit. 05.07.07, ,5 mill smolt 500 t BM. Fylkesmannen Discharge permit dt 07.06.2007 for 500t feed. , NVE permit on abstaction, dt 22.07.2004 @ 600l minimum residual, and lake water level defined NFSA permit dt 20.04.2007
	C. Verify that farm obtains records from smolt suppliers to show compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements.	Y				F. Dir inspction report dt 28.01.13 , all issues closed and CA approved 24.06. 13
	D. Verify that farm keeps records to show how smolt suppliers comply with regulations on discharge and applicable permitting requirements related to water quality.	Y				Int. Environmental report. 2013 and NC system docs. Shows no registration of NC given form aut. Inspections. F. Dir inspction report dt 28.01.13 , all issues closed and CA approved 24.06. 13
8.2	A. Verify farm obtains declaration from smolt suppliers.	Y				Int. statement presented (Code of conduct) an "Personaløguiden" int handbook (online) on labor issues. With internal rules and public regulations. MH mob. Phone app. for reproting/communicating e.g OHAS isssues. Internl OHAS inspetioons performed twice a year, included elected employee representative.

	B. Verify that farm obtains inspection records from suppliers (as applicable).	Y				MH OHAS coordiantor states no inspections relating labour conditions/issues has been held by auhtorities.
Standards related to Principle 2						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
	Note: If the smolt facility has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity					
8.3	A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I-3.	Y				Miljøovervåking - survey (MOM-B resipient survey dt Feb 2013 by Rådgivende Biologer (www.radgivende-biologer.no) next planned 2018 by j. also int Risk Ananlysis. Also Rådgiv. Biol environmental assessment report dt.02.05.2006. RA ID 30682 consider Env.Risks,with contingency plans and refs rro relevant public regulations.
	B. Review declaration.	Y				Internal env. Report Kvinge 2013 addressing potential env. Impacts from operations.
8.4	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.4 - Calculating Total Phosphorus Released per Ton of Fish Produced** Farms must confirm that each of their smolt suppliers complies with the requirement of indicator 8.4. This specifies the maximum amount of phosphorus that a smolt production facility can release into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period. The requirement is set at 5 kg/mt for the first three years from date of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard (i.e. from June 13, 2012 until June 12, 2015), dropping to 4 kg/mt thereafter. The calculation of total phosphorus released is made using a "mass balance" approach. Detailed instructions and formulas are given in Appendix VIII-1. If applicable, farms may take account of any physical removals of phosphorus in the form of sludge provided there is evidence to show: - the smolt supplier has records showing the total quantity of sludge removed from site over the relevant time period;					
	A. Verify that farm has records for feeds used by smolt suppliers over the relevant time period.	Y				552 000kg feed for calendar yr 2013
	B. Verify that farm has records showing that smolt supplier determined phosphorus content in feeds.	Y				1,44 %
	C. Confirm that calculations are done according to Appendix VIII-1.	Y				19,51 kg P/mt BM
	D. Verify that farm obtained from the smolt supplier all records needed to calculate the amount of biomass produced during the past 12 months.	Y				472 500kg
	E. Confirm that calculations are done according to Appendix VIII-1.	Y				OK
	F. As applicable, verify farm has records showing that smolt supplier determined the amount of phosphorus removed from the system as sludge.	Y			NA	No sludge produced
	G. Review calculations to confirm that the farm's smolt supplier(s) do not exceed requirements for release of phosphorus.				NA	VR accepted by ASC 09.14
Standards related to Principle 3						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
	A. Verify that the farm has evidence that their smolt suppliers do not produce non-native species. If the farm can show that smolt suppliers produces only native species, then Indicator 8.5 does not apply.				NA	S. salar native to region.

8.5	B. If applicable, verify the farm has evidence from smolt suppliers confirming when the non-native species was first brought into wide commercial production in the area where production is occurring now.				NA	S. salar native to region.
	C. Review evidence to confirm that smolt suppliers use only 100% sterile fish.				NA	S. salar native to region.
	D. Review evidence that the farm's smolt suppliers comply with each point raised in 8.5d.				NA	S. salar native to region.
	E. Verify that farm retains evidence of compliance by all smolt suppliers.				NA	S. salar native to region.
Footnote	[156] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.					
Footnote	[157] Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical barriers that are in place and well-maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.					
8.6	A. Review the farm's records for escape monitoring by the smolt supplier to confirm completeness and accuracy of information.	Y				Int RA with instruction for regs and repor tin. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Dir. escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)
	B. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that the smolt supplier complied with the requirement.	Y				No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Dir. escape incidents overviw (www.F.Dir.no)
	C. Confirm that the farm informs their smolt suppliers that they must maintain records for escape monitoring for > 10 years.	Y				Internal smolt supplier. Common QM system.
	D. Review the farm's request for a rare exception to the Standard for an escape event at the smolt production site. Confirm no prior exceptional events were documented during the previous 10 years, or since the date of the start of the production cycle during which the farm first applied for certification. An example of an exceptional event is vandalization of the farm. Events that are not considered exceptional include failures in moorings due to bad weather and boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the smolt production facility.				NA	Int RA with instruction for regs and reporting. No incident reported.
Footnote	[158] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregated number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish.					
Footnote	[159] A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside of the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. Extreme weather (e.g., 100-year storms) or accidents caused by farms located near high-traffic waterways are not intended to be covered under this exception.					
8.7	A. Confirm that the farm keeps records of counting accuracy for the counting technology or method used on site at stocking and harvest.	Y				AquaScan electronic counting/registartion system docs presneted. Decl +/- max 2%.. VAKI Macro stating 99% accuarcy. Verified by provider specs.

	B. Verify that farm has records showing that the accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	Y				AquaScan electronic counting/registartion system docs presneted. Decl +/- max 2%.. VAKI Macro stating 99% accuarcy. Verified by provider specs.
Footnote	[160] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand counts.					
Standards related to Principle 4						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
8.8	A. Confirm that the farm has relevant policies on file from each smolt supplier and review those policies to verify the farm's suppliers are in compliance with the requirement.	Y				MH int doc "Avfallsplan Kvingo" with autorised service provider NGIR defined, type of waste defined, domestic, special waste/chemicals, for recycling etc. Overview over produced waste inannual Env. Report (Miljørapport 2013). Inr Proc ID 30346 on waste policies
8.9	Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.1.					
	A. Verify that the farm obtains records for energy consumption from smolt suppliers.	Y				Records OK
	B. Verify that the farm has reviewed the supplier's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	Y				2 057 701 kWh/purchased electricity and 95640 l diesel/10 678 612kJ(scope 1&2)
	C. Verify that the farm has supplier records for total weight of fish produced during the last year.	Y				472500 kg BM produced
	D. Verify that the farm has records to show that the smolt supplier's calculations are complete and accurate.	Y				22,6kJ/Mt BM produced
	E. Verify that the farm has evidence that its smolt supplier(s) has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the supplier's energy consumption.	Y				In Env. Reprot2013 from Kvingo
8.10	Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.2.					
	A. Verify that the farm obtains records of GHG emissions from smolt suppliers.					Records OK
	B. Verify that the farm confirms that calculations by smolt suppliers are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1.	Y				Scope 1 onfarm genreated energy= 263 966,. Kg CO 2 (conv.factor is 2,76) Scope 2 emission =864 234 kg CO2
	C. Verify that the farm has records from smolt suppliers for all emissions factors used and their sources.	Y				2 057 701 kWh/ purchased electricity and 95640 l diesel/10 678 612kJ(Scope 1&2).
	D. Verify that the farm has records from smolt suppliers for all GWPs used and their sources.				NA	CO2 used
	E. Verify that the farm has evidence that smolt suppliers undergo a GHG assessment annually and that the methods used are in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.				NA	CO2 used
Footnote	[161] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO_2); methane (CH_4); nitrous oxide (N2O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6).					
Footnote	[162] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.					
Standards related to Principle 5						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					

8.11	A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of fish health management plans from smolt suppliers.	Y				Seen FHMP 3 parts Corporate (Norway), Regional (Reg. Sør) and local (site)components. Incl. external Vet service "Akvavet Gulen", Resp. Vet. Aud Asheim
	B. Verify that farm has evidence that supplier's fish health management plan was approved by designated veterinarian.	Y				Seen FHMP, approval dt 19.12.13 documented. With rsponsibles named.
8.12	A. Review list and the supporting analysis.	Y				In FHMP/VHP(Regionaal. and Loca)l type of disease and control monitoring strategy, vaccine/pathogen type/product name.
	B. Review list and the supporting analysis.	Y				In FHMP/VHP type of disease and control monitoring strategy, vaccine/pathogen type/product name.
	C. Verify client has the list from the smolt supplier(s).	Y				In smolt CV with dates ant type for smolts in Skipningsdalen site, 100% vaccination is a legal requirement controlled by NFSA
	D. Cross-check lists to verify that all required vaccines were received by all batches of smolt received by the farm during the current production cycle.	Y				100% vaccinated according to legislation. And verified in smolt CV verified towards reqs. In FHP.
Footnote	[163] The farm's designated veterinarian is responsible for undertaking and providing written documentation of the analysis of the diseases that pose a risk in the region and the vaccines that are effective. The veterinarian shall determine which vaccinations to use and demonstrate to the auditor that this decision is consistent with the analysis.					
8.13	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.13-- Testing of Smolt for Select Diseases** The farm is responsible for developing and maintaining a list of diseases of regional concern for which each smolt group should be tested. The list of diseases shall include diseases that originate in freshwater and are proven or suspected to occur in seawater (and for which seawater fish-to-fish transmission is a concern). The designated veterinarian to the smolt supplier is required to evaluate, based on scientific criteria and publicly available information, which diseases should be tested for. This analysis shall include an evaluation of whether clinical disease or a pathogen carrier state in fresh water is deemed to have a negative impact on the grow-out phase, thereby disqualifying a smolt group from being transferred. The analysis must be available to the CAB upon request. Note: A "smolt group" is defined as a population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry, and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents for each group.					
	A. Review list. If auditor has questions about the list, request and review supporting analysis.	Y				Vets visits, list.according tolocal VHP predetermined sampling and visits regime defined in plan..
	B. Verify records show that each smolt group was tested prior to entering the water at the farm (the grow-out site).	Y				Vets visits according to VHP. Smolt group health certificate dt 02.09,13 by Akvavet Gulen Report# BR 13559, signed Vet. S .Strandos .
Footnote	[164] A smolt group is any population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents for each group. Only diseases that are proven, or suspected, as occurring in seawater (and for which seawater fish-to-fish transmission is a concern) but originating in freshwater should be on the list of diseases tested. The designated veterinarian to the smolt farm is required to evaluate, based on scientific criteria and publicly available information, which diseases should be tested for. This analysis shall include					

8.14	A. Review records of chemical and therapeutant use for completeness and confirm the records were signed by a qualified veterinarian.	Y				Vaccines only therpeutant used, as in fish CV in AquaFarmer aacording to FHP - type and producer and batch. Prescription signed by resp. FHB/Vet. No other terapeutant used on fish. Vaccines by Pharmaq and Novax. Formalin treatment 15.03.13 and anaesthetics only.
8.15	A. Verify list has been provided and is consistent with the list in 5.2.2a.	Y				MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined
	B. Verify that the farm informed the smolt supplier.	Y				MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined. Internal smolt supplier.
	C. Review farm's comparison to verify accuracy.	Y				Vaccines only as in fish CV in AquaFarmer - type and producer and batch. Prescription signed by resp. FHB/Vet. Ananesthetics and 01 antiparasite treament formlin. OK according to list.
Footnote	[165] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance.					
Footnote	[166] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.					
8.16	A. Verify farm obtains treatment records from smolt supplier (See also 8.14A).				NA	NO AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed
	B. Confirm that the smolt supplier used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.				NA	NO AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed
8.17	A. Confirm that the farm provided smolt supplier with the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics.	Y			NA	market requirements used) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined,: against WHO critical list.
	B. Verify that the farm informed the smolt supplier.	Y				MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined
	C. Review farm's comparison to verify accuracy.	Y				NO AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identifed Compared to WHO critical list.
Footnote	[167] The 3rd edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at:					
Footnote	[168] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.					
8.18	Note: see instructions for Indicator 5.4.3 regarding evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.					
	A. Verify that farm has provided the smolt supplier with copies of (or access to) the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Y				OIE list in internal system. Procedures and instructions in common system.
	B. Confirm that the farm informed its smolt supplier(s) that any supplier to an ASC certified farm must show compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Y				OIE list in internal system. Procedures and instructions in common system.

	C. Review the smolt supplier's declaration and supporting policies and procedures to verify compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Y				OIE list in internal system. Procedures and instructions in common system.
Footnote	[169] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Exotic signifies not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen).					
Footnote	[170] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171.					
Standards related to Principle 6						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
8.19	A. Verify that farm obtains copies of company-level policies and procedures from all of its smolt suppliers and a declaration of compliance.	Y				Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used.
	B. Review supplier documents provided by the farm to verify compliance of the smolt supplier's policies and procedures with labor requirements.	Y				Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used.
Standards related to Principle 7						
	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
8.20	**Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.20 - Consultation and Engagement with Community Representatives** Farms must comply with Indicator 7.1.1 which requires that farms engage in regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations. Under Indicator 8.20, farms must show how each of their smolt suppliers complies with an equivalent requirement. Farms are obligated to maintain evidence that is sufficient to show their suppliers remain in full compliance. Evidence shall be documentary (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) and will substantiate the following: - the smolt supplier engaged in "regular" consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually); - the supplier's consultations were effective (e.g. using participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or similar methods); and - the supplier's consultations included participation by elected representatives from the local					
	A. Verify that farm obtains required information from each smolt supplier.	Y				Meetings were organised 2014-08
	B. Review evidence for compliance.	Y				The documents were reviewed.
8.21	A. Verify that farm obtains copies of supplier's complaints procedures from each of its smolt suppliers.	Y				Internal Smolt supplier used. Company procedures are used. See Principle 7.1.2.
8.22	A. Review evidence to determine whether Indicator 8.22 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s).	Y				It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites. No indigenous groups present in neighbourhood.
	B. Verify that the smolt supplier complies with relevant requirements.				N/A	
8.23	A. Review evidence to determine whether Indicator 8.23 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s).				N/A	
	B. Review documentary evidence to confirm that the smolt supplier has undertaken proactive consultations.				N/A	

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT AND FOR CLOSED/SEMICLOSED SYSTEMS DISCHARGING TO FRESHWATER ARE BOTH NA					