



# Aquaculture Stewardship Council Audit Report for Farms Salmon

## Lerøy Aurora AS

Dato:	18. - 22. November 2013	Ved:	BUREAU VERITAS Certification - Danmark- Oldenborggade 2, 7000 Fredericia, Denmark
Kunde :	Lerøy Aurora		REVISJONS TEAM : Irene watten, ASC Lead Auditor, Stine Josefson, LA SA 8000
Kontakt (Revidert person):	Gudrun Gunnarsdottir		
RAPPORT REFERANSE :	ASC -	RAPPORTERING :	18.11.2013 - 21.01.2014
REVISJONSLEDER :	Irene Watten		GJENNOMGANG AV RAPPORT

GJENNOMGANG / FORMÅL	FØRSTEGANG	x
	VEDLIKEHOLD	
	KOMPLETT /SUPPLEMENT	

### 1. Sammendrag:

Rapporten viser resultatene av den første revisjonen hos Lerøy Aurora, på Gourtesjohka sjønlegg i Kåfjorden, som har som mål å bli sertifisert iht. ASC Salmon Standard. Revisjonen foregikk over tre dager. Første revisjonsdag ble gjennomført ute på sjønlegget hvor det var intervjuer med ansatte og gjennomgang av dokumentasjon, samt visning av utsyr og prosesser. Dag to og tre av revisjonen ble gjennomført på hovedkontoret til Lerøy Aurora i Tromsø siden det der var lettere å få tilgang til nødvendig dokumentasjon og kompetanse innenfor de forskjellige områdene. Kap. 6 og den sosiale delen av revisjonen: Revisor ble gitt adgang til alle ønsket steder, ansatte og data Konfidensielle intervjuer ble godtatt og det var revisors forståelse at de intervjuede ansatte svarte på spørsmålene uten frykt for represalier. generelt virker det som om HMS er svært godt ivaretatt. Ingen tegn til diskriminering, tvangsarbeid, barnearbeid, fysisk eller mentalt press. Det er valgfritt om en ønsker å være med i en interesseorganisasjon etc. Konfidensielle intervjuer ble gjennomført med tre ansatte som var på arbeid den dagen revisjonen ble gjennomført. Generelt var de intervjuede ansatte svært fornøyde med å arbeide i selskapet og ville gjerne anbefale en jobb i selskapet til en god venn. Resultatet av ASC- revisjonen gav 10 større avvik og 10 mindre avvik.. De er dokumentert og detaljert beskrevet i seksjon non-conformity report.

### 2. Bakgrunnsopplysninger om sjønlegget:

Gourtesjohka sjønlegg, med lokalitetsnummer 10734 er et påvekstanlegg for atlantisk laks fra smoltstadiet og fram til slaking. Anlegget er lokalisert i Kåfjorden og Kåfjord Kommune i Troms Fylke. Se [www.Fiskeridirektoratet.no/akvakulturregisteret](http://www.Fiskeridirektoratet.no/akvakulturregisteret) .

### 3.Omfang:

STANDARD	ASC Salmon Standard Version 1.0 - June 2012
Aktivitet og omfang av revisjonen:	På Gourtesjohka drives oppdrett av atlantisk laks fram til slaking. Oppdrettet foregår i merder. Kontroll med fisken samføring av fisken foregår ut fra en flåte som er plassert nært opp til merdene. Anlegget har også en landbase med kontor og lager, der de ansatte også skifter til arbeidstøy for de drar ut på lokaliteten. Anlegget har en MTB på 3600 tonn laks.
Art :	Atlantisk Laks (Salmo Salar)
Omgivelser :	Anlegget ligger i Kåfjorden, som eneste oppdrettsanlegg i denne fjorden. Nærmesteoppdrettsanlegg tilhører også Lerøy Aurora og ligger i Lyngenfjorden. Det finnes naturlige ville laksefiskbestander innenfor en radius på 75 km, som Reisavassdraget og Målselvvassdraget i Troms Fylke.

**4. Revisjonsplan:**

Dokumentgjennomgang før revisjonen

Dokumentgjennomgang okt. 2013

Konsultasjon av eventuelle interessenter

Steder for selskapet som berøres af ASC. <b>Før hvert anlegg vis:</b>	Anleggets navn :	Gourtessjohka
	Adresse :	Strandveien 106, 9006 Tromsø, Norway
	Kontakt :	Gudrun Gunnarsdottir
	Navn og funksjon på personer konsultert eller på annen måte involvert i revisjonen:	Renate Larsen: Daglig leder Lerøy Aurora, Gudrun Gunnarsdottir: Kvalitetskoordinator, Hugo Nilsen: ansv. Produksjonsutstyr, Hans Otto Larsen: Driftsleder, Bjørn Mikalsen, Driftsleder, Marita Gundersen: Røkter, Jørgen Waltenberg: Røkter, Håvard Hårstad: Fiskehelsesjef, Erik Monsen: Tilsynsansvarlig Fiskehelse, Roy Tore Rikhardsen: Produksjonsjef
Dato for besøkene :	Revisjon på Gourtessjohka sin lokalitet: 18.11.2013, Revisjon og dokumentgjennomgang på hovedkontoret: 19. og 22.11.2013, Revisjon og dokumentgjennomgang av smoltelverandør: 22.11.2013, Sosial responsibility: 21.01.2014	

**Tidligere revisjoner (hvis gjeldende):**

Ingen tidligere ASC revisjoner er gjennomført på denne lokaliteten. Hos Lerøy Aurora er det gjennomført revisjon på Årøya og Gourtessjohka.

**5. Funn**

	Tidligere revisjoner			Denne revisjonen		
	Antall	Referanse avvik	Åpen/lukket	Antall	Referanse avvik	Åpen/ lukket
<b>Observasjoner</b>	NA	NA	NA	-		
<b>Mindre avvik</b>	NA	NA	NA	10		Åpen
<b>Større avvik</b>	NA	NA	NA	10		Åpen

Status sertifisering :

**6. Resultat av evalueringen:**

Lerøy Aurora har et robust og godt implementert kavalitetssystem som dekker hele organisasjonen fra smolt til ferdig slaktet fisk. Selskapet er sertifisert for Globalgap i hele kjeden. Revisjonen ble utført på Gourtessjohka og Lerøy Aurora sitt hovedkontor i Tromsø. Laksefjords smoltanlegg i Finnmark ble ikke besøkt. Det ble gjennomført Chain of Custody audit på slakteriet 21. okt.2013. Lerøy Aurora er et selskap som viser stort engasjement vedrørende sine ansatte, både når det gjelder helse, miljø og sikkerhet, sosiale krav og norsk lovverk. Det ble ikke gjort funn som indikerer interne kritiske krav eller alvorlige arbeidsulykker. Anlegget er vedrevet med aktuelle dokumentasjoner og de ansatte er godt opplært i interne prosedyrer. Dessuten er det et høyt nivå i hele Lerøy Aurora for å oppnå bedre kunnskap og kontinuerlig opplæring av alle ansatte. Det kom også tydelig fram under intervjuene at arbeidet med ASC standarden ble svært godt mottatt av de ansatte. Alle aktuelle pre-revisjonsdata var tilgjengelige før revisjonen. Dessuten hadde revisorene åpen tilgang til all dokumentasjon og kvalitetssystem.

**7. Avviksrapport(er)**

Venligst se vedlagte avviksrapporter

## 8. Bestemmelse av startpunkt for CoC

Det er nødvendig med COC sertifisering fra det punktet hvor den direkte kontrollen med fisken endres. Det skjer når fisken blir overført fra brønnbåt og pumpes over i ventemerd. Fisken kommer da under slakteriet sitt COC sertifikat for å kunne oppfylle ASC Salmon Standard sine sertifiseringstatus. Fra ventemerd hvor fisken blir stående 1 - 2 dager blir den pumpet inn i slakteriet, bedøvd, avlivet og utblødd, før den blir sortert og videre foredlet eller direkte pakket. Dette skjer på Lerøy Aurora sitt slakteri på Skjervøy.

### Bestemmelse for oppstart av Chains of Custody og hvilket punkt det kan starte

Evaluering av om systemet for sporing og segregering i akvakultur driften er tilstrekkelig til å sørge for at alle akvakulturprodukter som er identifisert og solgt som sertifisert, stammer fra driften i den sertifiserte enheten

Element	Risiko grad			Kommentarer og bevis
	Lav risiko	Medium risiko	Høy risk	
1. Sporingssystem i bruk	x			Lerøy Aurora er sertifisert ihht. Globalgap
2. Muligheter for substitusjon før eller ved høsting	x			Liten mulighet for substitusjon
3. Mulighet for å innføre produkt utenfor sertifisert enhet		x		Høstet laks som stammer fra enkelte eksterne smoltelverandører
4. Robusthet av styringssystemet	x			Robust styringssystem
5. Eventuelle omlastingsaktiviteter som foregår	x			Brønnbåt er underleverandør, men chartret
6. Antall og plassering av merdene det hentes fisk fra	x			det høstes fra en not om gangen

Anbefaling fra revisor	YES	NO	Kommentar
Systemet er robust, og oppdrettsproduktene kan inngå videre i sertifiserte kjeder og være kvalifisert til å bære the ASC merket.	x		
<i>Beskriv punktet hvor det er endring i eierskap og der COC er nødvendig</i>	Fra det punktet der fisken blir losset fra ventemerd ved slakteriet er det en endring. Det er derfor nødvendig med COC sertifisering for slakteriet til Lerøy Aurora		

Hvis nei inkluder dette i avslutningsrapport

## Konfidensiell komersiell sensitiv informasjon

*Denne rapporten inneholder ikke konfidensiell informasjon*

## Signatur - Godkjenning

Signatur kunde

Signatur auditor

<b>AVGJØRELSE</b>	
Status sertifisering:	Bureau Veritas Certification bestemmer at alle kravene i standarden er tilstrekkelig oppfylt, og har sertifisert Lerøy Aurora SITE OF Gourtesjohka. Et sertifikat er utstedt for omfanget angitt i avsnittet "scope" ovenfor i rapporten. Eventuelle utestående avvik og deres status er oppført i avsnittet "Funn" ovenfor i rapporten.
Dato sertifisering:	07/04/2014
Utløpsdato:	06/04/2017
Omfanget av sertifikatet:	Akvakulturanlegg for laks
Liste over åpne avvik:	Alle avvik funnet ble stengt

Avvik No.	Clause	Beskrivelse av avvik	Årsak	Korrigerende handling rapport	Akseptert	Major	Minor
1	2.1.1 E	Resultatene fra ASC ( miljø-) undersøkelsen for å verifisere at redox potentialiet er ihht. Kravene på hvert målested utenfor AZE er ikke ferdige ved revisjonen	Resultater fra ASC (miljø-) undersøkelsen forelå 19. desember 2013. I rapporten (vedlegg 1) beskrives metoden og resultatene for redox målingene. Alle målingene lå like under kravet i ASC standarden.	Oppdragsgiver ble bedt om å vurdere måling av sulfid i felt, men det viser seg å være vanskelig å gjennomføre. Oppdragsgiver tviler også på om det vil gi noe annet resultat. Det skal gjennomføres en ny strømmåling på lokaliteten for å avklare om bunnstrømmen er svak. Hvis det viser seg å være tilfelle kan det bli aktuelt å søke om flytting av lokaliteten.	17/02/2014	1	
2	2.1.1 G	Resultatene er ikke sendt til ASC	Resultater fra ASC undersøkelsen forelå 19. desember 2013.	Rapporten ble sendt til ASC i januar 2014. Se vedlegg 2.	17/02/2014		1
3	2.1.2 E	Resultatene for å verifisere at fra ASC ( miljø-) undersøkelsene Shannon Wiener score er > 3 på hver målestasjon utenfor AZE er ikke ferdig ved revisjonen	Resultater fra ASC (miljø-) undersøkelsen forelå 19. desember 2013. I rapporten (vedlegg 1) beskrives metoden og resultatene av Shannon Wiener score. 2 av 4 prøver lå like under ASC kravet på >3.	Oppdragsgiver ble bedt om å vurdere de andre metodene og skal i fremtidige undersøkelser se om de andre metodene gir noe annet resultat.	17/02/2014	1	
4	2.1.2 H	Dokumentasjon for å vise metoden som brukes var ikke ferdig ved revisjonen.	Resultater forelå i 19. desember 2013. Metoden er beskrevet i rapporten og faunaanalysen ble utført av akkreditert laboratorium (Marine Bunnndyr AS):	Rapporten følger vedlagt (vedlegg 1).	17/02/2014		1
5	2.1.2 I	Resultatene er ikke sendt til ASC	Resultater fra ASC undersøkelsen forelå i februar 2014.	Rapporten ble sendt til ASC i januar 2014. Se vedlegg 2.	17/02/2014		1
6	2.1.3 B	Sediment prøvene som er tatt innenfor AZE av makro fauna var ikke ferdige ved revisjonen	Resultater forelå i februar 2014. Metoden er beskrevet i rapporten og faunaanalysen ble utført av akkreditert laboratorium (Marine Bunnndyr AS):	Rapporten følger vedlagt (vedlegg 1).	17/02/2014		1
7	2.1.3 D	Dokumenterte bevis for identifisering og metode var ikke frdig ved revisjonen.	Resultater forelå i februar 2014. Metoden er beskrevet i rapporten og faunaanalysen ble utført av akkreditert laboratorium (Marine Bunnndyr AS):	Rapporten følger vedlagt (vedlegg 1).	17/02/2014	1	
8	2.1.3 E	Resultatene er ikke sendt til ASC	Resultater fra ASC undersøkelsen forelå 19. desember 2013.	Rapporten ble sendt til ASC i januar 2014. Se vedlegg 2.	17/02/2014		1
9	2.1.3.C	Faunaanalyser og metode var ikke ferdige ved revisjonen.	Resultater forelå 19. desember 2013. Metoden er beskrevet i rapporten og faunaanalysen ble utført av akkreditert laboratorium (Marine Bunnndyr AS):	Alle måleresultater ligger innenfor kravet til ASC standarden (se vedlegg 1).	17/02/2014	1	
10	2.5.7. A	Manglende risikoanalyse for avlaving av predatorer mangler.	Under revisjonen kunne det ikke legges fram dokumentasjon på gjennomført risikoanalyse.	Risikoanalysen er gjennomført, samt at prosedyre for avlaving av vilt/predatorer er implementert. Skjema for oversikt fylles ut og sendes til hovedkontoret hver måned. Se vedlegg 3.	17/02/2014		1
11	4.1.1 C	Det mangler revisjonsrapport fra fiskeforproduktene som anlegget bruker, gjennomført av sertifiseringsselskap eller annet firma ihht. ASC-sertifiseringen,	Kopi av diverse sertifikater fra forselskapene (Ewos og Skretting) ble lagt fram under revisjonen. I følge auditor var dette ikke nok dokumentasjon.	I vedlegg 4 følger utdrag av revisjonsrapporter fra Skretting og Ewos, samt kopi av sertifikater.	17/02/2014	1	
12	4.1.1 F	Det mangler revisjonsrapporter på anlegget.	Kopi av diverse sertifikater fra forselskapene (Ewos og Skretting) ble lagt fram under revisjonen. I følge auditor var dette ikke nok dokumentasjon.	I vedlegg 4 følger utdrag av revisjonsrapporter fra Skretting og Ewos, samt kopi av sertifikater.	17/02/2014	1	
13	4.3.2 B	Fish source score for fiskeforleveranser fra foret levert til Gourtesjohkas sjøanlegg	Oversikten fra forleverandøren over Fish Source Score ble lagt fram under revisjonen. Der viste det seg at noen få fiskearter (1,5 % av totalen) er scoren ikke i henhold til kravene i ASC standarden.	Ved neste revisjon bør vi kunne dokumentere at vi ligger over kravene i standarden. I vedlegg 5 følger oversikten over Fish Source Score, samt en oversikt over forforbruket på Gourtesjohka siden fisken kom dit i juni 2013. Der fremkommer det at det er brukt Sandeel fra Danmark og Norge i små mengder. I følge	17/02/2014	1	
14	4.3.3 A	Det er ingen rapport fra fiskeforselskapene sine sporbarhetssystem for å vise at de er ihht. 4.3.2	Rapport ble ikke lagt fram under revisjonen i november 2013.	I vedlegg 6 vises sporbarheten til både Ewos og Skretting. I vedlegg 7 og 8 følger rapport fra tredjeparts revisjon.	17/02/2014	1	
15	4.3.3 B	Det foreligger en liste av fiskearter benyttet men ingen resultater fra 3. parts revisjon som dokumentasjon.	Under revisjonen forlås ikke rapport fra tredjeparts revisjon.	I vedlegg 6 vises sporbarheten til både Ewos og Skretting. I vedlegg 7 og 8 følger rapport fra tredjeparts revisjon.	17/02/2014		1
16	4.4.1 C	Det foreligger ingen tredjeparts revisjon av for leverandører som beviser leverandørens politikk er implementert.	Under revisjonen ble dette ikke dokumentert godt nok.	I vedlegg 4 følger utdrag av revisjonsrapporter fra Skretting og Ewos, samt kopi av sertifikater.	17/02/2014		1
17	6.5.1	Manglende dokumentasjon for månedlig check af mobiliseringsbåden.	Under revisjonen viste det seg at selv om de ansatte visste at de skulle sjekke MOB-båten månedlig kunne det ikke dokumenteres at dette ble gjort månedlig.	Proseduren kontroll av sikkerhetsutstyr er gjennomgått på lokalitet, samt at det er presisert at månedlig skal det registreres i utstyrsweben at MOM-båten er kontrollert. Prosedyren og utklipp fra utstyrsweben følger i vedlegg 9.	17/02/2014		1
18	6.5.1	Leverandørbrugsanvisning på Alculu-S er forældet. leverandørbrugsanvisning på siden er dateret 21/7 2007. Den nyeste utgaven er dateret 31/12 2012.	Det ble avdekket at noen sikkerhetsdatablad ikke var av nyeste versjon. I følge prosedyrer skal disse være oppdatert til hver tid. Ved siste oppdatering ble Ecoonline ikke brukt, men der ligger nyeste tilgjengelige versjoner.	Prosedyrer for bruk av kjemikalier og sikkerhetsdatablad er gjennomgått på lokalitet. Lokalitetleder er ansvarlig for å holde sikkerhetsdatabladene vedlike. Driftsleder er gitt tilgang til Ecoonline (elektronisk database) og kvalitetskoordinator abonnerer på endringer i sikkerhetsdatabladene (en tjeneste på Ecoonline). Utgådde sikkerhetsdatabladene er byttet ut med gjeldende versjoner. Se vedlegg 10.	17/02/2014		1
19	6.5.2.	Filter til gasmasker. Filter utløber i følge mærkning på filteret i 2019. Filteret er påsat gasmasken (emballasje er anbrudt) det er uklart hvor længe holdbarheten reelt er når filterets indpakning er anbrudt.	Under revisjonen kunne vi ikke dokumentere levetiden på et filter som var tatt i bruk.	Vi har kontaktet leverandører av produktet og fått vite at ved å oppbevare gasmasken i en lufttett boks kan den reelle holdbarheten være utløpsdatoen på filteret. Dette er dog avhengig av hvor mye filteret har vært brukt. Hvis det er tungt å puste gjennom filteret eller det lukter gass når den er på - må filteret skiftes umiddelbart. Det er nå kjøpt inn lufttette beholdere til gasmaskene og prosedyre (vedlegg 11) er gjennomgått på lokalitet.	17/02/2014		1

20	6.7.2	Det kan ikke dokumenteres at EWOS (leverandør af fiskefoder) har forpligtiget sig til at efterleve,	Under revisjonen ble det lagt fram Ewos sitt code of conduct for suppliers.	I vedlegg 12 følger statement fra Ewos.	17/02/2014		1
----	-------	---	---	---	------------	--	---

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard		385	9	12	133		
Scope: Species belonging to the genus <i>Salmo</i> and <i>Oncorhynchus</i>							
Principle: In order to determine the level of compliance against the ASC Salmon Standard it is essential to use information of completed crop cycle(s), or on a specific point in time in the crop (e.g. stocking for several requirements. For this reason, for first audits, it is necessary for farms to present full data on at least one or more completed crop cycle(s) per site at the time of the assessment.							
PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS							
Criterion 2.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
1.1.1	Indicator: Presence of regulations demonstrating compliance with local and national requirements and requirements on land and water use Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws. b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable. c. Keep records of inspections for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation). d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	A. Review compliance with applicable land and water use laws. B. Confirm client holds original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements or land titles. C. Review inspection records for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (as applicable). 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).	1	1	F. dir. dt 28.2.2013, Gourestsohka, licence 10734, Mattilynet, discharge permit 3600 tons, MTR, dt.21.01.2013	Confirm original agreements. Doc. Records from F.dir., and Mattilynet inspections on the site. F. dir map service and GPS documented. No conflict with preservation areas
1.1.2	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CAB will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public. b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates. c. Register with national or local authorities as an "aquaculture activity".	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. B. Confirm client has a basic knowledge of tax requirements for farm. C. Verify client is registered with local or national authorities.	1	1	Statement from Kemeren, paid on 16.03.2013, Statistatren: 17.09.2013. See above	
1.1.3	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification). b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	A. Confirm client has specified documentation. B. Review inspection records for compliance with national labor laws and codes (as applicable).	1	1	Arbeidsinspektøren: Lovdata: Lov 2005-06-17 nr. 68 Inspection reports: Mattilynet 21.01.2013, F.dir: 01.07.2013	Bransjereguleringer: Statement licence for Aurora 05.08.2013
1.1.4	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable. b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations. c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	A. Verify that client obtains permits as applicable. B. Review evidence of compliance with discharge laws or regulations. C. Verify that records show compliance with discharge laws and regulations.	1	1	As doc. Above Records from F.dir., and Mattilynet inspections on the site and internally registrations from production.	
<b>PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION</b>							
Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		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. See Appendix VI for requirements on							
<b>Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 2.1 - Modification of the Benthic Sampling Methodology</b>							
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							
2.1.1	Indicator: Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix 1-1 Requirement: Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) or Sulphide < 1,500 microMoles / l Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collection stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification [3] to the CAB. b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1.e, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard. d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix 1-1 (i.e. at the time of peak biomass and at all required stations). e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. Site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC.	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (Appendix 1-1) and evidence (if applicable) to justify use of a site specific AZE. B. Review evidence of benthic type and confirm whether to proceed to 2.1.1c. C. Record which option the client chose. D. Review documentary evidence (notes, GPS coordinates) showing sampling time, stations, and frequency. Cross check against farm maps and harvest records. 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. 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. G. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	A map showing sampling stations according to Appendix 1-1 The benthos throughout the whole AZE is not hard bottom The farm chose option #1, analysis of redox potential Samples from the 11 stations has been sampled 21.9.2013, and sent for analyse to FiskeLIV AS Results are not finished 1 1 Results are not sent to ASC	
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 AUTODOPOMOD and verified through							
2.1.2	Indicator: Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix 1-1 Requirement: AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score > 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score > 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score > 25 Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collection stations (see 2.1.1). b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement. c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix 1-1 (see 2.1.1). d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method. e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method. f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method. g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method. h. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analyzed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results. i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (see 2.1.1). B. Record which option the client chose for scoring faunal index. C. Confirm sample collection followed Appendix 1-1 (see 2.1.1). D. Review results (as applicable) to verify that AMBI score of sediments is > 3.3 at each sampling station outside the AZE. E. Review results (as applicable) to verify that Shannon-Wiener score of sediments is > 3 at each sampling station outside the AZE. F. Review results (as applicable) to verify that BQI score of sediments is > 15 at each sampling station outside the AZE. G. Review results (as applicable) to verify that ITI score of sediments is > 25 at each sampling station outside the AZE. H. Confirm that an approved method was used or that a qualified independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index. I. Confirm that client submitted faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	A map showing sampling stations according to Appendix 1-1 The farm chose option #2, Shannon-Wiener Index score Samples from the 11 stations has been sampled 21.9.2013, and sent for analyse to FiskeLIV AS Results are not ready at audit Results are not ready Results are reviewed Results are not ready Results are not ready Results are not sent to ASC	
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							
Footnote [5] <a href="http://www.aquaticlife.eu/ambti-azti-marine-biotic-index.html">http://www.aquaticlife.eu/ambti-azti-marine-biotic-index.html</a>							
2.1.3	Indicator: Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix 1-1 Requirement: > 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b. b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method. c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species. d. Retain documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained. If samples were analyzed by an independent lab, obtain copies of results. e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	A. Confirm appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b. B. Confirm that an appropriate method was used or that a suitably qualified independent laboratory performed the analysis. C. Confirm that all samples from within the AZE have > 2 highly abundant [6] taxa (exclusive of pollution indicator species). D. Confirm that a suitable method was used or that a suitably qualified independent laboratory performed the scoring of faunal index. E. Confirm that client has submitted scores to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	Sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c Results are not ready Results are not ready Results are not ready Results are not sent to ASC	
Footnote [6] Highly abundant: Greater than 100 organisms per square meter (or equally high to reference site) if natural abundance is lower than this level.							
Footnote [7] Robust and credible: The SEPA AUTODOPOMOD 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							
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.							
<b>Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [2]</b>							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
2.2.1	Indicator: Weekly average percent saturation [13] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [14] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix 1-4 Requirement: > 70% [15] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [15]	a. Monitor and record on-farm percent saturation of DO at a minimum of twice daily using a calibrated oxygen meter or equivalent method. For first audits, farm records must cover > 6 months. b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time. c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data. d. If any weekly average DO values are < 70%, or approaching that level, monitor and record DO at a reference site and compare to on-farm levels (see Instructions). e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site. f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	A. Do not schedule audit until client provides a minimum of 6 months of DO data. B. Review records for completeness and conformity with methodology in Appendix 1-4. C. Review calculation and confirm all weekly averages > 70%. D. As needed, review DO data from reference site and document in the audit report (see Instructions). 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. F. Confirm that client has submitted DO results to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	Results from registering of DO in period from 23.7.2012 until this day Results are complete Weekly averages > 70 %, seen as 110 %, 103 %, 91 %, lowest result 7.92 (02.2.13) 31.8.2012 No weekly results < 70 % Monitoring with measuring tube placed in cage, cleaning and changing of sensor cap regular, seen for 3.8.2013	
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 8am and 2pm).							
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	Indicator: Minimum average or weekly samples within the AZE that fall under 2 mg/liter DO. Requirement: < 5% Applicability: All farms except as noted in [15]	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/l DO. b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	A. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that 5% of weekly samples fall under 2 mg/l DO. B. Confirm that client has submitted results to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	No measuring samples fall under 2 mg/l DO Submitted to ASC	
2.2.3	Indicator: For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets [16], demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently [17] classified as having "good" or "very good" water quality [18] Requirement: Yes [19] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Inform the CAB whether relevant targets and classification systems are applicable in the jurisdiction. If applicable, proceed to 2.2.3.b. If not applicable, take action as required under 2.2.4. b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification. c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.	A. Record whether indicator is applicable. 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. C. Confirm that the analysis and classification shows the farm is located in an area where the water quality complies with the requirement.	1	1	Water framework directive has been implemented in Norway, the quality target is that all water occurrence have good water quality before 2015 Havforskningsinstituttet (Institute of marine research) has classified Marnepostale N and P, chlorophyll and oxygen for estimation of condition of water The quality classifying for area has been evaluated 05% as presumed good, 13% good and 7% very good from www.vannret.no	
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							
2.2.4	Indicator: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorus [20] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix 1-5 Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix 1-5, testing a minimum of once weekly in both locations. For first audits, farm records must cover > 6 months. b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations. c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	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 1-5. B. Verify that client calibrates equipment as needed. C. Confirm that client has submitted N and P data to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	Doc. Monitoring plan Calibration of equipment Submitted to ASC	
Footnote [20] Farms shall monitor total N, NH4, NO3, total P and Ortho-P							
<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand</b>							

2.2.5	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [21]) of the farm on a production cycle basis</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.</p> <p>b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.</p>	<p>A. Review calculation, cross-check data used with feed and harvest records.</p> <p>B. Confirm that client has submitted calculated BOD to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	1		<p>Calculation of BOD has been cross checked. N is calculated from protein in feed (38 %) and fish (31 %) using factor 6.25 for calculation for N. C is calculated from 45 and 12 % C in feed and fish respectively</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [21] BOD calculated as: <math>(\text{Total N in feed} - \text{total N in fish}) \times 4.57</math> (Total C in feed - total C in fish) <math>\times 9.73</math>. A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient</p>						
<p><b>Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production</b></p>						
<p><b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b> Note: The methodology given in Appendix 2.2 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.</p>						
<p><b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b></p>						
2.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Percentage of fines [22] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [23] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> &lt; 1% by weight of the feed</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [23]</p>	<p>a. Determine and document a schedule and location for quarterly testing of feed. If testing prior to delivery to farm site, document rationale behind not testing on site.</p> <p>b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations.</p> <p>c. Conduct test according to detailed methodology in Appendix I-2 and record results for the pooled sample for each quarter. For first audits, farms must have test results from the last 3 months.</p>	<p>A. Review timing and location of testing. If testing off-site, verify rationale and ensure consistent with [23].</p> <p>B. Verify that client has appropriate testing technology on site and that, if applicable, it is calibrated as required.</p> <p>C. Review testing results and confirm that the pooled sample for each quarter has a percent fines &lt;1%.</p>	1		<p>Feed are tested at every receiving of feed, results from 6 mm 12.2.2013 0,21 %, no results more than 1 % dust. Sieve calibrated 18.3.2011 regarding visual and size</p> <p>Apparatus with Retsch sieve, has been calibrated 18.3.2011 regarding visual and size</p> <p>Testing results from feed to Gourtessohka from July 2012 - October 2013, every month, no results more than 1 % dust</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [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 3 mm sieve, or particles that separate from feed with a diameter greater than 5 mm when sieved through a 3 mm sieve.</p> <p>[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</p>						
<p><b>Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species</b></p>						
<p><b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b> 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:</p>						
<p><b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b></p>						
2.4.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outlined in Appendix I-3</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Perform (or contract to have performed) a documented assessment of the farm's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3.</p> <p>b. If the assessment (2.4.1a) identifies potential impact(s) of the farm on biodiversity or nearby critical, sensitive or protected habitats or species, prepare plan to address those potential impacts.</p> <p>c. Keep records to show how the farm implements plan(s) from 2.4.1b to minimize potential impacts to critical or sensitive habitats and species.</p>	<p>A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I-3.</p> <p>B. Verify the farm has a plan to address all potential impacts identified in the assessment.</p> <p>C. Verify that the farm implements the plan(s).</p>	1		<p>There is a MoMn analyse from Gourtessohka, state 1. Risk assessment from Høyforbrukningsinstitutt for impact of habitats and species</p> <p>There is environmental assessment from Høyforbrukningsinstitutt for impact from lice and lice treatment. No species listed on IUCN list</p> <p>There are no special plan for area Gourtessohka</p>
<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to Requirements that Farms are not sited within Protected Areas or HCVAs</b></p>						
2.4.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [24] or High Conservation Value Areas [25] (HCVAs)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None [26]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [26]</p>	<p>a. Provide a map showing the location of the farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) as defined above (see step 1.3.1a).</p> <p>b. If the farm is sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Area as defined above, prepare a declaration attesting to this fact. In this case, the requirements of 2.4.2c-d do not apply.</p> <p>c. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVCA, review the scope of applicability of indicator 2.4.2 (see Instructions above) to determine if your farm is allowed an exception to the requirements. If yes, inform the CAB which exception (#1, #2, or #3) is allowed and provide supporting evidence.</p> <p>d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVCA and the exceptions provided for indicator 2.4.2 do not apply, then the farm does not comply with the requirement and is ineligible for ASC certification.</p>	<p>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 HCVCA.</p> <p>B. Obtain a copy of the farm's declaration stating that the farm is not sited in a protected area or HCVCA (as applicable).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>D. Review evidence to determine whether the farm is allowed to be sited in a protected area or HCVCA and hence eligible for ASC certification.</p>	1		<p>A map was shown. Gourtessohka is not in a protected area or HCVCA</p> <p>There is a declaration from farm</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [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."</p> <p>[25] High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs): Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVAs are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a</p> <p>[26] The following exceptions shall be made for Standard 2.4.2:</p>						
<p><b>Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]</b></p>						
<p><b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b> [27] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.6.</p>						
<p><b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b></p>						
2.5.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of days in the production cycle where acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 0, within three years of the date of publication [28] of the S40 standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a written statement affirming that the farm's management is committed to eliminate all usage of acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) by June 13, 2015.</p> <p>b. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs were used by the farm after June 13, 2015 (applicable only after the specified date).</p>	<p>A. Confirm that farm management has prepared a written statement of commitment.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p>	1		<p>There is a declaration from farm</p> <p>There is no use of ADD or AHD at time of audit</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [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.</p>						
2.5.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Prior to the achievement of 2.5.1, if ADDs or AHDs are used, maximum percentage of days [29] in the production cycle that the devices are operational</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 40%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All, until June 13, 2015</p>	<p>a. Maintain a log for the use of any ADDs or AHDs on farm that includes recording the number of days (24-hour cycles) during which the devices were used.</p> <p>b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle.</p> <p>c. Confirm devices were operational 40% of the days of the production cycle.</p> <p>d. Submit data on number of days that ADDs/AHDs were used to the ASC as per Appendix VI. Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	<p>A. Review log and cross-check with records of predator incidents.</p> <p>B. Verify calculations and cross-check against records for the duration of the production cycle.</p> <p>C. Confirm devices were operational 40% of the days of the production cycle.</p> <p>D. Confirm that client has submitted data on ADDs/AHDs to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	1		<p>No use of ADD or AHD</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [29] Day: 24-hour cycle.</p>						
2.5.3	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of mortalities [30] of endangered or red-listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 0 (zero)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.</p> <p>b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.</p> <p>c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.</p> <p>d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.3).</p>	<p>A. Review list.</p> <p>B. Review farm records of predator incidents and cross-check against relevant records (e.g. escapes).</p> <p>C. Review records for completeness. Cross-check mortality records against interviews with farm staff and community representatives.</p> <p>D. Review list for consistency with 2.4.1</p> <p>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.</p>	1		<p>For bird protection, there is a net covering cages</p> <p>There has been no predator incidences, from list at farm, and no red listed animals</p> <p>No mortality of animals or birds</p> <p>No IUCN animal area</p> <p>No mortalities of these animal on farm</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [30] Mortalities: Includes animals intentionally killed through lethal action as well as accidental deaths through entanglement or other means.</p> <p>[31] Species listed as endangered or critically endangered by the IUCN or on a national endangered species list.</p>						
2.5.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [32] against a predator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action</li> <li>Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager</li> <li>Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority</li> </ol> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes [33]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [33]</p>	<p>a. Provide a list of all lethal actions that the farm took against predators during the previous 12-month period. Note: "lethal action" is an action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds.</p> <p>b. For each lethal action identified in 2.5.4a, keep record of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a rationale showing how the farm pursued all other reasonable avenues prior to using lethal action;</li> <li>approval from a senior manager above the farm manager of the lethal action;</li> <li>where applicable, explicit permission was granted by the relevant regulatory authority to take lethal action against the animal.</li> </ol> <p>c. Provide documentary evidence that steps 1-3 above (in 2.5.4b) were taken prior to killing the animal. If human safety was endangered and urgent action necessary, provide documentary evidence as outlined in [33].</p>	<p>A. Review list of lethal actions taken by the farm and cross-check against 2.5.3b.</p> <p>B. Review documentation to confirm that the farm shows evidence of compliance with requirements in steps 1-3.</p> <p>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].</p>	1		<p>No lethal actions at farm</p> <p>Documentation of possible lethal action in document IL1.2.15 in quality system</p> <p>Actions will be documented</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [32] Lethal action: Action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds.</p> <p>[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.</p>						
<p><b>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"</b></p>						
2.5.5	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that information about any lethal incident [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.</p> <p>b. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.</p> <p>c. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>B. Verify that required information is easily publicly available.</p>	1		<p>There has not been lethal actions, and will be published at website</p> <p>There has not been lethal actions, and will be published at website</p> <p>There has not been lethal actions, and will be published at website: <a href="http://www.leroyseafood.com/investor/beskrift/matvarer/iskerth/berlingser/eng/">http://www.leroyseafood.com/investor/beskrift/matvarer/iskerth/berlingser/eng/</a></p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [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.</p>						
2.5.6	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior two years</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> &lt; 9 lethal incidents [36], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.4a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, &gt; 6 months of data are required.</p> <p>b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.</p> <p>c. Send ASC the farm's data for all lethal incidents [35] of any species other than the salmon being farmed (e.g. lethal incidents involving predators such as birds or marine mammals). Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	<p>A. Review log.</p> <p>B. Verify that over the previous two years there were &lt; 9 lethal incidents in total and the 2 of those incidents were marine mammal deaths.</p> <p>C. Confirm that data on all lethal incidents has been submitted to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	1		<p>List for records of lethal actions, no lethal incidents last 6 months</p> <p>List for records of lethal actions, no lethal incidents last 6 months</p>
<p><b>Footnote</b> [35] Lethal incident: Includes all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids.</p> <p>[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.</p>						
2.5.7	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that the farm has undertaken an assessment of the risk of lethal incidents [37] has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidents</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Keep records showing that the farm undertakes an assessment of risk following each lethal incident and how those risk assessments are used to identify concrete steps the farm takes to reduce the risk of future incidents.</p> <p>b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.7a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents.</p>	<p>A. Review farm records to confirm that all the farm performs an appropriate risk assessment following all lethal incidents (see list 2.5.4a).</p> <p>B. Verify that the farm implements steps to reduce risk of lethal incidents.</p>	1		<p>No risk assessment of lethal incidents</p> <p>There has not been lethal incidents</p>
<p><b>PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [38-39]</b></p>						
<p><b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b> [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.</p> <p><b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b> [39] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7.</p>						
<p><b>Instruction to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1</b></p>						
3.1.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Participation in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme for managing disease and resistance to treatments that includes coordination of stocking, following, therapeutic treatments and information-sharing. Detailed requirements are in Appendix II-1.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<p>a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme.</p> <p>b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including: coordination of stocking; following; therapeutic treatments; and information sharing.</p> <p>c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with all requirements in Appendix II-1, including definition of area minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements.</p> <p>d. Submit dates of following period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.</p>	<p>A. Review records of farm participation in ABM scheme. Contact other ABM participants as necessary to confirm the accuracy of client records.</p> <p>B. Review description of ABM to verify that the management activities address each of the four elements from indicator 3.1.1.</p> <p>C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with Appendix II-1.</p> <p>D. Confirm that client has submitted dates of following periods to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	1		<p>Doc. Troms and Finnmark fylker reg. ABM scheme, including plan for 2013. Doc. Records from Fish talk system.</p> <p>Doc. Troms and Finnmark fylker reg. ABM scheme, vet. Reports and Fish-talk production system</p> <p>Doc. In ABM scheme, vet reports and Fish Talk</p> <p>Dates submitted to ASC</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> 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 a. Retain records to show how the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups (NGOs, academics, governments) to agree on and collaborate towards areas of research to measure impacts on wild stocks, including requests for research support and collaboration and responses to those requests.</p>						
<p>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.</p>						



<p>3.1.2</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<p>b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either:                  - providing researchers with access to farm-level data;                  - granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or                  - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way.</p> <p>c. When the farm and/or its operating company denies a request to collaborate on a research project, ensure that there is a written justification for rejecting the proposal.</p> <p>d. Maintain records from research collaborations (e.g. communications with researchers) to show that the farm has supported the research activities identified in 3.1.2a.</p>	<p>B. Review how the farm and/or its operating company has provided non-financial support for research activities.</p> <p>C. As applicable, review the provided record of rejecting proposals to confirm that denial was 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.</p> <p>D. Verify that the farm's communications with researchers demonstrate a commitment to collaborate on relevant areas of research.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Available for UNIFØD, FHL, Akvaplan Niva in different projects</p> <p>Records from FOU activities for FHL, Philips, LSG</p> <p>Several research reports documented</p>	
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[40] <b>Commitment:</b> 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</p>	<p>a. Keep records to show that a maximum sea lice load has been set for:                  - the entire ABM; and                  - the individual farm.</p> <p>b. Maintain evidence that the established maximum sea lice load (3.1.3a) is reviewed annually as outlined in Appendix II-2, incorporating feedback from the monitoring of wild salmon where applicable (see 3.1.6).</p> <p>c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the ABM has set (3.1.3a) and annually reviewed (3.1.3.b) maximum sea lice load in compliance with requirements in Appendix II-2.</p> <p>d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.</p>	<p>A. Review records to confirm compliance.</p> <p>B. Confirm that sea lice load is reviewed annually and, if applicable, the review incorporates information from monitoring of wild salmon.</p> <p>C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with requirements of Appendix II-2 for establishing and reviewing maximum sea lice loads.</p> <p>D. Confirm that client has submitted the ABM maximum sea lice load to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Doc. Reports from January until week 39/40</p> <p>Doc. In the records and in FishTalk</p> <p>Doc. In the records and in FishTalk</p> <p>Data submitted to ASC</p>
<p>3.1.3</p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II-2</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<p>a. Prepare an annual schedule for testing sea lice that identifies timeframes of routine testing frequency (at a minimum, monthly) and for high-frequency testing (weekly) due to sensitive periods for wild salmon (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles).</p> <p>b. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for sea lice. If farm deviates from schedule due to weather [41] maintain documentation of event and rationale.</p> <p>c. Document the methodology used for testing sea lice (testing includes both counting and identifying sea lice). The method must follow national or international norms, follows accepted minimum sample size, use random sampling, and record the species and life-stage of the sea lice. If farm uses a closed production system and would like to use an alternate method (i.e. video), farm shall provide the CAB with details on the method and efficacy of the method.</p> <p>d. Make the testing results from 3.1.4b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within seven days of testing. If requested, provide stakeholders access to hardcopies of test results.</p> <p>e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.</p> <p>f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>B. Review records to confirm that testing follows the farm's annual schedule. Review the rationale for any deviations from the schedule.</p> <p>C. Review the farm's methodology for testing sea lice. If practicable, observe testing while on-site. If a farm is a closed system using an alternate testing method, document the distinction and review evidence of efficacy of the method.</p> <p>D. Test access from an offline computer to confirm that results are easily publicly available, if applicable, confirm that the farm made hardcopies of test results easily available to stakeholders.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>F. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Doc. In F. Dir: "forskrift for metode lusestelling" and internally procedure for counting, registration and reporting of sea lice</p> <p>Weekly counting</p> <p>Method as described in the F.dir. Forskrift for lusestelling and internally procedure</p> <p>Doc. In Lusestada website and LSG website</p> <p>Documentation from each week verified.</p> <p>Data submitted to ASC</p>	
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[41] Testing must be weekly during and immediately prior to sensitive periods for wild salmon, 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 publicly available</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmon Health and Migration</b></p> <p>a. Identify all salmonid species that naturally occur within 75 km of the farm through literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. If the farm is not in an area with wild salmonids, see 3.1.5a and do not apply.</p> <p>b. For species listed in 3.1.5a, compile best available information on migration routes, migration timing (range of months for juvenile outmigration and returning salmon), life history timing for coastal resident salmonids, and stock productivity over time in major waterways within 50 km of the farm.</p> <p>c. From data in 3.1.5b, identify any sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. periods of outmigration of juveniles) within 50 km of the farm.</p>	<p>A. Review salmonid species list for accuracy and cross-check source references. Confirm whether 3.1.5 b and c are applicable.</p> <p>B. Review the accuracy of the farm's information on local salmonid migratory patterns and stock productivity. Cross-check source references as necessary.</p> <p>C. Confirm accuracy of farm's understanding. Cross-check against 'sensitive periods' listed in the farm's annual schedule for testing for sea lice.</p> <p>D. Confirm the farm's understanding of this information through interviews.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>MAP of Norske lusestasjon - Måskevassdraget &amp; Reissvassdraget</p> <p>Doc. Driftplan for Reissaeva 2011 - 2015</p> <p>Doc. About</p> <p>Doc. Above</p>
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[43] For purposes of these standards, "area with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat.</p>	<p>This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the area. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[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.</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.</p> <p>b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.</p> <p>c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids is in compliance with the requirements in Appendix III-1.</p> <p>d. Make the results from 3.1.6b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within eight weeks of completion of monitoring.</p> <p>e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI.</p>	<p>B. Review evidence to confirm farm's participation in monitoring.</p> <p>C. Evaluate documents to confirm methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids complies with requirements of Appendix III-1.</p> <p>D. Confirm that results are easily publicly available and that they were posted within the required timeframe.</p> <p>E. Confirm that client has submitted monitoring results to ASC (Appendix VI).</p> <p>F. 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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>It is not possible counting privately. Only monitoring by genetic work.</p> <p>Havforskningsinstituttet: Laksefisk langs norskekysten, Framdriftsrapport 2013</p> <p>As doc. Above</p> <p>All results are publicly available in acceptable timeframe</p> <p>Data submitted to ASC</p> <p>The company operates in an area of wild salmon</p>
<p>3.1.6</p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Arctic char, with results made publicly available. See requirements in Appendix III-1.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.</p> <p>b. Establish the sensitive periods [45] of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.</p> <p>c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2.</p> <p>d. Provide the CAB with evidence there is a 'feedback loop' between the targets for on-farm lice levels and the results of monitoring of lice levels on wild salmonids (Appendix II-2).</p>	<p>A. Review purchase records to confirm the origin and identity of all species that are used for sea lice control on farm.</p> <p>B. Review evidence for compliance with the requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature, government documentation confirm 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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Sensitive periods in springtime, regarding to temperature.</p> <p>Records shows the levels on the farm is very low. No delving in springtime. No treatments for sea lice the last 7 years</p> <p>No monitoring performed by the farm on wild stocks</p>	
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[45] Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.</p>	<p>Confirm that monitoring data for lice levels are used in a feedback loop as required by Appendix II-2.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[46] 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</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.2.2 - Exceptions to Allow Production of Non-Native Species</b></p> <p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p> <p>b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard (i.e. before June 13, 2012).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>d. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b or 3.2.1c, provide documented evidence that the production system is closed to the natural environment and for each of the following:                  1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained;                  2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce [47]; and                  3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material [47] that might survive and subsequently reproduce (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of any effluent water exiting the system to the natural environment).</p> <p>e. Verify compliance.</p>	<p>A. Confirm the farm has informed ASC which species is in production (Appendix VI).</p> <p>B. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species for 3.2.1. If the farm only produces a native species, then indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p> <p>C. Confirm that the scientific research included: multi-year monitoring for non-native species; used credible methodologies &amp; analyses; and underwent peer review. If the farm requests an exemption then enter "NA" and proceed to 3.2.2d.</p> <p>D. As applicable, review the farm's request for exemption. Verify that the evidence shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified above.</p> <p>E. Confirm the farm submits required evidence to ASC.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p>
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[47] The research must at a minimum include multi-year monitoring of the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction and these results submitted to the CAB for review [49].</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p> <p>b. If yes to 3.2.2b, provide evidence of scientific research completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction. Alternatively, the farm may request an exemption to 3.2.2c (see below).</p> <p>d. If applicable, submit to the CAB a request for exemption that shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified in instruction box above.</p> <p>e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.</p>	<p>A. Confirm the farm has informed ASC which species is in production (Appendix VI).</p> <p>B. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species for 3.2.1. If the farm only produces a native species, then indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p> <p>C. Confirm that the scientific research included: multi-year monitoring for non-native species; used credible methodologies &amp; analyses; and underwent peer review. If the farm requests an exemption then enter "NA" and proceed to 3.2.2d.</p> <p>D. As applicable, review the farm's request for exemption. Verify that the evidence shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified above.</p> <p>E. Confirm the farm submits required evidence to ASC.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p> <p>No non-native species farmed</p>
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[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</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.</p> <p>b. Maintain records (e.g. invoices) to show the species name and origin of all fish used on the farm for purposes of sea lice control.</p> <p>c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.</p>	<p>A. Confirm whether the farm uses fish for sea lice control. If no, auditor response to 3.2.3A c is "not applicable" (NA).</p> <p>B. Review purchase records to confirm the origin and identity of all species that are used for sea lice control on farm.</p> <p>C. Review evidence for compliance with the requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature, government documentation confirm 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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No use of fish for sea lice control</p> <p>No use of fish for sea lice control</p> <p>No use of fish for sea lice control</p>
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[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.</p>	<p><b>Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species</b></p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> Use of transgenic [53] salmon by the farm</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>A. Verify declaration of no use of transgenic salmon.</p> <p>B. Review records to confirm compliance with the requirement.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Statements: Stoffiskur LTD, March 2012, Aqua gen, 10.10.2012.</p> <p>Records from Aqua gen and Stoffiskur</p> <p>Not allowed in Norway</p>
<p>Footnote</p>	<p>[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</p>	<p><b>Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]</b></p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum number of escapes [56] in the most recent production cycle</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 300 [57]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [57]</p>	<p>a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.</p> <p>b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.</p> <p>c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>B. Review the calculation and confirm compliance with the requirement.</p> <p>C. Confirm that farm documents show continuous monitoring of escapes.</p> <p>D. Review the farm's request for a rare exemption 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 vintalization of the farm. Events that are not considered exceptional include failures in mooring due to bad weather, boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the farm, human error, and predation.</p> <p>E. Confirm that client has submitted escape monitoring data to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	<p>Records from FishTalk - production in the sea now.</p> <p>Doc in production reports from FishTalk</p> <p>Doc. In production reports from FishTalk</p> <p>Doc. 0 escapes from 2008</p> <p>Data submitted to ASC</p>

Footnote	[56] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregate number of escapes 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 [57].								
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								
3.4.2	Indicator: Accuracy [58] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers Requirement: > 98% Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of accuracy of the counting technology used by the farm at times of stocking and harvest. Records include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts. b. If counting takes place off site (e.g. pre-smolt vaccination count), obtain and maintain documents from the supplier showing the accuracy of the counting method used (as above). c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm). d. Submit counting technology accuracy to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). e. Confirm that client has submitted counting technology accuracy to ASC (Appendix VI).	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
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	Indicator: Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon to be made publicly available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss</b> a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escape (as per 3.4.1). b. Calculate the estimated unexplained loss as described in the instructions (above) for the most recent full production cycle. For first audit, farm must demonstrate understanding of calculation and the requirement to disclose EUL after harvest of the current cycle. c. Make the results from 3.4.3b available publicly. Keep records of when and where results were made public (e.g. date posted to a company website) for all production cycles. d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. 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.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
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	Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping; reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors, reporting and follow up of escape events), and worker training on escape prevention and counting technologies Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Prepare an Escape Prevention Plan and submit it to the CAB before the first audit. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document as long as it addresses all required elements of indicator 3.4.4. b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; - net traceability; - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. d. Maintain records as specified in the plan. e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan. f. Interview farm workers to confirm that the plan is implemented.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER</b>									
<b>Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed</b>									
<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds</b>					<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
4.1.1	Indicator: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [62] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records. b. Inform each feed supplier in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to production of salmon feeds and send them a copy of the ASC Salmon Standard. c. For each feed producer used by the farm, confirm that an audit of the producer was recently done by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme. Obtain a copy of the most recent audit report for each feed producer. d. For each feed producer, determine whether the farm will use method #1 or method #2 (see instructions above) to show compliance of feed producers. Inform the CAB in writing. e. Obtain declaration from feed supplier(s) stating that the company can assure traceability of all feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed to a level of detail required by the ASC Salmon Standard [62]. f. Cross-check the declarations against results from audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) to verify evidence of required levels of traceability.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
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								
<b>Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]</b>									
<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.2.1 - Calculation of FFD0m</b>					<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
4.2.1	Indicator: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFD0m) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV - 1) Requirement: < 1.35 Applicability: All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used including: - Quantities used of each formulation (kg); - Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation used; - Source (fishery) of fishmeal in each formulation used; - Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation derived from trimmings; and - Supporting documentation and signed declaration from feed supplier. b. For FFD0m calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery). c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1). d. Calculate FFD0m using formulas in Appendix IV-1. e. Submit FFD0m to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4.2.2	Indicator: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFD0o) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV - 1), OR Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [64] (calculated according to Appendix IV-2) Requirement: FFD0o < 2.95 or [EPA + DHA] < 30 g/kg feed Applicability: All	Note: Under Indicator 4.2.2, farms can choose to calculate FFD0o (Option #1) or EPA & DHA (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values. a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a. b. For FFD0o and EPA+DHA calculations (either option #1 or option #2), exclude fish oil derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery). c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard. d. For option #1, calculate FFD0o using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c. e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2. f. Submit FFD0o or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
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								
<b>Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials</b>									
<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.1 - FishSource Score of Fish Used in Feed</b>					<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
4.3.1	Indicator: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries Requirement: < 5 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of fishmeal and fish oil to fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in 4.3.1a. c. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, use feed inventory and feed supplier declarations in 4.2.1a to develop a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients. d. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that fishmeal and fish oil used in feed come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
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 ISAL guidelines as demonstrated through full membership in the ISAL 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	Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score [68] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived Requirement: All individual scores > 2, and biomass score > 8 Applicability: All, until June 13, 2017	a. Record FishSource score for each species from which fishmeal or fish oil was derived and used as a feed ingredient (all species listed in 4.2.1a). b. Confirm that each individual score > 2 and the biomass score is > 8. c. If the species is not on the website it means that a FishSource assessment is not available. Client can then take one or both of the following actions: 1. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as priority for assessment. 2. Contract a qualified independent third party to conduct the assessment using the FishSource methodology and provide the assessment and details on the third party qualifications to the CAB for review.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
							1	
		<b>Footnote</b> [68] Or equivalent score using the same methodology. See Appendix IV-3 for explanation of FishSource scoring.						
		<b>Indicator:</b> Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2						
4.3.3	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All, until June 13, 2017	a. Obtain from the feed supplier documentary evidence that the origin of all fishmeal and fish oil used in the feed is traceable via a third-party verified chain of custody or traceability program. b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.2.1a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).	A. Review evidence and confirm that a third-party verified chain of custody or traceability program was used for the fishmeal and fish oil. B. Verify that demonstration of third-party verified chain-of-custody is in place for all species used.	1		1	There is not a report from third party traceability program to show compliance with 4.3.2 There is a list of species used, but not a demonstration of third party chain-of-custody in place for the species used There is a list of fishmeal from by-product used, with origin	
		<b>Indicator:</b> Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products [69] or trimmings from IUU [70] catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71]						
4.3.4	Requirement: None [72] Applicability: All except as noted in [72]	a. Compile and maintain, consistent with 4.2.1a and 4.2.2a, a list of the fishery of origin for all fishmeal and fish oil originating from by-products and trimmings. b. Obtain a declaration from the feed supplier stating that no fishmeal or fish oil originating from IUU catch was used to produce the feed. c. Obtain from the feed supplier a declaration that the meal or oil did not originate from a species categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71] and explaining how they are able to demonstrate this (i.e. through other certification scheme or through their independent audits). d. If meal or oil originated from a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, obtain documentary evidence to support the exception as outlined in [72].	A. Review list and confirm consistent with 4.2.1a, 4.2.2a, 4.3.3b. B. Verify that the farm obtains declarations from feed suppliers. 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. D. Review evidence to support exception (if applicable).	1		1	Statement from Ewos 17.6.2013 no use of fishmeal or fish oil originating from IUU catch was used to produce the feed. No species from IUCN red list used for fishmeal or fish oil	
		<b>Footnote</b> [69] Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or 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						
		<b>Footnote</b> [70] IUU: Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported.						
		<b>Footnote</b> [71] The International Union for the Conservation of Nature reference can be found at <a href="http://www.iucnredlist.org/status/introduction">http://www.iucnredlist.org/status/introduction</a> .						
		<b>Footnote</b> [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						
<b>Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed</b>								
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>		<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
4.4.1	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a) b. Obtain from each feed manufacturer a copy of the manufacturer's responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients showing how the company complies with recognized crop moratoriums and local laws. c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.	A. Review feed supplier list and cross check against feed purchases. (See also 4.1.1a) B. Review policies from each feed supplier to confirm required sourcing policy is in place crop moratoriums and local laws. C. Verify that the scope of third-party audits of feed suppliers includes review of policies and evidence of implementation.	1		1	Main feed supplier is Ewos, from sourcing 2.5 % of total supply of feed. There is a sourcing policy in place from feed producer Ewos, 17.6.2013 and Screenshot January 2013 Third-party audits from feed suppliers are not seen reviewed	
		<b>Footnote</b> [73] 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						
		<b>Footnote</b> [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						
4.4.2	Requirement: 100%, within five years of the publication [78] of the S4D standards Applicability: All, after June 13, 2017	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soy to soy certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTS) or equivalent. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soy certified under the RTS (or equivalent) c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2a) d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soy in the feed. e. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that soy used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTS) or equivalent [77]	A. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible sourcing of soy or soy-derived feed ingredients. B. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent. C. Verify that farm notifies feed suppliers. D. Confirm that the farm has sufficient and supportive evidence for the origin of soy products in feed to demonstrate compliance with indicator 4.4.2 E. As of June 13, 2017, review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.4.2a does not apply.	1		1	There is a policy from client to support responsible sourcing of soy There is a letter of intent to source feed containing soy certified from ewos 16.10.2013, Screenshot 3.10.2013 Origin of soy is declared	
		<b>Footnote</b> [77] Any alternate certification scheme would have to be approved as equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC						
		<b>Footnote</b> [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.						
4.4.3	Requirement: Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [81] Applicability: All	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of soy and other plant raw materials in feed and whether it is transgenic. b. Disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure. For first audits, farm records of disclosures must cover > 6 months. c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soy in the feed.	A. Review feed supplier declaration and ensure declarations from all suppliers are present (see also 4.4.1a) 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 C. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether feeds containing transgenic ingredients are used on farm (Appendix VI) D. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal. E. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client.	1		1	Declaration from feed suppliers, no use of vegetable GM No use of transgenic plant ingredients	
		<b>Footnote</b> [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 producer to the farm and by the farm to the buyer of their salmon.						
		<b>Footnote</b> [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.						
		<b>Footnote</b> [81] See Appendix VI for transparency requirement for 4.4.3						
<b>Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production</b>								
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>		<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
4.5.1	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Prepare a policy stating the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the farm's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation. b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean. c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.	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. B. Verify the client makes a declaration. C. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal. D. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client.	1		1	Waste policy is described in doc. 11.3.12, and 1.1.04 Waste policy include no dumps of waste to ocean On-site inspection show proper waste disposal All types of waste material, as battery, oil, bags, steel, metal, empty painting boxes, nets, are described with action	
		<b>Footnote</b> [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-						
4.5.2	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. (See also 4.5.1c) b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d) c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken. d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.	A. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal. (See also 4.5.1c) B. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client. (See also 4.5.1d) C. Review infractions and corrective actions. D. Review records to verify waste disposal and/or recycling is consistent with client description and policy.	1		1	Waste disposal as planned Nets are sent to NDFI for scrap There are not reported improper waste disposal Records (in Team) for disposal of nets and cage equipment (in mg), for 25-2013 scrap of 16 net with ID, sent to NDFI	
<b>Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]</b>								
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>		<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
		<b>Footnote</b> [84] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3						
		<b>Indicator:</b> Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible (e.g., disposal and recycling)						
4.6.1	Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoules/m <sup>3</sup> fish/production cycle Applicability: All	a. Maintain records for energy consumption (source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle. b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kJ) during the last production cycle. c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle. d. Using results from 4.6.1b and 4.6.1c, calculate energy consumption on the farm as required, reported as kilojoules/m <sup>3</sup> fish/production cycle. e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of V-1.	A. Verify that the farm maintains records for energy consumption. B. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy. 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). D. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy. E. Confirm that client has submitted energy use calculations to ASC (Appendix VI). F. Confirm that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the farm's energy consumption.	1		1	Registration of petrol, diesel and electricity in Team, for Lerøy Aurora 1.9.2012-1.10.2013, for Gouttesjønka SeaFarm from 1.09.2012-1.10.2013 Total farm energy consumption (kJ) reported per month for Gouttesjønka Total fish weight mt reported in detail Calculation of kilojoules/m <sup>3</sup> fish/production cycle reviewed Calculation as described in Appendix V-1 Energy use assessment undergone.	
		<b>Indicator:</b> Records of greenhouse gas (GHG) [85] emissions [86] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1						
4.6.2	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm. b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1. c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emission factors. d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases to CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source. e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.	A. Verify that the farm maintains records of GHG emissions. B. Confirm that calculations are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1. C. Verify that the farm records all emissions factors used and their sources. D. Verify that the farm records all GWPs used and their sources. E. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations to ASC (Appendix VI). F. Confirm that the farm has undergone a GHG assessments annually and that the methods used comply with requirements of Appendix V-1.	1		1	Farm has maintained records for CO <sub>2</sub> emission, based on use of diesel, oil and gas The calculation of CO <sub>2</sub> have been done from 1.9. 2012 to date of audit All sources have been recorded for CO <sub>2</sub> There has been calculation of non CO <sub>2</sub> gases GHG calculation of CO <sub>2</sub> emission has been submitted GHG assessments has been shown for CO <sub>2</sub> annually	
		<b>Footnote</b> [85] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> ); methane (CH <sub>4</sub> ); nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF <sub>6</sub> )						
		<b>Footnote</b> [86] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.						
		<b>Indicator:</b> Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [87] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2						
4.6.3	Requirement: Yes, within three years of the publication [88] of the S4D standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015) Applicability: All, after June 13, 2015	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed). b. Multiply the GHG emissions per unit feed by the total amount of feed from each supplier used in the most recent completed production cycle. c. If client has more than one feed supplier, calculate the total sum of emissions from feed by summing the GHG emissions of feed from each supplier. d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	A. Verify declaration from feed supplier(s) and confirm client has declarations from all feed suppliers. B. Verify calculations cross-checking with feed purchase and use records. C. Verify calculations. D. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations for feed to ASC (Appendix VI).	1		1	Nets treated with Netaxa Ni gold, copperoxid 10-24 %, from registration Nets are not cleaned in situ, as verified from procedure and policy	
		<b>Footnote</b> [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 to produce						
		<b>Footnote</b> [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.						
<b>Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs (NS-90)</b>								
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>		<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>				
		<b>Footnote</b> [89] Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.						
		<b>Footnote</b> [90] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.7.1, 4.7.3 and 4.7.4.						
4.7.1	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping. b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets. c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets. d. If copper-based treatments are used, maintain documentary evidence (see 4.7.1b) that farm policy and practice does not allow for heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ. e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	A. Review procedure for completeness. B. Review documentary evidence and records for completeness, including traceability records of the nets where available. 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. D. Review evidence and interview farm manager to confirm that farm does not do any heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ. E. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (Appendix VI).	1		1	There is a procedure 1.03.05 for cleaning of nets Records of cleaning of nets as from procedure Nets treated with Netaxa Ni gold, copperoxid 10-24 %, from registration Nets are not cleaned in situ, as verified from procedure and policy	
		<b>Footnote</b> [91] Under the S4D, "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-						
		<b>Footnote</b> [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						
4.7.2	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land. b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place.	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. B. Review documentary evidence to confirm that each net-cleaning facility has effluent treatment in place.	1		1	Nets are cleaned on land, by supplier NDFI, description of procedure For every cleaning of net, a certificate is following	

Requirement: Yes	Applicability: All farms except as noted in [89]	C. If yes to 4.7.2b, obtain evidence that effluent treatment used at the cleaning site is an appropriate technology to capture of copper in effluents.	1		Documentary report from supplier NDFI, treatment of inlet and outlet water with analyze of copper, with analyze result
Footnote	[93] Treatment must have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper if the farm uses copper-treated nets.	Note: If the berths 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 2.1.3c). A. Declare to the CAB whether the farm uses copper nets or copper-treated nets. (See also 4.7.3c). If "no", Indicator 4.7.3 does not apply. B. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, measure and record copper in sediment samples from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE. C. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, maintain records of testing methods, equipment, and laboratories used to test copper level in sediments from 4.7.3c.	1		
4.7.3	Indicator: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix 1-1 Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [89]	A. Review declaration and cross-check against declaration from 4.7.3c. Record whether Indicator 4.7.3 is applicable to the client. 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. C. Verify the measurements were taken using appropriate equipment and testing methods.	1		Farm use copper treated nets  Sediment sampled as described, has been sent for analyze, results are not finished  Sediment sampled as described, has been sent for analyze, results are not finished at audit
4.7.4	Indicator: Evidence that copper levels (ppm) are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight OR in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [89] and excluding those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3	a. Inform the CAB whether: 1) farm is exempt from Indicator 4.7.4 (as per 4.7.3a), or 2) farm has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment. b. Provide evidence from measurements taken in 4.7.3b that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight. c. If copper levels in 4.7.4b are > 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, provide evidence the farm tested copper levels in sediments from reference sites as described in Appendix 1-1 (also see indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). d. Analyze results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites. e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	1		Farm has conducted testing of copper from sediment  Analyses are below the 34 mg/CU/kg  Doc. Testing levels  Regarding the background levels  Results sent to ASC
Footnote	[94] According to testing required under 4.7.3, the standards for testing of copper levels in sediments from reference sites are antiseptic and approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia	A. Document and verify applicability of 4.7.4 to client (see also 4.7.3a) B. Verify that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg sediment. If no, proceed to 4.7.4c. C. If applicable, review evidence to confirm that farm followed Appendix 1-1 for testing copper levels at reference sites. D. As applicable, review data to confirm that copper levels fall within the range of background concentrations as measured at reference sites. E. Confirm that farm has submitted to ASC data on copper levels in sediment (Appendix VI).	1		
4.7.5	Indicator: Evidence that the use of antibiotics and antifungals is approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia Requirement: Yes	a. Identify all biocides used by the farm in net antifouling. b. Compile documentary evidence to show that each chemical used in 4.7.5a is approved according to legislation in one or more of the following jurisdictions: the European Union, the United States, or Australia. c. Review documentary evidence to confirm compliance.	1		Nets treated with Netwax NI gold, copperporoxid 10-24 %  Safety data sheet for product
<b>PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER</b>					
<b>Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [95]</b>					
Footnote	[95] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.6.				
5.1.1	Indicator: Fish health management plan for identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites Requirement: Yes	a. Prepare a fish health management plan that incorporates components related to identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document. b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [96].	1		Doc. VHP, by fish health resp. H. Håstad  Signed by fish health resp. H. Håstad 23.09.2013
5.1.2	Indicator: Visits to the farm by a designated veterinarian [96] at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager [97] at least once a month Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of visits by the designated veterinarian [96] and fish health manager [97]. If schedule cannot be met, a risk assessment must be provided. b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed as the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [96] and fish health manager(s) [97]. c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.	1		Min. 12 visits each year by vet. H. Håstad and E. Mosen  Doc. Fish health journals from all the visits  Doc. Certificates from H. Håstad and E. Mosen
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 person who does not necessarily have the authority to prescribe medicine.				
Footnote	[97] A fish health manager is someone with professional expertise in fish health, who works for a farming company or for a veterinarian, but who does not necessarily have the authority to prescribe medicine.				
5.1.3	Indicator: Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner Requirement: 100% [98] Applicability: All	a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner. b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities. c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.	1		Removed on daily basis to the ensilage tank. Registered in the daily journals and in FishTalk.  The ensilage is kept in tanks and removed by approved company Ålværen. There is also agreement if there will be a mass mortality in the farm
Footnote	[98] The SÅD 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.				
5.1.4	Indicator: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis Requirement: 100% [99] Applicability: All	a. Maintain detailed records for all mortalities and post-mortem analyses including: date of mortality and date of post-mortem analysis; total number of mortalities and number receiving post-mortem analysis; name of the person or lab conducting the post-mortem analysis; qualifications of the individual (e.g. veterinarian [96], fish health manager [97]); cause of mortality (specific disease or pathogen) where known and classification as "unexplained" when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6). b. For each mortality event, ensure that post-mortem analyses are done on a statistically relevant number of fish and keep a record of the results. c. If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive and disease is suspected or results are inconclusive over a 1-2 week period, ensure that fish are sent to an off-site laboratory for diagnosis and keep a record of the results (5.1.4a). d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications. e. Provide additional evidence to show how farm records in 5.1.4a-d cover all mortalities from the current and previous two production cycles (as needed). f. Submit data on numbers and causes of mortalities to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	1		Doc. In FishTalk, vet health reports and results of analysis made by Veterinærinstituttet  Doc. Reports from Veterinærinstituttet verified  All the mortality of the fish is reported in vet. Reports, FishTalk and daily journals  Doc. In vet. Reports, last 24.09.2013  Data submitted to ASC
Footnote	[99] If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive, this standard requires that the percentage of mortality events shall receive a post-mortem analysis, not necessarily every				
5.1.5	Indicator: Maximum viral disease-related mortality [100] on farm during the most recent production cycle Requirement: < 10% Applicability: All	a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease. b. Combine the results from 5.1.5a with the total number of unspecified and unexplained mortalities from the most recent complete production cycle. Divide this by the total number of fish produced in the production cycle (x100) to calculate percent maximum viral disease-related mortality. c. Submit data on total mortality and viral disease-related mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). d. Confirm that client has submitted data on mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	1		No viral disease in the farm. Doc. From vet. Reports  Calculated mortality in the farm is: 8,13%  Data submitted to ASC
Footnote	[100] Viral disease-related mortality shall include unspecified and unexplained mortality as it could be related to viral disease.				
5.1.6	Indicator: Records in 5.1.4a to calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for the most recent full production cycle. If rate was 6%, then the requirement of 5.1.6 does not apply. If total mortality rate was > 6%, proceed to 5.1.6b. Requirement: < 40% of total mortalities Applicability: All farms with > 6% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle.	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for the most recent full production cycle. If rate was 6%, then the requirement of 5.1.6 does not apply. If total mortality rate was > 6%, proceed to 5.1.6b. b. Calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for each of the two production cycles immediately prior to the current cycle. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle. c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. d. Confirm that client has submitted data on unexplained mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	1		Calculated Mortality is 5,97%  1 Below 6%  1 Below 6%
5.1.7	Indicator: A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates. b. Use the data in 5.1.7a and advise from the veterinarian and/or fish health manager to develop a mortalities-reduction program that defines annual targets for reductions in total mortality and unexplained mortality. c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.	1		Doc. In VHP mortality rates and in FishTalk  Doc. In VHP: targets for mortality, based on historical data  VHP understanding demonstrated
<b>Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]</b>					
Footnote	[101] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.6 and 5.2.10.				
<b>Instruction to Clients and CABs for Criterion 5.2 - Records Related to Therapeutic Treatments</b>					
5.2.1	Indicator: On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals [102] and therapeutics used during the most recent production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing, and all disease and pathogens detected on the site Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutic use that includes: name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; product name and chemical name; reason for use (specific disease); date(s) of treatment; amount (g) of product used; dosage; mt of fish treated; the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and the supplier of the chemical or therapeutic. b. If not already available, assemble records of chemical and therapeutic use to address all points in 5.2.1a for the previous two production cycles. For first audits, available records must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle. c. Submit information on therapeutic use (data from 5.2.1a) to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	1		No therapeutic have been used in Gourtesjøhøla. Only Benzozok for sedating the fish when counting sea lice. Doc. In vet. Reports and FishTalk  Detailed records in FishTalk and in vet. Journals  Data submitted to ASC
Footnote	[102] Chemicals used for the treatment of fish.				
5.2.2	Indicator: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [103] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries listed in [104] Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Prepare a list of therapeutics, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are prospectively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [104]. b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles. c. Cross-check records of therapeutic use (5.2.1a) against the list of banned therapeutics to verify compliance with requirements.	1		Doc. In the official list "Grenserevidler for legemidler i angiringsmidler for dyr 30.05.2012"  No treatment used of that type of treatments. Doc. in Vet. reports  Verified "Low EU and US banned substances
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				
Footnote	[104] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.				
5.2.3	Indicator: Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Obtain prescription for all therapeutic use in advance of application from the veterinarian or equivalent (see [96] for definition of veterinarian). b. Maintain copies of all prescriptions and records of veterinarian responsible for all medication events. Records can be kept in conjunction with those for 5.2.1 and should be kept for the current and two prior production cycles. c. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a). d. Compile and maintain documentation on legally-required withholding periods for all treatments used on-farm. Withholding period is the time interval after the withdrawal of a drug from the treatment of the salmon before the salmon can be harvested for use as food. e. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.	1		Doc. Certificates for the veterinarian and journals from the visits and in FishTalk  Reviewed doc. From veterinarian and results of analysis.  Doc. In the VHP. No treatments in Gourtesjøhøla so far
5.2.4	Indicator: Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Review the farm's fish health management plan to confirm inclusion of withholding periods and interview farm staff to verify implementation. b. Review documentation for completeness and accuracy. Compare to records of therapeutic use (5.2.1a). 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.	1		Doc. From VHP and FishTalk  Doc. From FishTalk and vet. Journals. No use of treatments in the farm
5.2.5	Indicator: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VI Requirement: PTI score ≤ 13 Applicability: All	a. Using farm data for therapeutics usage (5.2.1a) and the formula presented in Appendix VI, calculate the cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score for the most recent production cycle. Calculation should be made and updated on an ongoing basis throughout the cycle by farm manager, fish health manager, and/or veterinarian. b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score. c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	1		No treatments in the farm, only Benzozok for counting sea lice  No treatments in the farm  Data submitted to ASC

5.2.6	<p><b>Indicator:</b> For farms with a cumulative PTi2 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [105] is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes, within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms with a cumulative PTi2 6 in the most recent production cycle</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> Indicator 5.2.6 does not take effect until June 13, 2017. Nonetheless farms should start collecting data on parasiticide load beforehand in case farms have to demonstrate</p> <p>a. Review PTi scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTi2 6 in the most recent production cycle. If yes, proceed to 5.2.6b; if no, indicator 5.2.6 does not apply.</p> <p>b. Using results from 5.2.5 and the weight of fish treated (kg), calculate parasiticide load in the most recent production cycle [105].</p> <p>c. Calculate parasiticide load in the two previous production cycles as above (5.2.6b) and compute the average. Calculate the percentage difference in parasiticide load between current cycle and average of two previous cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.</p> <p>d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and two previous production cycles (Appendix VI)</p>	<p>A. Review farm's cumulative PTi score to determine if indicator 5.2.6 is applicable.</p> <p>B. Review the farm's calculation of parasiticide load to verify accuracy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>D. Confirm that client has submitted data on parasiticide load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No treatments</p> <p>No treatments</p> <p>No treatments</p> <p>Not started yet</p>
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 consolidated production across all sites.				
5.2.7	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for purchase of antimicrobial treatments [106]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles.</p> <p>b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3).</p> <p>c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (litres) of antibiotics used during the current and two previous production cycles (Appendix VI)</p>	<p>A. Review purchase records and calculate total amount procured by client. Inspect storage areas to verify quantities on-site.</p> <p>B. Review log of medication events to verify that the quantity of antibiotics applied by the client does not suggest prophylactic use.</p> <p>C. Verify that the total amount of antibiotics used in the current production cycle is equal to the total amount prescribed.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p>
Footnote	[106] The designated veterinarian must certify that a pathogen or disease is present before prescribing medication.				
5.2.8	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO) [107]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None [108]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>Note: 1. Farms have the option to verify 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 the person or persons, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are all eligible for certification.</p> <p>a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [107].</p> <p>b. If the farm has used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit.</p> <p>c. If the farm has used antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit.</p> <p>d. If yes to 5.2.8c, request an exemption from the CAB to certify only a portion of the farm. Prior to the audit, provide the CAB with records sufficient to establish details of treatment, which pens were treated, and how the farm will ensure full traceability and separation of treated fish through and post-harvest.</p>	<p>A. Confirm that the farm has the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>D. Review the farm's exemption request and supporting documents to verify that the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate traceability [108] to meet an exemption.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p>
Footnote	[107] The third edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: <a href="http://www.who.int/foodsafety/antimicrobials">http://www.who.int/foodsafety/antimicrobials</a>				
Footnote	[108] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens or fish, the farm must ensure that the antibiotic treatment is applied to a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days and be				
5.2.9	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Number of treatments [109] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> ≤ 3</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Maintain records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 5.2.1a). For first audits, farm records must cover the current and immediately prior production cycles in a verifiable statement.</p> <p>b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation.</p>	<p>A. Review documents to confirm that the client maintains a record of all treatments of antibiotics. Cross-check against records of on-farm chemical &amp; therapeutic use (5.2.1a). Confirm that the client used 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.</p> <p>B. Confirm that the client used 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p>
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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load [110] is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017)</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> 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 consolidated production across all sites.</p> <p>a. Use results from 5.2.9b to show whether more than one antibiotic treatment was used in the most recent production cycle. If not, then the requirement of 5.2.10 does not apply. If yes, then proceed to 5.2.10b.</p> <p>b. Calculate antibiotic load (antibiotic load = sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotic used in kg for most recent production cycle and for the two previous production cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.</p> <p>c. Provide the auditor with calculations showing that the antibiotic load of the most recent production cycle is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles.</p> <p>d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>B. Review farm's calculations for accuracy and completeness of coverage. Cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a).</p> <p>C. Review evidence to verify that farm complies with requirement.</p> <p>D. Confirm that client has submitted data on antibiotic load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No use of antibiotics</p>
Footnote	[110] Antibiotic load = 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 production across all sites.				
5.2.11	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Preparation of procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [112] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutics used in production (see 4.4.3b)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [112] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutics used in production (see 4.4.3b).</p> <p>b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutics used in production.</p>	<p>A. Review the farm's procedure and confirm implementation based on relevant documentary evidence (e.g. sales records, invoices).</p> <p>B. Review sales records for completeness and cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a) to verify that buyers were adequately informed about therapeutics used in production.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Doc. Verified used if necessary. Using results doc. In vet. Reports and FishTalk</p> <p>Doc. Example of type of records by sales to H. Lerøy 2.4.2013</p>
Footnote	[112] Buyer: This company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product.				
<b>Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments</b>					
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>	<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>		
5.3.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.3.1 - Identifying the Expected Effect of Medicinal Treatment</b></p> <p>a. In addition to recording all therapeutic treatments (5.2.1a), keep a record of all cases where the farm uses two successive medicinal treatments.</p> <p>b. Whenever the farm uses two successive treatments, keep records showing how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.</p> <p>c. For any result of 5.3.1b that did not produce the expected effect, ensure that a bio-assay analysis of resistance is conducted.</p> <p>d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.</p>	<p>A. Review farm records to confirm recording of all successive medicinal treatments.</p> <p>B. If applicable, review how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>D. Verify that farm maintains records from bio-assays (as applicable).</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p> <p>No treatments in the farm</p>
5.3.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Review results of bio-assay tests (5.3.1b) for evidence that resistance has formed. If yes, proceed to 5.3.2b. If no, then indicator 5.3.2 is not applicable.</p> <p>b. When bio-assay tests show evidence that resistance has formed, keep records showing that the farm took one of two actions: used an alternative treatment (if permitted in the area of operation); or immediately harvested all fish on site.</p>	<p>A. Review evidence from bio-assay tests to determine whether indicator 5.3.2 is applicable.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>If needed the decision is reg. To ABM for the area to use Betanin</p> <p>Records from vet. Journals and the ABM for the area</p>
<b>Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]</b>					
		<b>Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):</b>	<b>Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):</b>		
Footnote	[113] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.4.2 and 5.4.4.				
5.4.1	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class [114]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 100% [115]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All farms except as noted in [115]</p>	<p>a. Keep records of the start and end dates of periods when the site is fully fallow after harvest.</p> <p>b. Provide evidence of stocking dates (purchase receipts, delivery records) to show that there were no gaps &gt; 6 months for small inputs to the current production cycle.</p>	<p>A. Review records and verify fallow periods by cross-checking during interviews with farm staff and community representatives.</p> <p>B. Review evidence to confirm there were no gaps in small inputs &gt; 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.</p> <p>C. Verify that the available evidence shows that salmon on the site are from a single-year class.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Doc. In Fish health report form 22.07.2012. Doc. Single years class, Last slaughterdate 25.4.2012</p> <p>Doc. In FishTalk: From 22.4.2012 until 1.9.2012</p> <p>Vet. Reports shows single years class</p>
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:				
5.4.2	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentified transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, [116] the farm has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority</li> <li>Increased monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM</li> <li>Promptly [118] made findings publicly available</li> </ol> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4b, show evidence that the farm promptly evaluated each to determine whether it was a statistically significant increase over background mortality rate on a monthly basis [116]. The accepted level of significance (for example, <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) should be agreed between farm and CAB.</p> <p>b. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4b, record whether the farm did or did not suspect (yes or no) an unidentified transmissible agent.</p> <p>c. Proceed to 5.4.2c if, during the most recent production cycle, either: results from 5.4.2a showed a statistically significant increase in unexplained mortalities or "the answer to 5.4.2b was 'yes'". Otherwise, indicator 5.4.2 is not applicable.</p> <p>d. If required, ensure that the farm takes and records the following steps: 1) Report the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority; 2) Increase monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM; and 3) Promptly (within one month) make findings publicly available.</p> <p>e. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>D. If applicable, verify that the farm keeps records to show how each of the required steps was completed.</p> <p>E. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality as applicable.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No unexplained mortalities. Vet reports</p> <p>No unexplained mortalities</p> <p>No unexplained mortalities</p> <p>No unexplained mortalities</p> <p>Data submitted to ASC</p>
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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of compliance [119] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [120]</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p><b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.4.3 - Compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code</b></p> <p>a. Maintain a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code on site or ensure staff have access to the most current version.</p> <p>b. Develop policies and procedures as needed to ensure that farm practices remain consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (5.4.3a) and with actions required under indicator 5.4.4.</p>	<p>A. Verify that farm management is aware of practices described in the most current version of the code during interviews.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Doc in OIE Aquatic Health Code, version 2013</p> <p>Doc in several procedures for health controls, and extra controls if IAS</p> <p>Well implemented to the staff</p>
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				
Footnote	[120] OIE 2013, Aquatic Animal Health Code. <a href="http://www.oie.int/">http://www.oie.int/</a>				
5.4.4	<p><b>Indicator:</b> If an OIE-notifiable disease [121] is confirmed on the farm, evidence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected</li> <li>the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122]</li> <li>the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease</li> <li>the farm promptly [123] made findings publicly available</li> </ol> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>a. Ensure that farm policies and procedures in 5.4.3a describe the four actions required under indicator 5.4.4 in response to an OIE-notifiable disease on the farm.</p> <p>b. Inform the CAB if an OIE-notifiable disease has been confirmed on the farm during the current production cycle or the two previous production cycles. If yes, proceed to 5.4.4c. If no, then 5.4.4c and 5.4.4d do not apply.</p> <p>c. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm (see 5.4.4b), then retain documentary evidence to show that the farm: 1) immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected; 2) immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122]; 3) enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease; and 4) promptly (within one month) made findings publicly available.</p> <p>d. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>B. Record whether there were any OIE-notifiable diseases confirmed on the farm during the current or two previous production cycles.</p> <p>C. If applicable, review documentary evidence to verify the farm's response complied with the four actions required under indicator 5.4.4.</p> <p>D. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm (as applicable).</p> <p>E. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm, verify that notifications were made to regulatory bodies under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [122].</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Doc. In procedures. Will be managed by the authority Mattmyren</p> <p>No diseases in the previous production cycles</p> <p>Doc. In the farm procedures</p> <p>Data submitted to ASC</p> <p>No diseases in the farm</p>
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 anaemia (ISA), Viral				
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.				
<b>PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER</b>					
<b>6.3 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]</b>					
		<b>Compliance Criteria</b>			
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	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits "acts which are designed to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control of employers' organizations."</p> <p>c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.</p> <p>d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Confidential interviews with employee state that they are free to join any Union on own choice. Agreement with the relevant union Felleforbundet</p> <p>Confidential interviews are done with the shop steward Audun Reinstad, site Saltsjøen</p> <p>Confidential interviews state that employee have access to their shop steward etc.</p> <p>Confidential interviews with employee was allowed.</p>	

<p>6.1.2</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p>	<p>a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association</p> <p>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).</p> <p>c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Seen contract</p> <p>Policy and interviews with employees state that workers are free to join a union of their own choice.</p>
<p>6.1.3</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.</p> <p>c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Shop steward for all site at Leroy Aurora Audun Reiertsen state that the union Fellesforbundet have good and regular meetings with the top management of Leroy Aurora.</p> <p>Seen agreement between the relevant union Fellesforbundet and the employer representative organization NHO. Further has the Shop Steward and the top management at Leroy Aurora a signed agreement covering payment and work hour.</p> <p>Interview and review of documentation state that a collective bargain.</p>
<p><b>Criterion 6.2 Child labor</b></p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Compliance Criteria</b></p>				
<p>6.2.1</p> <p>Indicator: Number of incidences of child [125] labor [126]</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All except as noted in [125]</p>	<p>a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions:                  i. in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years (see footnote 125); or                  ii. 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.</p> <p>b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).</p> <p>c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Confidential interviews, review of documentation (contract, pay slip include personal identification no with age) and walk around indicate no child labour. No employee under 18 year.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
<p>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</p>				
<p>Footnote [126] Child Labor: Any work by a child younger than the age specified in the definition of a child.</p>				
<p>6.2.2</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of young workers [127] that are protected [128]</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies &amp; training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.</p> <p>b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.</p> <p>c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.</p> <p>d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time does not exceed 10 hours.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Confidential interviews, review of documentation (contract, pay slip include personal identification no with age) and walk around indicate no child labour. No employee under 18 year.</p>
<p>Footnote [127] Young Worker: Any worker between the age of a child, as defined above, and under the age of 18.</p>				
<p>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</p>				
<p>Footnote [129] Hazard: The inherent potential to cause injury or damage to a person's health (e.g., unguarded to handle heavy machinery safely, and unprotected exposure to harmful chemicals).</p>				
<p>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).</p>				
<p><b>Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor</b></p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Compliance Criteria</b></p>				
<p>6.3.1</p> <p>Indicator: Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labor</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.</p> <p>c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.</p> <p>d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.</p> <p>e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.</p> <p>f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Review of documentation (contract, pay slip, hour registration) and confidential interviews with employee indicate no forced, bonded or compulsory labour. Employee are free to leave the workplace after work. No withholding of passport, salaries or likely. No fees.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
<p>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</p>				
<p>Footnote [132] Bonded labor: When a person is forced by the employer or creditor to repay a financial debt to the crediting agency.</p>				
<p><b>Criterion 6.4 Discrimination (23)</b></p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Compliance Criteria</b></p>				
<p>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 distinction is not discrimination.</p>				
<p>6.4.1</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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 orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.</p> <p>b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.</p> <p>c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Seen written policy and procedure about anti-discrimination (doc. 4.2.15 ver. 06.10.2013)</p> <p>Confidential interviews state that every body knows how to handle discrimination complaints.</p> <p>Confidential interviews and review of agreement between worker and management, contract, payroll and hour counting state that payment, job opportunities, promotion etc. are done on behalf of qualifications.</p> <p>Regular meetings state that managers receive training about anti-discrimination. Local meetings are done for all employees according to implement this standard including anti-discrimination policy.</p>
<p>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,</p>				
<p>6.4.2</p> <p>Indicator: Number of incidences of discrimination</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Confidential interviews state that there have been none complaints according to discrimination</p> <p>Confidential interviews state that there have been no kind of discrimination according to gender, age, religion etc.</p>
<p><b>Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety</b></p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Compliance Criteria</b></p>				
<p>6.5.1</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [135] and policies on a yearly basis</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.</p> <p>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 (OSHA) and effective use of PPE.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Seen documented procedure handling H&amp;S matters. 2 minor NC.</p> <p>Confidential interviews state that employees know and understand emergency procedures.</p> <p>Seen documentation for regular yearly H&amp;S training. Seen certificates from 20 hours course from 2013 (fire, first aid, handling of freezing etc.)</p>
<p>Footnote [135] Health and safety training shall include emergency response procedures and practices.</p>				
<p>6.5.2</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals).</p> <p>b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Seen MSD for H&amp;S hazards</p> <p>Filter for gas mask. Filter expire according to markings on the filter in 2019. The filter is attached to the gas mask (packaging has been opened) it is unclear how long the shelf life is actually when the filter packing is breached. All other PPE are in proper condition.</p> <p>Confidential interviews indicate that annual training in use of PPE are done.</p> <p>Confidential interviews indicate that annual training in use of PPE are done.</p>
<p>6.5.3</p> <p>Indicator: Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).</p> <p>c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Seen documentation for H&amp;S assessment H&amp;S walk around are done 8th Aug. 2013. Internal H&amp;S assessment are done 12th Nov. 2013.</p> <p>Confidential interviews state that employee are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risk.</p> <p>H&amp;S procedures are implemented and are changes on behalf of risk assessment and registration of near miss, accident and observations.</p>
<p>6.5.4</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.</p> <p>b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Review of documentation and confidential interviews state that the site have had no accident in 2013. One H&amp;S observation are registered.</p> <p>No H&amp;S accident in 2013 and until now in 2014.</p> <p>Seen procedure for H&amp;S. No accident or near miss in 2013 and until now in 2014.</p>
<p>6.5.5</p> <p>Indicator: Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance (accident or injury) for 100% of worker costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Local law require that companies have insurance covering their employees H&amp;S accidents.</p>

6.5.6	<p>Indicator: Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Note: If the farm outsources its diving operations to an independent company, the farm shall ensure that auditors have access to specified information sufficient to demonstrate</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	1	1	<p>Seen documentation related to diving certificate, H&amp;S check, signed document for activities in accordance with this standard, Skjerming Dykkersevice are used.</p> <p>See above</p>
<b>Criterion 6.6 Wages</b>					
<b>Compliance Criteria</b>					
6.6.1	<p>Indicator: The percentage of workers whose basic wage [136] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [137]</p> <p>Requirement: 0 (None)</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 employer's records must show how the current wage meets or exceeds industry standard. If wages are based on piece rate or pay per production, the employer's records must show how workers can reasonably attain (within regular working hours) wages that meet or exceed the legal minimum wage.</p> <p>c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their farm workers.</p> <p>d. 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.</p>	1	1	<p>Seen documentation for local min. wage and calculation of minimum basis need for a dissent living. Single 3620 NOK/month couple with 2 children between 19280 NOK/month and 20666 NOK/month</p> <p>Confidential interviews, review of pay slip and hour registration document that employees salary are between 33875 NOK and 44500 NOK/month. Work hour are 10 hour per day in seven days and then 7 day of. No piece rate. A small bonus can be given when the salmon are slaughtered. Overtime are paid with +50 % for overtime between 18.00 and 21.00 and +100 % for the hour after 21.00-08.00. +100% for Sundays. Payment for work in the free week are +50 % for the first 5 hour and then +100%.</p> <p>Seen payroll, hour registration and contract for 3 interviewed employees. Check of these documents are done for the month Aug. 2013, December 2013 and January 2014 (payment are done the 20th in the month for the hole running month)</p>
<p>Footnote [136] Basic wage: The wages paid for a standard working week (no more than 48 hours).</p> <p>Footnote [137] If there is no legal minimum wage in a country, basic wages must meet the industry-standard minimum wage.</p>					
6.6.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [138]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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 wage</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.</p>	1	1	<p>See 6.6.1 a)</p> <p>See 6.6.1 a)</p> <p>The salary are much higher than the basic needs wage</p>
<p>Footnote [138] Basic needs wage: A wage that covers the basic needs of an individual or family, including housing, food and transport. This concept differs from a minimum wage, which is set by law and may or may not cover the basic needs of workers.</p>					
6.6.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [139]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.</p> <p>b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	1	1	<p>Seen contract, pay slip and hour registration for the 3 interviewed worker covering the month Aug. 2013, Dec. 2013 and Jan. 2014.</p> <p>Confidential interviews with employees state that they all understand their payroll and how their wage are calculated.</p> <p>Payment are done through bank transfer.</p> <p>Confidential interviews was done with three employees at the site.</p>
<p>Footnote [139] Payments shall be rendered to workers in a convenient manner.</p>					
<b>Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting</b>					
<b>Compliance Criteria</b>					
6.7.1	<p>Indicator: Percentage of workers who have contracts [141]</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.</p> <p>b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.</p> <p>c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p>	1	1	<p>Seen contract, pay slip and hour registration for the 3 interviewed worker covering the month Aug. 2013, Dec. 2013 and Jan. 2014.</p> <p>Confidential interviews, walk around and review of documentation indicate no evidence of labor-only contracting or false apprenticeships.</p> <p>Confidential interviews was done with three employees at the site</p>
<p>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</p>					
6.7.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.</p> <p>c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.</p>	1	1	<p>Seen policy and document that show how Lerøy by contract provide suppliers to act in accordance with socially responsible practices and policies.</p> <p>Seen document which show all suppliers.</p> <p>It can not be demonstrated that FWOS (supplier of fish feed) has committed itself to full fill Lerøy's policy of "social compliance."</p> <p>Review of many other supplier document that they have signed to full fill Lerøy's CoC (for instance Skjerming Dykkersevice).</p>
<b>Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution</b>					
<b>Compliance Criteria</b>					
6.8.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.</p> <p>b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access.</p> <p>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.</p>	1	1	<p>Interview with management and shop steward state that the facility has a clear policy for handling worker grievance in a confidential manner.</p> <p>Confidential interviews state that employee have fair access to complaint.</p> <p>No evidence of any grievance 2013 and 2014 until now.</p>
6.8.2	<p>Indicator: Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [142] within a 90-day timeframe</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised.</p> <p>b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed.</p> <p>c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe.</p>	1	1	<p>No evidence of any grievance 2013 and 2014 until now.</p> <p>No grievance in 2013 and 2014 until now.</p> <p>Confidential interviews are done with three employees - no sign of any grievance.</p>
<p>Footnote [142] Addressed: Acknowledged and received, moving through the company's process for grievances, corrective action taken when necessary.</p>					
<b>Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices</b>					
<b>Compliance criteria</b>					
6.9.1	<p>Indicator: Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity.</p> <p>b. Allegations of corporal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors.</p> <p>c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.</p>	1	1	<p>Confidential interviews, walk around and review of documentation (pay slip, hour registration, H&amp;S issues etc.) indicate none disciplinary practices with impacts on workers physical and mental health or dignity</p> <p>Nothing to investigate</p> <p>Confidential interviews are done with three employee at the site.</p>
<p>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.</p>					
6.9.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [143]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [143].</p> <p>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.</p>	1	1	<p>Seen written policy for disciplinary actions - these are in agreement with the intention of this standard</p> <p>Confidential interviews are done with three employees at the site.</p>
<p>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</p>					
<b>Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime</b>					
<b>Compliance criteria</b>					
6.10.1	<p>Indicator: Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [145]</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law.</p>	1	1	<p>Confidential interviews and review of contract, pay slip, hour registration, agreement with the relevant union document that the employer act in accordance with their standard and local law.</p> <p>Most of the employee work 7 days, 10 hours /day and then 7 days of. Overtime is voluntary and paid in accordance with the agreement with the relevant union (Fellesforbundet) + 50 % for overtime between 18.00 and 21.00 after this + 100 % 7100% for Sundays. If working in the free week + 50% for the first 5 hours and then + 100%. Working hours is in accordance with the law.</p>

		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).	1		Interview and review of relevant documentation show that the facility act in accordance with local law, this standard and the agreement with the union.
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	1		Confidential interviews are done with three employees at the site.
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	Indicator: Overtime is limited, voluntary [146], paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except as noted in [146]	a. Payment records (e.g. paylips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours. 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).	1 1		See 6.10.1 b). Interviewed employees had between 0 and 216 over time hour in 2013 - this is in accordance with law, agreement with unions and this standard. Overtime is always voluntary.
Footnote	[146] Compulsory overtime is permitted if previously agreed to under a collective bargaining agreement.				Confidential interviews are done with three employees at the site.
Footnote	[147] Premium rate: A rate of pay higher than the regular work rate. Must comply with national laws/regulations and/or industry standards.				
<b>Criterion 6.11 Education and training</b>					
6.11.1	Indicator: Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g. courses, certificates and degrees) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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 b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees). 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.	1 1 1		Written policy for education are seen. Seen documentation for workers participation in training (H&S training 20 hours, 27-28 Nov. 2013 etc.) Confidential interviews are done with three employees at the site.
<b>Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility</b>					
6.12.1	Indicator: Demonstration of company-level [148] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11. 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. 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). 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).	1 1 1 1		Company policies are in line with this standard 6.1 - 6.11 Company policies are approved by the top management Company policies cover all activities in the salmonid production Access was given to all required document
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				
<b>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.</b>					
<b>PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN</b>					
<b>Criterion 7.1 Community engagement</b>					
7.1.1	Indicator: Evidence of regular and meaningful [149] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually). b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: The farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (SIA) or an equivalent method for consultations. c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda. d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3). e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above. f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.	1 1 1 1 1 1		Doc: Meetings with the local community, F.dtr and Mattlynet: Issue no 2013 Meaningful consultation with planned agenda. Records doc: As doc: Above Environmental questions, health, contingency plans and competence is main questions Doc: Reports from the meetings No interviews with representative from local community
Footnote	[149] Regular and meaningful: Meetings shall be held at least 2-annually with elected representatives of affected communities. The agenda for the meetings should in part be set by the community representatives. Participatory Social Impact				
7.1.2	Indicator: Presence and evidence of an effective [150] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations. 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 c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders). d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.	1 1 1 1		All claims are reported to the headoffice and followed up No claims from Gourtespikka The claims are followed up from the headoffice. Documentation No interviews performed
Footnote	[150] Effective: In order to demonstrate that the mechanism is effective, evidence of resolutions of complaints can be given.				
7.1.3	Indicator: Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice [151] at the farm during times of therapeutic treatments and has, as part of consultation with communities under 7.1.1, communicated about potential health risks from treatments Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (Use of anaesthetic baths is not regarded a therapeutic) 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). c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1) d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.	1 1 1 1		Visually signs at the farm are in place reg. To the Norwegian laws. No treatments so far in the farm. Visually signs are placed at the farm close to gateways Health and environmental question is a part of the meetings No interviews of the community are performed
Footnote	[151] Signage shall be visible to mariners and, for example, to fishermen passing by the farm.				
<b>Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories</b>					
<b>Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 7.2 - Traditional Territories of Indigenous Groups</b>					
7.2.1	Indicator: Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations Requirement: Yes	a. Documentary evidence demonstrates that the farm does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups. c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.	1 1 1 1		Doc: For no indigenous groups No indigenous groups No indigenous groups No indigenous groups
7.2.2	Indicator: Evidence that the farm has taken an active process consultation with indigenous communities Requirement: Yes	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm. b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.	1 1		No indigenous groups No indigenous groups
Footnote	[152] All standards related to indigenous rights only apply where relevant, based on proximity of indigenous territories.				
7.2.3	Indicator: Evidence of an active process [153] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities Requirement: Yes	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm. b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.	1 1 1		No indigenous groups No indigenous groups No indigenous groups
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				
<b>Criterion 7.3 Access to resources</b>					
7.3.1	Indicator: Stronger smolt rearing access to vital community resources [154] without community approval Requirement: None Applicability: All	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). b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented. 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.	1 1 1		A part of the farms license The authorities must be contacted and accept before any movements is performed No interviews are performed
Footnote	[154] Vital community resources can include freshwater, land or access to resources				
7.3.2	Indicator: Evidence of assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources Requirement: Yes	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. b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.	1 1		This is a part of the license from the authorities This is a part of the license from the authorities
<b>INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION</b>					
Footnote	[155] The S&C 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				
<b>SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT</b>					
<b>Standards related to Principle 1</b>					
8.1	Indicator: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Identify all of the farm's smolt suppliers. For each supplier, identify the type of smolt production system used (e.g. open, semi or closed systems) and submit this information to ASC (Appendix VII). b. Where legal authorization related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits. c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	1 1 1		One smolt supplier: Laksefjord AS, license: 13140 internally supplier Doc: From Finnmark fylkeskommune and Mattlynet, 27.2.2006. Doc: From Fylkesmannen, 12.12.2012 license 7.5 mill smolt.
8.2	Indicator: Compliance with labor laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labor laws and regulations. b. Keep records of supplier inspections for compliance with national labor laws and code (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation; see 1.1.3a)	1 1		Estimated feed use is 238 tons, doc: From smolt supplier Doc: declaration from Laksefjord
<b>Standards related to Principle 2</b>					
8.3	Indicator: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains the same components as the assessment for grow-out facilities under 2.4.1 Requirement: Yes	Note: If the smolt facility has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may obtain and a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a documented assessment of the smolt site's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3. b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration confirming they have developed and are implementing a plan to address potential impacts identified in the assessment.	1 1		Doc: Results from analysis April 2013- Grade 1 Declaration from Laksefjord AS nov. 2013
<b>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.4 - Calculating Total Phosphorus Released per Ton of Fish Produced</b>					
8.4	Indicator: Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1) Requirement: 5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the S&C standards, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months. b. For all feeds used by the smolt suppliers (result from 8.4a), keep records showing phosphorus content as determined by chemical analysis or based on feed supplier declaration (Appendix VIII-1). c. Using the equation from Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a and b, calculate the total amount of phosphorus added as feed during the last 12 months of smolt production. d. Obtain from smolt suppliers records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months. e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1. f. If applicable, obtain records from smolt suppliers showing the total amount of P removed as sludge (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months. g. Using the formula in Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a-f (above), calculate total phosphorus released per ton of smolt produced and verify that the smolt supplier is in compliance with requirements.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Records from Skretting with all types of feed used in the period Doc: Records from Laksefjord Estimated calculations from feed supplier reg. To appendix All needed records from the smolt supplier in place Calculations regarding to the requirements demonstrated No phosphorus are removed Calculations from the smolt supplier verified and acceptable
<b>Standards related to Principle 3</b>					
		a. Obtain written evidence showing whether the smolt supplier produces a non-native species or not. If not, then Indicator 8.5 does not apply.	1		Doc: In the license: Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout





8.21	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.</p>	<p>A. Verify that farm obtains copies of supplier's complaints procedures from each of its smolt suppliers.</p>	1			No complaints from the local community and stakeholders doc.
8.22	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people (see Indicator 7.2.1). If not then the requirements of 8.22 do not apply.</p> <p>b. Obtain documentation to demonstrate that, as required by law in the jurisdiction: smolt supplier consulted with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b. OR smolt supplier confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence.</p>	<p>A. Review evidence to determine whether indicator 8.22 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s).</p> <p>B. Verify that the smolt supplier complies with relevant requirements.</p>			1	No indigenous groups consulted
8.23	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p>	<p>a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier.</p> <p>b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.</p>	<p>A. Review evidence to determine whether indicator 8.23 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s).</p> <p>B. Review documentary evidence to confirm that the smolt supplier has undertaken proactive consultations.</p>	1		1	No indigenous groups consulted, meetings with the local community doc. Doc. From the meetings with the community
<b>ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT</b>							
<b>Instructions to Clients for Indicators 8.24 through 8.31 - Requirements for Smolt Produced in Open Systems</b>							
8.24	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> None</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids.</p> <p>b. Request smolt suppliers to identify all water bodies in which they operate net pens for producing smolt and from which facilities they sell to the client.</p> <p>c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results.</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm obtains relevant declarations from its smolt supplier(s).</p> <p>B. Confirm that the farm obtains information on the water bodies in which its suppliers are operating net pens for smolt production.</p> <p>C. Review search results and cross-check against the other lines of evidence for salmonid distribution in the region (e.g. results from 3.1.5a).</p>			1	No net pens in water bodies
8.25	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Minimum net pen production or holding smolt in net pens in any water body</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Take steps to ensure that by June 13, 2017 the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens.</p> <p>b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.</p> <p>c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5.</p> <p>d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a).</p> <p>e. If the study in 8.26a is more than two years old and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since completion, request evidence that an updated assessment study has been done.</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of assimilative capacity assessments as are relevant to the water bodies in which its smolt supplier(s) operate.</p> <p>B. Verify that the assessment was done by a reliable entity (e.g. government body or academic institution).</p> <p>C. Verify that the assessment reports in compliance with requirements.</p> <p>D. Verify that the farm confirms that total biomass in the water body does not exceed carrying capacity.</p> <p>E. Verify that the farm requests an updated assessment (&lt; 2 years old) if there was a significant increase in nutrient inputs to the water body.</p>			1	No net pens in water bodies
8.26	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body has been established by a reliable entity (171) within the past five years (172), and total biomass in the water body is within the limits established by that study (see Appendix VIII-5 for minimum requirements)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. For the water body(s) where the supplier produces smolt for the client (see 8.24b), obtain a copy of the most recent assessment of assimilative capacity.</p> <p>b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.</p> <p>c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5.</p> <p>d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a).</p> <p>e. If the study in 8.26a is more than two years old and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since completion, request evidence that an updated assessment study has been done.</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of assimilative capacity assessments as are relevant to the water bodies in which its smolt supplier(s) operate.</p> <p>B. Verify that the assessment was done by a reliable entity (e.g. government body or academic institution).</p> <p>C. Verify that the assessment reports in compliance with requirements.</p> <p>D. Verify that the farm confirms that total biomass in the water body does not exceed carrying capacity.</p> <p>E. Verify that the farm requests an updated assessment (&lt; 2 years old) if there was a significant increase in nutrient inputs to the water body.</p>			1	
Footnote	[171] E.g., Government body or academic institution.						
Footnote	[172] If the study is older than two years, and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since the completion of the study, a more recent assessment is required.						
<b>Instructions to Clients for Indicators 8.27 and 8.28 - Monitoring TP and DO in Receiving Water for Open Smolt Systems</b>							
8.27	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> &lt; 20 µg/l [174]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements of Appendix VIII-6.</p> <p>b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations.</p> <p>c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station.</p> <p>d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body.</p> <p>e. Confirm that the average value for TP over the last 12 months did not exceed 20 µg/l at any of the sampling stations nor at the reference station.</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of the smolt supplier's monitoring records (datasets, protocols, reports).</p> <p>B. Review and confirm that the spatial arrangement of sampling stations complies with requirements of Appendix VIII-6.</p> <p>C. Review TP monitoring results.</p> <p>D. Repeat comparison.</p> <p>E. Verify that TP &lt; 20 µg/l in the receiving water body.</p>			1	
Footnote	[173] The concentration is equivalent to the upper limit of the Mesotrophic Trophic Status classification as described in Appendix VIII-7.						
8.28	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimeters above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> &gt; 50%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a).</p> <p>b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months.</p> <p>c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.</p>	<p>A. Verify as above (see 8.27A).</p> <p>B. Verify that farm has copies of supplier's DO monitoring results.</p> <p>C. Review the supplier's monitoring results to verify compliance with requirements.</p>			1	
8.29	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable).</p> <p>b. If the trophic status of the waterbody has not been classified (see 8.29a), obtain evidence from the supplier to show how the supplier determined trophic status based on the concentration of TP.</p> <p>c. As applicable, review results from 8.29b to verify that the supplier accurately assigned a trophic status to the water body in accordance with the table in Appendix VIII-7 and observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months.</p> <p>d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported at all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change.</p>	<p>A. Verify that farm obtains evidence from suppliers (as applicable).</p> <p>B. Review how supplier determined trophic status (as applicable).</p> <p>C. Verify that the farm conducts a review of the supplier's results and conclusions regarding trophic status of the water body.</p>			1	
8.30	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 25%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable.</p> <p>b. Compare the baseline TP concentration (result from 8.30a) to the average observed TP concentration over the past 12 months (result from 8.29c).</p> <p>c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration.</p>	<p>A. Verify that farm has supplier's records for baseline TP concentrations in the water body.</p> <p>B. Repeat comparison.</p> <p>C. Repeat calculation to verify compliance with the requirement.</p>			1	
8.31	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 25%</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable).</p> <p>b. If the trophic status of the waterbody has not been classified (see 8.29a), obtain evidence from the supplier to show how the supplier determined trophic status based on the concentration of TP.</p> <p>c. As applicable, review results from 8.29b to verify that the supplier accurately assigned a trophic status to the water body in accordance with the table in Appendix VIII-7 and observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months.</p> <p>d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported at all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change.</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm obtains relevant declarations from its smolt supplier(s).</p>			1	
<b>ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS</b>							
<b>Instructions to Client for Indicators 8.32-8.35 - Requirement for smolts produced in open systems</b>							
8.32	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Water quality monitoring regime completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes [177]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing that water quality monitoring was conducted at least quarterly (i.e. once every 3 months) over the last 12 months.</p> <p>b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness.</p> <p>c. Submit the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix to ASC as per Appendix VIII-2 and Appendix VI at least once per year.</p>	<p>A. Verify that farm has records to show smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring at the required frequency and duration.</p> <p>B. Confirm that smolt supplier's water quality monitoring program covers sampling of all parameters given in Appendix VIII-2 (i.e. TP, TN, BOD, P50).</p> <p>C. Confirm that client has submitted to ASC the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix for the last 12 month period.</p>			1	Data not submitted to ASC
Footnote	[177] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.32.						
8.33	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> 60% [178,179]</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems</p>	<p>a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b).</p> <p>b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation.</p> <p>c. If a single DO reading (as reported in 8.33a) fell below 60%, obtain evidence that the smolt supplier performed daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for a least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2).</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm obtains water quality monitoring records from its smolt supplier(s).</p> <p>B. Review the supplier's monitoring results to verify compliance with requirements.</p> <p>C. Verify that the farm obtained evidence for enhanced DO monitoring by the smolt supplier (as applicable).</p>			1	
Footnote	[178] A single oxygen reading below 60 percent would require daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for at least a week demonstrating a minimum 60 percent saturation at all times.						
Footnote	[179] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.33.						
8.34	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Benthic invertebrate surveys demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys.</p> <p>b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).</p> <p>c. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm the survey results show that benthic health is similar to or better than upstream of the supplier's discharge.</p>	<p>A. Verify that the farm has documentation of macro-invertebrate surveys from its smolt supplier(s).</p> <p>B. Review documents from the farm's smolt supplier to verify the surveys were conducted as required in Appendix VIII-3.</p> <p>C. Review documents to verify that survey results demonstrate compliance with requirements.</p>			1	
8.35	<p><b>Indicator:</b> Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMP) (Appendix VIII-4)</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Applicability:</b> All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems</p>	<p>a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.</p> <p>b. Obtain from smolt supplier a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly.</p> <p>c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months.</p> <p>d. Obtain records from smolt supplier showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning, maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2.</p>	<p>A. Verify the supplier's biosolids management plan for compliance with Appendix VIII-2.</p> <p>B. Confirm that smolt supplier's process flow diagram for compliance with Appendix VIII-2.</p> <p>C. Confirm that farm obtains declarations from smolt suppliers.</p> <p>D. Review the farm's records from smolt suppliers to verify there is evidence of implementation of biosolids management as required in Appendix VIII-2.</p>			1	

Fortrolige opplysninger til kommersiel informasjon

*Skriftlig eller annen dokumentert informasjon og Bureau Veritas Certification svar til hver innlevering.*

*Hvis ingen innlevering, noter "ingen merknader mottatt"*

<b>Offentlig høring periode</b>	<b>Interessenter innlevering</b>	<b>BV Response</b>
Audit kunngjøring (30 dager før revisjonen)		
	Ingen merknader mottatt	
Utkast offentlig rapport (10 dager fra offentliggjøring)		

Table 1. Data collections and record keeping farms must initiate prior to first audit. The minimum timeframe covered by data sets or records are given relative to the first audit.

No.	Brief Description of Data Set or Record	Indicator(s)	Minimum Timeframe Prior to First Audit
1	Records for redox potential or sulphide concentration in sediments outside AZE	2.1.1	current production cycle
2	Records for faunal index scores of sediments outside AZE	2.1.2	current production cycle
3	Records for faunal taxa in sediments inside AZE	2.1.3	current production cycle
4	Results of monitoring weekly average percent saturation of DO	2.2.1	≥ 6 months
5	Analysis of data from weekly DO monitoring in mg/l	2.2.2	≥ 6 months
6	Ta	2.2.4	≥ 6 months
7	Calculation of BOD	2.2.5	current production cycle
8	Records from quarterly testing of fines in feed	2.3.1	≥ 6 months
9	Records for use of ADDs or AHDs	2.5.2	≥ 6 months
10	Records related to monitoring of mortality of red listed and endangered species	2.5.3	≥ 6 months
11	Records related to lethal action taken against predators	4.4, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.	≥ 6 months
12	Results of on-farm testing for sea lice	3.1.4, 3.1.7	≥ 6 months
13	Monitoring of escapes	3.4.1	≥ 6 months
14	Records for accuracy of counting technology	3.4.2	≥ 6 months
15	Records of all feed purchases	.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.	≥ 6 months
16	List of all feed suppliers	4.1.1, 4.4.1	≥ 6 months
17	Detailed records on feed composition and ingredients	4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.4	≥ 6 months
18	FishSource scores for ingredients of purchased feeds	4.3.2	≥ 6 months
19	Evidence that feed producers have traceability systems for handling fishmeal and fish oil ingredients	4.3.3	≥ 6 months
20	Feed supplier declaration - no fishmeal or fish oil ingredients were derived from IUU fisheries	4.3.4	≥ 6 months
21	Feed supplier declaration - no fishmeal or fish oil ingredients were derived from endangered species	4.3.4	≥ 6 months
22	Feed supplier declaration - use of transgenic soya and plant material in feed	4.4.3	≥ 6 months
23	Records of farm disclosures to fish buyers about transgenic content of feeds	4.4.3	≥ 6 months
24	List of fish buyers	4.4.3, 5.2.11	≥ 6 months
25	Records of energy use	4.6.1	≥ 6 months
26	Records of greenhouse gas emissions	4.6.2	≥ 6 months
27	Records of antifoulants and chemicals used on nets	4.7.1, 4.7.5	≥ 6 months
28	Results of copper testing in sediments outside AZE and at reference sites (if applicable)	4.7.3, 4.7.4	current production cycle
29	Record of visits by farm veterinarians and fish health managers	5.1.2	≥ 6 months
30	Records of mortality removals	5.1.3	≥ 6 months
31	Records for disposal of mortalities	5.1.3	≥ 6 months
32	Records for mortalities & post-mortem analyses	5.1.4, 5.4.2	≥ 6 months
33	Records for viral disease-related mortalities	5.1.5	≥ 6 months
34	Records for unexplained mortality rates	5.1.6	≥ 1 full production cycle
35	Record of chemical and therapeutant use	.1, 5.2.4, 5.2.7, 5.	≥ 1 full production cycle
36	Calculation of antibiotic load (not applicable until date + 5 years)	5.2.10	≥ 1 full production cycle
37	Results of voluntary and mandatory chemical residue testing	5.2.2	≥ 1 full production cycle
38	Records of prescriptions for all medication events	5.2.3, 5.2.7, 5.2.9	≥ 1 full production cycle
39	Records related to determination of PTI scores	5.2.5	≥ 6 months
40	Records related to calculation of parasiticide load (not applicable until June 13, 2017)	5.2.6	≥ 1 full production cycle
41	Calculation of the total amount of antibiotic used	5.2.7, 5.2.10	≥ 1 full production cycle
42	Calculation of the total number of antibiotic treatments used	5.2.9	≥ 1 full production cycle
43	Records related to unidentifiable transmissible agent and unexplained increased mortality	5.4.2	≥ 6 months

Explanation to Timeframe Categories:

- "Production cycle" means the period of approximately 14 to 24 month period during which salmon are held in the water at the farm site.
- " ≥ 6 months" means data or records covering fish production for a full six months or more immediately prior to the first audit.
- "Current production cycle" means data or records covering those fish currently in production (i.e. pre-harvest) at the time of the first audit.
- " ≥ 1 full production cycle" means data or records covering those fish from the full production cycle completed (i.e. harvested) immediately prior to the current production cycle.

Table 2. Farm records to be submitted to the CAB prior to the first audit\* in addition to those items listed in Table 1.

No.	Description of Farm Record	Indicator(s)	Yes / No / NA
1	Map of farm showing AZE and sampling stations	2.1.1, 2.1.2	
2	Records for defining a site-specific AZE (not applicable until June 13, 2015)	2.1.4	
3	Assessment of farm impact on biodiversity	2.4.1	
4	Map of farm showing nearby protected areas and HCVA's	2.4.2	
5	Records of farm participation in ABM scheme	3.1.1	
6	Records of farm's external collaborations on research into impacts on wild stocks	3.1.2	
7	Records for setting of sea lice load	3.1.3	
8	Data on wild salmonid migration routes, timing, and stock health (applies in areas of wild salmonids)	3.1.5	
9	Results of monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids	3.1.6	
10	Analysis of sensitive periods for wild fish (applies in areas of wild salmonids)	3.1.7	
11	Evidence for prior wide commercial production of species (applies to farming of non-native species)	3.2.1	
12	Records of use of non-native species for sea lice control (if applicable)	3.2.3	
13	Records for origin of cultured stock	3.3.1	
14	Estimated unexplained loss	3.4.3	
15	Escape prevention plan	3.4.4	
16	Feed supplier declaration - traceability	4.1.1	
17	Audit report from a recent audit of feed supplier	4.1.1, 4.4.1	
18	Farm policy of responsible feed sourcing to promote management of small pelagic fisheries	4.3.1	
19	Feed supplier policy of responsible sourcing of feed ingredients	4.4.1	
20	Farm policy on use of certified soya as feed ingredients	4.4.2	
21	Feed supplier declaration - origin of soya in feed	4.4.2	
22	Farm policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste	4.5.1	
23	Records of disposal of waste materials including net-pens.	4.5.2	
24	Results of energy use assessment	4.6.1	
25	Results of GHG assessment	4.6.2	
26	Feed supplier declaration - GHG emissions associated with feeds (not applicable until June 13, 2015)	4.6.3	
27	Analysis of GHG emissions associated with feeds (not applicable until June 13, 2015)	4.6.3	
28	Farm procedures for cleaning and use of copper-treated nets (if applicable)	4.7.1	
29	Records of effluent treatment at on-land net-cleaning sites (if applicable)	4.7.2	
30	Fish health management plan	5.1.1, 5.2.4	
31	List of designated farm veterinarians and fish health managers	5.1.2	
32	Records of qualifications of designated farm veterinarians and fish health managers	5.1.2	
33	Program for farm-specific reduction of mortalities	5.1.7	
34	List of therapeutants that are banned in the primary salmon producing and importing countries	5.2.2	
35	Documentation of all legally-required withholding periods	5.2.4	
36	List of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by WHO	5.2.8	
37	Records related to bio-assay analysis to determine resistance	5.3.1, 5.3.2	
38	Records for stocking dates and fallow periods	5.4.1	
39	Policies and procedures consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code	5.4.3	
40	Records related to farm actions in response to OIE-notifiable disease (if applicable)	5.4.4	
41	Daily records of working hours	6.3.1, 6.6.1 - 6.6.3	

42	Policies and records related to the health and safety of workers	.1, 6.5.2, 6.5.3, 6.5.4	
43	Records and personnel qualifications related to farm diving operations	6.5.6	
44	Records of salary or wage payments	6.6.1 - 6.6.3	
45	Policies and records related to compliance of suppliers and contractors with social requirements	6.7.2	
46	Policies and records related to worker conflict resolution	6.8.1, 6.8.2	
47	Company-level policies in line with social requirements of the Standard	6.12.1	
48	Records related to consultations with the community and indigenous groups	.1, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3	
49	Policy for resolution of complaints from the community and stakeholders	7.1.2	
50	Records related to notifying the community about treatments	7.1.3	
51	Assessment of the farm's impact on access to resources	7.3.1, 7.3.2	
52	[Additionally farms need to obtain all records from smolt suppliers as specified under Principle 8]	8.1 thru 8.38	

\* Information that must be gathered prior to the first audit but for which no minimum timeframe has been specified for the duration of data collection.