

ASC SALMON STANDARD AUDIT REPORT

ASC Periodisk revisjon 1, rapport

Marine Harvest Norway 11857 Buksevika lokalitet

Report No.: 01, Rev 01.

Date: 16.12.2014



Prosjekt navn: ASC Salmon Standard Audit Report DNV GL Business Assurance
Rapport tittel: ASC Periodisk revisjon 1, rapport Norway AS
Kunder: Marine Harvest Norway 11857 Buksevika Veritasveien 1
lokaltet, Norge 1322 Høvik
kontakt person: Ingrid Lundamo/ Catarina Martins Norway
Utgivelses dato: 16.12.2014
Prosjekt No.: PRJC-505010-2014-MSC-NOR Tel: +47 67 57 99 00
Organisasjons- 11857 Buksevika lokalitet
enhet:
Rapport No. 01: 01, Rev. 01

Skrevet av:
Kjell Bekkevold

Verifisert av:
Kim A. Karlsen

[title]
Darius Pamakstys
SA8000 auditor

Kim A. Karlsen
[title]

- Foreløpig rapport (kundens versjon)
 Offentlige kommentarer Report (Interessenters gjennomgang)
 Slutt-rapport
- Førstegangs revsijon
 Periodisk revisjont
 Resertifiseringss-revisjon

Rev. No.	Date	Reason for Issue	Prepared by	Verified by	Approved by
01	17.12.2014	First issue	KRBE	Kim A. Karlsen(TRW)	Kim A.Karlsen

Innholdsfortegnelse

1	SAMMENDRAG.....	1
2	OMSØKT LOKALITET	1
3	SCOPE.....	2
4	REVISJONS-PLAN	3
4.1	Revisjons-team team	3
4.2	Revisjonsaktiviteter	3
4.3	Tidligere revisjoner (ikke anvendt)	3
4.4	Personer involvert i revisjonen	4
4.5	Interessenters henvendelser	4
5	FUNN	4
5.1	Sammendrag hoved avvik	4
5.2	Sammendrag mindre Avvik	4
5.3	Sammendrag Observasjoner	5
6	BESTEMMELSE AV START PUNKT FOR IHENNDEHAVELSE-SERTIFIKATET (CHAIN OF CUSTODY)	5
7	AVGJØRELSE.....	7
8	EVALUERINGENS RESULTAT.....	1
9	KONFIDENSIELL KOMMERSIELL FØLSOM INFORMASJON	1
	APPENDIX 1: INTERSSENTERS HENVENDELSER.....	1
	APPENDIX 2: SJEKKKLISTE (EVALUERINGENS RESULTAT)	1

1 SAMMENDRAG

Rapporten

Denne rapporten dekker resultatene fra Periodisk Revisjon #1 hos Marine Harvest Norway AS, heretter i rapporten kalt "Organisasjonen" eller "selskapet" **11857 Buksevika** lokalitet ihht ASC Salmon Standard V1. Juni 2012.

Revisjonen

Revisjonen ble holdt over tre dager. De tre første dagene i selskapets regions-kontor, med fokus på avvikene fra forrige revisjon, og på tekniske og juridiske tema, hvor relevant operasjonelt og administrativt personell til stede. Andre del av revisjonen som også omfattet en anleggsbesøk på **Buksevika**, fant også sted den fjerde dagen for å dekke gjenværende punkter av det administrative og tekniske, samt avslutte temaer knyttet til sosialt ansvar. Revisjonen ble gjennomført som en dokumentgjennomgang (digital og papirbasert informasjon) i tillegg til intervjuer med relevant personell, inkludert personell fra **Buksevika**.

Praktisk demonstrasjon av utstyr og prosesser relevant til sertifikat-omfanget, relevant ihht ASC standard v 1 og tilhørende retningslinjer i revisjonsmanualen ble utført. Dette inkluderte befarings av slakte-prosessen i bruk i en fullskala slakteoperasjon med slaktefartøyet «M/S Tauranga» i henhold til ASC Salmon Standard V1. Juni 2012 og ifølge retningslinjer i ASC Salmon Audit Manual v1.0.

Slakteriet, "**Marine Harvest Norway Ryfisk slakteri**", med adresse at Hundsnæs, 4131 Hjelmeland, Norge, er ASC sertifisert Ref. til www.asc-aqua.org hvor oppdatert informasjon finnes.

Intervjuene angående sosialt ansvar-delen av ASC Salmon Standard ble avholdt i adskilte lokaler forhold, for å sikre uhindret tale og åpne dialoger mellom intervjuer og intervju-objekt. De intervjuede ansatte er heller ikke navngitt i rapporten, av samme grunn.

Resultater

Evalueringen av selskapets oppfyllelse av kravene i ASC Salmon standarden er beskrevet i detalj senere i rapporten. Funnene er dokumentert i seksjon 5 og 6 og i Annex 2 i denne rapporten. Videre er det henvist til alle relevante prinsippene i ASC standarden og tilhørende indikatorer, kriterier og underpunkter i ASC revisjons-sjekklista for avvikene. (Annex 2)

Det prinsippet hvor det ble oppnådd fullt samsvar av krav, er:

Prinsipp 1; "*Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations*"

Prinsipp 2 "*Conserve natural habitats, local biodiversity and ecosystem function*"

Prinsipp 4 "*Use resources in an environmentally efficient and responsible manner*"

Prinsipp 5 "*Manage disease and parasites in an environmentally responsible manner*"

Prinsipp 6 "*Develop and operate farms in a socially responsible manner*"

Prinsipp 7 "*Be a good neighbour and conscientious citizen*"

Prinsipp 8 "*Standard for Suppliers of smolts*"

Videre for Prinsipp 3, «Protect the health and Genetic integrity of Wild populations», ble fullt samsvar med kravene ikke oppfylt, selv om kravene også her i meget stor grad ble oppfylte.

Som følge av dette ble resultatet et begrenset antall (2) Minor (Mindre) avvik. Dette førte til konklusjonen at opprettholdelse av **sertifiseringen, basert på utkommet av denne Periodiske Revisjonen anbefales**. En tilfredsstillende respons fra søkeren for å lukke de mindre avvikene fra førstegangsrevisjonen 2013, med dokumenterte korrigerende tiltak ble funnet å være på plass før denne periodiske revisjonen. Dette førte til at alle mindre avvik fra førstegangsrevisjonen nå er lukket.

Angående nye avvik fra denne periodiske revisjonen 2014, er en tilfredsstillende respons fra søkeren forventet, for å lukke de mindre avvikene, med dokumenterte korrigerende tiltak i henhold til en godkjent handlingsplan å være på plass før denne periodiske revisjonen.

Detaljer vedrørende kriterier for innfrielse av krav finnes i sjekklista for periodisk revisjon 2014 (Vedlegg #2)

2 OMSØKT LOKALITET

Navn på lokaliteten	MHN matfisk-anlegg 11857 Buksevika
---------------------	------------------------------------

Beskrivelse av lokaliteten	11857 Buksevika er et konvensjonelt flytende merdanlegg for oppdrett av laks. Produksjonsmerdene er flytende stålkonstruksjoner. Sentralt på lokaliteten er en føringsflåte med sentralisert føringsystem og UV kameraer for kontroll av føring. Alle installasjoner er sertifisert etter «NYTEK» standardens regler. Offentlige registre for detaljer om beliggenhet, se: www.Fiskeridirektoratet.no/akvakulturregisteret
Forventet produksjon ved utslakting	4680 mt
Beskrivelse av resipienten	Resipienten er kategorisert som t kyst-fjord, av Euhalin natur. (> 30 o/ooS). Økologisk kvalitet er antatt god. Kjemisk kvalitet er ifølge offentlig dokumentasjon udefinert. Detaljer finnes på Anlegget er plassert ved Hidra, resipient er Listafjorden-bassenget. Resipienten er kategorisert som t kyst-fjord, av Euhalin natur. (> 30 o/ooS). Økologisk kvalitet er antatt god. Kjemisk kvalitet er ifølge offentlig dokumentasjon udefinert. Detaljer finnes på WWW.Vannportalen.no Anlegget er under frivillig oppdretts-sone inndeling, hvor MHN er eneste aktør. Det finnes annen oppdrettsvirksomhet i fjordsystemet, inkludert et annet anlegg nærliggende anlegg også tilhørende Marine Harvest. Det finnes naturlig ville laksefiskbestander i området, selv om elver innfor en radius på 50km ikke har, så vidt vi vet, status som lakseførende vassdrag.
Andre sertifikater som anlegget og/eller selskapet innehar	IFA GLOBAL GAP, ISO 9001, ISO 14001, ISO 22 000
Kontakt person	Ingrid Lundamo/Catarina Martins

3 OMFANG

Standard	ASC Salmon Standard Version 1.0 June 2012
Aktivitet	Periodisk revisjon # 1. 2014
Art	Atlantisk laks (<i>Salmo salar</i>)
Selskapets offisielle navn	Marine Harvest Norway AS
Offisiell adresse	Sandviksboder 77A, 5035 Bergen, Norway
Lokalitetens navn	11857 Buksevika
Lokalitetens adresse	4432 Hidrasund, Norway

4 REVISJONS-PLAN

4.1 Revisjons team

Rolle	Navn
Revisjonsleder	Kjell Bekkevold DNVGL.
SA8000 Revisor	Darius Pamakstys, DNVGL.

4.2 Revisjons-aktiviteter

Aktivitet	Dato
Pre-revisjon dokument-gjennomgang	Ikke anvendt for periodisk revisjon
Revisjon på anlegg og kontorer	17.11.2014-19.11.2014
Publisering av foreløpig rapport for offentlige kommentarer	Ikke anvendt for periodisk revisjon
Publisering av endelig rapport	20.12.2014

4.3 Tidligere revisjoners

• Aktivitet	• Fullført dato:
Utført førstegangsrevisjon 2013	• 16,18 og 19.12.2013
• Rapportering	• 30.12.2013 – 13.01.2014
• Publisering av foreløpig rapport	• 22.01.2014
• Rapport gjennomgang	• 22.01.2014.-06.02.2014
• Sertifiserings avgjørelse	• 07.02.2014
• Slutt Rapport publisering	Uke 7 2014

Følgende tabell viser et sammendrag av avvik funnet under førstegangsrevisjonen. Full redegjørelse finnes i seksjon 8 i denne rapporten.

	Tidligere revisjoner (IA 2013)		O/C*
		antall	
Obs		03	(Nå forbedret)
Minor		06	(Nå lukket)
Major		00	0

4.4 Personer involvert i revisjonen

Rolle	Navn / tilhørighet
Kundens representanter (Ledelse)	Kjeltil Hansen, ASC ansvarlig/Planleggingsleder MHN Sør Ingrid Lundamo, MHN Miljø og Kvalitet-sjef Robin Scotland, MHN Sør område-leder Roar Jenssen, MHN Sør Driftsleder
Ansatte	Ansatte/operatører på anlegget
Kontraktører	Ikke anvendt
Interessenter	For interessenter, se liste under.
Observatører som deltok i revisjonen	Ikke anvendt

4.5 Interessenters henvendelser

Følgende interessenter er definert av den reviderte part. Ingen henvendelser mottatt fra interessenter i perioden mellom førstegangsrevisjon og periodisk revisjon.

Lokale:

Flekkefjord kommune – mail: post@flekkefjord.kommune.no

Flekkefjord Fiskarlag v/Ole Roald Danielsen – mail: oleroald@norgespost.no

Andabeløy Velforening v/Tommy Danielsen – mail: andabeloy@norgespost.no

Hidra Velforening v/Åge Syvertsen – mail: post@hidravel.no

Flekkefjord og Omegn Jeger- og Fiskerforbund v/Svein Arne Skailand – mail: nhjens@online.no

Nasjonale:

Mattilsynet – mail: postmottak@mattilsynet.no

Vest-Agder Fylkeskommune – mail: postmottak@vaf.no

Kystverket Sørøst – mail: post@kystverket.no

Fylkesmannen i Vest-Agder – mail: fmvpostmottak@fylkesmannen.no

Fiskeridirektoratet region sør – mail: postmottak@fiskeridir.no

5 FUNN

Følgende tabell inneholder et sammendrag av avvikene funnet i revisjonen. En full redegjørelse for avvikene finnes i seksjon 8 i denne rapporten.

5.1 Sammendrag av hoved-avvik

N	Standard referanse	Sammendrag av avviksbeskrivelse	Status*
		Ingen hoved-avvik funnet	

*Å Åpent; L Lukket

5.2 Sammendrag mindre avvik

N	Standard referanse	Sammendrag av avviksbeskrivelse	Status*
---	--------------------	---------------------------------	---------

1	3.1.4 d	Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing is required. Resultater blir nå lagt inn i AltInn Mattilsynet publiserer i offentlig tilgjengelige rapporter når data er prosessert. Direkte tilgang til data for det aktuelle anlegget burde etableres, som f.eks på MHNs ASC nettsider.	Åpent
2	3.4.3 c	Requirement is that estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available. Resultater er ikke gjort allment tilgjengelige. Direkte tilgang til data for det aktuelle anlegget burde etableres, som f.eks på MHNs ASC nettsider.	Åpent

*Å Åpent; L Lukket; A Korrigerende tiltak akseptert, effektivitet verifiseres nest periodiske revisjon.

5.3 Sammendrag av observasjoner

N	Standard referanse	Observasjon
		Ingen funn kategorisert som Observasjoner i denne periodiske revisjonen

Basert på bevisene fra revisjonen anbefaler revisjonsleder at sertifiseringen videreføres.

6 BESTEMMELSE AV STARTPUNKT FOR COC

- Produktene omhandlet i omfanget av denne revisjonen og i relevant ASC sertifikat
 - Kan inngå i videre sertifisert produktflyt
 - Har tillatelse til å bære ASC etikett
- Bestemmelsen er basert på vurderingen av punktene beskrevet i følgende avsnitt:

Type	Vurdering
Sporing, sporbarhet og segregering i oppdrettsoperasjonen.	Dokumenter beskriver tilfredsstillende kontroll med innkommende produkter, fra egen ferskvannsanlegg og tilhørende dokumenter identifiserer produksjonsanlegget, leverandørliste og mottaks kontroll, både i slakteri og videreforedling. Digital informasjon håndtert i Mercatus AquaFarmer for alle ferskvannstadier, vekstfase sjø. Etterfølgende slakting håndteres i prosess, logistikk og salgs-systemet Maritech Dette omfatter også tilstrekkelig informasjon om sporbarhet fra stamfisk og rogn til slaktefisk, innkjøp, fakturaer og leverandør-register.
Bruk av brønnbåt	Kun godkjent Brønnbåt/levende-fisk-transport brukes, som «MS Tauranga». Transporter er alltid identifiserbare på produksjonsenhet nivå (merd). All informasjon lagres både elektronisk i Mercatus Aquafarmer, og i Marel Innova for slakting og prosessering i tillegg til papirkopier. (eksempelvis papirkopier av fraktbrev).
Godkjente operatører og landingspunkt,	ASC CoC sertifisert slakteri. Slakte-operasjonen begynner når «MS Tauranga» pumper levende fisk fra produksjons-mærene. Fisken blir deretter bedøvet før avliving, utbløding og nedkjøling om bord. Fisken blir deretter transportert til HMN Ryfisk slakteriet for videre prosessering.
Muligheten for å bytte ut sertifisert produkt med ikke-sertifisert produkt innenfor	Kun ASC CoC sertifisert slakteri brukes. Alle produksjons-enheter på anlegget er sertifisert og

sertifiserings-enheten.	fisken de inneholder er ASC sertifisert
Punkt i prosessen hvorfra Chain of Custody sertifikat er påkrevd	Produktet er autorisert til å inngå i ASC Chain of Custody sertifisering fra det punktet der fisken overflyttes fra brønnbåt og pumpes over i ventemerder. Fra dette punktet ender anleggets direkte kontroll med fisken i praksis og ASC Salmon Standard sertifikatets omfang slutter. Når slakting starter, overtar slakteriets ASM CoC sertifikat. Dette er framgangsmåten for slakting ved MHN 11857 Buksevika matfisk-anlegg.

7 AVGJØRELSE

Søkers sertifiserings-status	Endelig avgjørelse om sertifisering har blitt tatt etter etterfølgende aktiviteter eller forandringer ihht ASC Farm Certification and Accreditation Requirements Version 1 March 2012. Organisasjonen beskrevet i seksjon 3 i denne rapporten for aktivitetene beskrevet i seksjon 3 i denne rapporten oppfyller kravene og forblir sertifisert.
Date for utstedelse av sertifikat	07. februar 2014
Dato for utløp av sertifikat	07. februar 2017
Sertifikatets omfang	Produksjon (Påvekst) av Atlantisk laks (<i>S. Salar</i>) i meder i sjø, og etterfølgende transport til slakteriets ventemerder. Lossing fra brønnbåt/levendefisk-transport og opphold i ventemerder er under slakteriets ASC CoC sertifikat.
Startpunkt for ihendehavelse sertifikat (ASC Chain of Custody)	Produktet er autorisert til å inngå i ASC Chain of Custody sertifisering fra det punktet der fisken overflyttes fra brønnbåt og pumpes over i ventemerder

Åpne mindre avvik er oppført i relevant tabell i seksjon 5 i denne rapporten. Plan for relevante korrigerende tiltak må godkjennes og korrigerende tiltak verifiseres ved neste periodiske revisjon.

8 RESULTAT AV VURDERNGEN

Denne seksjonen viser resultatene av revisjonen av driften opp mot spesifikke elementer i standarden og rettleidningsdokumenter, inkludert bevis fra revisjonen som viser pålitelige og reproduserbare konklusjoner

Avvik nummer	Avvik kilde revisjons-aktivitet	Standard referanse	Beskrivelse av avvik	Rot-årsaks analyse	Korrigerende tiltak rapport	Dato akseptert	Hoved (Major)	Mindre (Minor)	Observasjoner
1	Fra førstegangs-revisjon 2013 Hovedkontor, lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	<ul style="list-style-type: none">2.1.2 (I)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Innlevering av Faunal Index score til ASC (Appendix VI) minst en gang per produksjon-syklus, kunne ikke dokumenteres..		KRBE 02.12.14. Lukket avvik fra IA 2013. Sendt til ASC 06.12.13 og 14.11.14	02.12.14		Lukket	
2	Fra førstegangs-revisjon 2013 Hovedkontor, lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	<ul style="list-style-type: none">6.4.1 d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Selskapet burde organisere opplæring i mangfold og ikke diskrimineringsaker for alle ledere og linjeledere og dokumentasjon av virkningsgraden av dette bør kunne framlegges. Det er ikke tilstrekkelig bevis for at mangfold og ikke diskriminerings opplæring for ledere og linjeledere og		KRBE 02.12.14. Lukket avvik fra IA 2013. Informasjonen er presentert framferds-instruks (Code of Conduct) og i personal håndboka.			Lukket	

			ikke-diskriminerings opplæring for ansatte har blitt gjennomført.						
3	Fra førstegangs-revisjon 2013 Hovedkontor, lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.6.2 b) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arbeidsgiver skal beregne minstelønn (basic needs wages) for alle arbeidere på anlegget og sammenligne dette med faktiske lønning. Minstelønn var ikke beregnet 		KRBE 02.12.14. Lukket avvik fra IA 2013. Sammenlikningen er utført.			Lukket	
4	Fra førstegangs-revisjon 2013 Hovedkontor, lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.1.e) 	Selskapet skal ha register og dokumentert bevis for at konsultasjoner med lokale interessenter i nærmiljøet gjøres ifølge krav i 7.7.1. Mangel på dokumentert bevis på konsultasjonsmøter og engasjement med interessenter i nærmiljø og rundt anlegget.		KRBE 02.12.14. Lukket avvik fra IA 2013. . Møtereferater er gjort tilgjengelige.			Lukket	

5	Fra førstegangs-revisjon 2013 Hovedkontor, lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maksimum total mengde fosfor sluppet ut i miljøet per tonn fisk produsert over en 12 måneders periode. (se appendix VIII-1) ble funnet å være 9.51kg P /mt smolt produsert mens kravet er 5 kg for de 3 første årene. 		<p>KRBE 02.12.14. Lukket avvik fra IA 2013. Forespørsel om fravikelse fra standardens krav akseptert av ASC i september 2014.</p>			Lukket	
6	Fra førstegangs-revisjon 2013 Hovedkontor, lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.20 a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selskapet skal skaffe dokumentert bevis for konsultasjoner og engasjement i lokalsamfunnet for hver smoltleverandør. Mangel på dokumentert bevis for konsultasjonsmøter og engasjement med interessenter i lokalsamfunnet ved smoltanlegg. 		<p>KRBE 02.12.14. Lukket avvik fra IA 2013. ble organisert den 18. 08. 2014.</p>			Lukket	

7	Fra periodisk revisjon 2014 Hovedkontor og lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	3.1.4 d	Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing is required. Resultater blir nå lagt inn i AltInn Mattilsynet publiserer i offentlig tilgjengelige rapporter når data er prosessert. Direkte tilgang til data for det aktuelle anlegget burde etableres, som f.eks på MHNs ASC nettsider.					Åpent	
8	Fra periodisk revisjon 2014 Hovedkontor og lokalitets gjennomgang og intervjuer med ansatte	3.4.3 c	The requirement is that estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available. Resultater er ikke gjort allment tilgjengelige. Direkte tilgang til data for det aktuelle anlegget burde etableres, som f.eks på MHNs ASC nettsider.					Åpent	



9 KONFIDENSIELL KOMMERSIELT SENSITIV INFORMASJON

For å bidra til økt åpenhet, har selskapet besluttet å la all informasjon være åpen og tilgjengelig

APPENDIX 1: INTERSENTERS HENVENDELSER

Det var ingen henvendelser fra interessenter i perioden mellom førstegangsrevisjon og periodisk revisjon.



APPENDIX 2: CHECKLIST (EVALUATION RESULTS)



ABOUT DNV GL

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

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard

Created by the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue

Scope: species belonging to the genus *Salmo* and *Oncorhynchus*

INSTRUCTION TO FARMS/AUDITORS:
This audit manual was developed to accompany the version of the ASC Salmon Standard developed through the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue, dated June 13, 2012.

References in this Audit Manual to Appendices can be found in the ASC Salmon Standard document.

11857 Buksevik

PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS

Conform
mit y M NA

Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations

Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
1.1.1	<p>Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws.	A. Review compliance with applicable land and water use laws.	Y	Laws and regs in Lovdata with updates. Governed by int. proc.
		b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable.	B. Confirm client holds original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements or land titles.	Y	Buksevika # 11857, 4680 I BM 21.10.13, Vets Agder Fylkes kommune, farming permit. (www.Fiskeridir.no). Site owned by applicant. Discharge permit from Fylkesmannen11.09.13, 4680 I MTB, Kystverket19.06.13 on location, and Mattilsynet (NFSA) 04.07.13.
		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).	C. Review inspection records for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (as applicable).	Y	Mattilsynet (NFSA) report Buksevika 25.02.14, all OK.
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	D. Verify facility does not conflict with national preservation areas and has required operational permits if sited in such an area (see 2.4.2).	Y	Bothe sites inside "Landscape preservation zone" with permits to operate within zone. No immediate effect on seascapes. Kystsoneplan gir retningslinjer. (Coastal zone Plan gives guidelines)
1.1.2	<p>Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CABs will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public.	A. Verify client has records of tax payments to appropriate authorities. Do not disclose client tax information which is confidential. An independently audited company annual report may be used to confirm tax status.	Y	Authorised auditor report/statement for Org. Nr 959352887 dt 29.04.14 Ernst & Young
		b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	B. Confirm client has a basic knowledge of tax requirements for farm.	Y	Basic knowledge demonstrated, but farm is part of corporate economical system handling tax issues.
		c. Register with national or local authorities as an "aquaculture activity".	C. Verify client is registered with local or national authorities.	Y	Buksevika # 11857, 4680 I BM 21.10.13, Vets Agder Fylkes kommune, farming permit. (www.Fiskeridir.no). Site owned by applicant. Discharge permit from Fylkesmannen11.09.13, 4680 I MTB, Kystverket19.06.13 on location, and Mattilsynet (NFSA) 04.07.13.
1.1.3	<p>Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	A. Confirm client has specified documentation.	Y	Lovdata access to updated versions in TQM system "MHN personal guide" in Compendia Personal system. Including all relevant laws and regulations. Some docs in 4 languages in addition to Norwegian.
		b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	B. Review inspection records for compliance with national labor laws and codes (as applicable).	Y	No inspections present or previous cycle. Voluntarily health and working environment survey dt 27.06.13. Result: 9.1 of 10 in score on working conditions.
1.1.4	<p>Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable.	A. Verify that client obtains permits as applicable.	Y	MTB limitation on each site only Buksevika # 11857, 4680 I BM 21.10.13, Vets Agder Fylkes kommune, farming permit. (www.Fiskeridir.no). Site owned by applicant. Discharge permit from Fylkesmannen11.09.13, 4680 I MTB, Kystverket19.06.13 on location, and Mattilsynet (NFSA) 04.07.13. Plan dt 04.12.13. And Bronnoysundregisteret reg for activity of org. MOM-3 dt 24.02.14710.03.14
		b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	B. Review evidence of compliance with discharge laws or regulations.	Y	Fylkesmannes permit as above, on mTB limitation only.
		c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	C. Verify that records show compliance with discharge laws and regulations.	Y	MTB reported to Altinn end of month. Seen Oct.2014 report filed in Altinn. No indications of non compliance.
PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION					
Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]					
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 transparency for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.			
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 2.1 - Modification of the Benthic Sampling Methodology					
For farms located in a jurisdiction where specific benthic sampling locations are required under law, clients may request to modify the benthic sampling methodology prescribed in Appendix I-1 to allow for sampling at different locations and/or changes in the total number of samples. Where modifications are sought, farms shall provide a full justification to the CAB for review. Requests for modification shall be supported by mapping of differences in sampling locations. In any event, the sampling locations must at a minimum include samples from the					
		Note: Under Indicator 2.1.1, farms can choose to measure redox potential (Option #1) or sulphide concentration (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values.			
	Indicator: Redox	a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification [3] to the CAB.	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (Appendix I-1) and evidence (if applicable) to justify use of a site specific AZE.	Y	Rocky/hard seabed did not allow for sediment at sampling station. By service Rådgivende biologer, sampling dt 5-6.09.13. at 75%MTB

2.1.1	<p>potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1</p> <p>Requirement: Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1c-f, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.</p>	<p>B. Review evidence of benthic type and confirm whether to proceed to 2.1.1c.</p>	Y		Sampling according to ASC salmon standard requirement and site specific sampling MOM-C. Maps with sampling points for both methods provided.
		<p>c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.</p>	<p>C. Record which option the client chose.</p>	Y		Option #1
		<p>d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I-1 (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations).</p>	<p>D. Review documentary evidence (notes, GPS coordinates) showing sampling time, stations, and frequency. Cross-check against farm maps and harvest records.</p>	Y		Seen survey maps with sampling points indicated.
		<p>e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Y		187-187 55m E from site. All closer samples gave no sediment. MOM-C as per national regulations (NS 9410) ASC adapted (ISO 16665)
		<p>f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (µM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p>	<p>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.</p>			Redox NA
		<p>g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. If site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC.</p>	<p>G. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	Y		Submitted to ASC. Dt 06.12.13 and 14.11.14
		Footnote	[2] Farm sites can choose whether to use redox or sulphide. Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both.			
Footnote	[3] Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) is defined under this standard as 30 meters. For farm sites where a site-specific AZE has been defined using a robust and credible modeling system such as the SEPA AUTODEPOMOD and verified through monitoring, the site-specific AZE shall be used.					
2.1.2	<p>Indicator: Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1</p> <p>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</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>Notes: - Under indicator 2.1.2, farms can choose one of four measurements to show compliance with the faunal index Requirement: AMBI (Option #1), Shannon-Wiener Index (Option #2), BQI (Option #3), or ITI (Option #4). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet</p>				
		<p>a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collection stations (see 2.1.1).</p>	<p>A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (see 2.1.1).</p>	Y		Site specific on MOM-C and ASC regime in recent survey, but hard/rocky bottom did not allow for sediment samples
		<p>b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement.</p>	<p>B. Record which option the client chose for scoring faunal index.</p>			NA Hard bottom.
		<p>c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).</p>	<p>C. Confirm sample collection followed Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1).</p>			NA Hard bottom.
		<p>d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method.</p>	<p>D. Review results (as applicable) to verify that AMBI score of sediments is ≤ 3.3 at each sampling station outside the AZE.</p>			NA Hard bottom.
		<p>e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method.</p>	<p>E. Review results (as applicable) to verify that Shannon Wiener score of sediments is > 3 at each sampling station outside the AZE.</p>			NA Hard bottom
		<p>f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.</p>	<p>F. Review results (as applicable) to verify that BQI score of sediments is ≥ 15 at each sampling station outside the AZE.</p>			NA Hard bottom
		<p>g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.</p>	<p>G. Review results (as applicable) to verify that ITI score of sediments is ≥ 25 at each sampling station outside the AZE.</p>			NA Hard bottom
		<p>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.</p>	<p>H. Confirm that an approved method was used or that a qualified independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.</p>			NA Hard bottom
<p>i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.</p>	<p>I. Confirm that client submitted faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	Y		KRBE 02.12.14 Closed NC from IA 2013. Submitted to ASC. Dt 06.12.13 and 14.11.14		
Footnote	[4] "Good" Ecological Quality Classification: The level of diversity and abundance of invertebrate taxa is slightly outside the range associated with the type-specific conditions. Most of the sensitive taxa of the type-specific communities are present.					
Footnote	[5] http://www.azti.es/en/amb-i-azti-marine-biotic-index.html .					
2.1.3	<p>Indicator: Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1</p> <p>Requirement: ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b.</p>	<p>A. Confirm appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c or exemption as per 2.1.1b.</p>	Y		Evaluated after ISO 16665 -2013
		<p>b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method.</p>	<p>B. Confirm that an appropriate method was used or that a suitably qualified independent laboratory performed the analysis.</p>			NA Hard/rocky bottom
		<p>c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.</p>	<p>C. Confirm that all samples from within the AZE have ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa (exclusive of pollution indicator species).</p>			NA Hard/rocky bottom
		<p>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.</p>	<p>D. Confirm that a suitable method was used or that a suitability qualified independent laboratory performed the scoring of faunal index.</p>			NA Rocky/hard seabed did not allow for sediment at sampling station. By service Rødgivende biologer, sampling dt 5-6.09.13. at 75% MTB
		<p>e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.</p>	<p>E. Confirm that client has submitted scores to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	Y		Submitted to ASC. Dt 06.12.13 and 14.11.14
Footnote	[6] Highly abundant: Greater than 100 organisms per square meter (or equally high to reference site(s) if natural abundance is lower than this level).					
2.1.4	<p>Indicator: Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modeling system</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, within three years of the publication [8] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015)</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]</p>	<p>Note: Farms may define a site-specific AZE at any time before this date as long as they demonstrate full compliance by June 13, 2015.</p>				
		<p>a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern before 3 years have passed since publication of the Standard on June 13, 2012.</p>	<p>A. Review documentation to confirm that the farm has undertaken an analysis before the required date.</p>	Y		Site specific approach as described above
		<p>b. Maintain records to show how the analysis (in 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modeling using a multi-parameter approach [7].</p>	<p>B. Confirm that the farm used a robust and credible modeling system to define the site-specific AZE.</p>	Y		Site specific approach as described above
<p>c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data.</p>	<p>C. Confirm that farms have validated the general applicability of the site-specific AZE using monitoring data (i.e. 'ground truthing').</p>	Y		Site specific approach as described above		
Footnote	[7] Robust and credible: The SEPA AUTODEPOMOD modeling system is considered to be an example of a credible and robust system. The model must include a					
Footnote	[8] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication					
Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [12]						
Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):			Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[12] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.5.					
		<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.1 - Monitoring Average Weekly Percent Saturation of Dissolved Oxygen</p> <p>Appendix I-4 presents the required methodology that farms must follow for sampling the average weekly percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO). Key points of the method are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - measurements may be taken with a handheld oxygen meter or equivalent chemical method; - equipment is calibrated according to manufacturer's recommendations; - measurements are taken at least twice daily: once in the morning (6-9 am) and once in the afternoon (3-6 pm) as appropriate for the location and season; 				

2.2.1	<p>Indicator: Weekly average percent saturation [13] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [14] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4</p> <p>Requirement: $\geq 70\%$ [15]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [15]</p>	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.	A. Do not schedule audit until client provides a minimum of 6 months of DO data.	Y		Manual measurement
		b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.	B. Review records for completeness and conformity with methodology in Appendix I-4.	Y		Records complete for period. See below.
		c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.	C. Review calculation and confirm all weekly averages $\geq 70\%$.	Y		Seen dissolved O2 records for last 6 months. From 11.06.13 to 14.05.14 (min reg is 73)
		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).	D. As needed, review DO data from reference site and document in the audit report (see instruction).	Y		All above limit
		e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.	E. Witness DO monitoring and verify calibration while on site. On-site values should fall within range of farm data for DO. If an out of range measurement is observed, raise a nonconformity.	Y		DO system calibration log for monitoring. Curves, trends and minimum values OK.
		f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	F. Confirm that client has submitted DO results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted 14.11.14.
Footnote	[13] Percent saturation: Percent saturation is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sample compared to the maximum amount that could be present at the same temperature and salinity.					
Footnote	[14] Averaged weekly from two daily measurements (proposed at 6 am and 3 pm).					
Footnote	[15] An exception to this standard shall be made for farms that can demonstrate consistency with a reference site in the same water body.					
2.2.2	<p>Indicator: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/liter DO</p>	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/l DO.	A. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that $\leq 5\%$ of weekly samples fall under 2 mg/l DO.	Y		All above limits.
		b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	B. Confirm that client has submitted results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted in files dt 11.11.14.
2.2.3	<p>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]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes [19]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]</p>	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	A. Record whether indicator is applicable.	Y		Applicable: Targets in EU Water Directive 2000. (Vesentlige vannforvaltningsspørsmål for Agder). Data fra "Vann nett" 01.02.2013). Evaluation of area is "svært god" (very good).
		b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.	B. Confirm that there has been a recent third-party analysis (within two years prior to the audit) to classify areas according to national or regional water quality targets.	Y		(Vesentlige vannforvaltningsspørsmål for Agder). Data fra "Vann nett" 01.02.2013). Evaluation of area is "svært god" (very good).
		c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.	C. Confirm that the analysis and classification shows the farm is located in an area where the water quality complies with the requirement.	Y		EU Water Directive 2000. (Vesentlige vannforvaltningsspørsmål for Agder). Data fra "Vann nett" 01.02.2013). Evaluation of area is "svært god" (very good).
Footnote	[16] Related to nutrients (e.g., N, P, chlorophyll A).					
Footnote	[17] Within the two years prior to the audit.					
Footnote	[18] Classifications of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classification from other water quality monitoring systems in other jurisdictions are acceptable.					
Footnote	[19] Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of $> 75\%$ of solid nutrients as well as $> 50\%$ of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt from standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.					
2.2.4	<p>Indicator: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [20] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]</p>	a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5, testing a minimum of once weekly in both locations. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months.	A. Review the farm's monitoring plan and verify that the farm has collected monitoring data for N and P following the methodology in Appendix I-5.		NA	No farm specific monitoring as point is covered by: EU Water Directive 2000. (Vesentlige vannforvaltningsspørsmål for Agder). Data fra "Vann nett" 01.02.2013). Evaluation of area is "svært god" (very good).
		b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.	B. Verify that client calibrates equipment as needed.		NA	EU Water Directive 2000. (Vesentlige vannforvaltningsspørsmål for Agder). Data fra "Vann nett" 01.02.2013). Evaluation of area is "svært god" (very good).
		c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	C. Confirm that client has submitted N and P data to ASC (Appendix VI).		NA	EU Water Directive 2000. (Vesentlige vannforvaltningsspørsmål for Agder). Data fra "Vann nett" 01.02.2013). Evaluation of area is "svært god" (very good).
Footnote	[20] Farms shall monitor total N, NH4, NO3, total P and Ortho-P in the water column. Results shall be submitted to the ASC database. Methods such as a Hach kit are acceptable.					
2.2.5	<p>Indicator: Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [21]) of the farm on a production cycle basis</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand				
		Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) can be calculated based on cumulative inputs of N and C to the environment over the course of the production cycle. $BOD = ((\text{total N in feed} - \text{total N in fish}) * 4.57) + ((\text{total C in feed} - \text{total C in fish}) * 2.67)$.				
Footnote	[21] BOD calculated as: $((\text{total N in feed} - \text{total N in fish}) * 4.57) + ((\text{total C in feed} - \text{total C in fish}) * 2.67)$. A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient wasted. In this equation, "fish" refers to harvested fish. Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting; Sept 25-29, 2009; VeraCruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.uvic.ca/~gapi/explore-gapi/bod.html .		a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box.	A. Review calculation, cross-check data used with feed and harvest records.	Y	BOD of 83139 kgO2 on completed
			b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	B. Confirm that client has submitted calculated BOD to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y	Submitted 14.11.14
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):			Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
2.3.1	<p>Indicator: Percentage of fines [22] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [23] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2)</p> <p>Requirement: $< 1\%$ by weight of the feed</p>	Note: The methodology given in Appendix I-2 is used to determine the fines (dust and small fragments) in finished product of fish feed which has a diameter of 3 mm or more.				
		a. 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.	A. Review timing and location of testing. If testing off-site, verify rationale and ensure consistent with [23].	Y		According to reqs. Ranging from 0.16 to 0.2%, measured at point of recetion on farm.
		b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations.	B. Verify that client has appropriate testing technology on site and that, if applicable, it is calibrated as required.	Y		As per ASC as part of normal SOPs

	<p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [23]</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>C. Review testing results and confirm that the pooled sample for each quarter has a percent fines of <1%.</p>	Y		According to reqs. Ranging from 0,16 to 0,2%.
Footnote	[22] Fines: Dust and fragments in the feed. Particles that separate from feed with a diameter of 5 mm or less when sieved through a 1 mm sieve, or particles that separate from feed with a diameter greater than 5 mm when sieved through a 2.36 mm sieve. To be measured at farm gate (e.g., from feed bags after they are delivered to farm).				
Footnote	[23] To be measured every quarter or every three months. Samples that are measured shall be chosen randomly. Feed may be sampled immediately prior to delivery to farm for sites with no feed storage where it is not possible to sample on farm. Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients and > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt.				
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species					
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):		
2.4.1	<p>Indicator: 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>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Note: If a farm has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may use such documents as evidence to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 2.4.1 as long as all components in Appendix I-3 are explicitly covered.</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>A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I-3.</p>	Y	Konsekvensutredning (Impact assessment) by Rådgivende Biologer dt. 02.01.09.
		<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>B. Verify the farm has a plan to address all potential impacts identified in the assessment.</p>	Y	No negative impacts identified. Impacts consequence assessment performed by third party service "Rådgivende Biologer" On marine and aquatic: biological diversity, terrestrial biological diversity - and values of these. MOM-B per cyclus at cond.1 result.
		<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>C. Verify that the farm implements the plan(s).</p>	Y	Registrations and MOM-B and MOM-C surveys on benthic impact. Also mapping of Marine Biological diversity Weak negative impacts identified. Impacts consequence assessment performed by third party service "Rådgivende Biologer"
2.4.2	<p>Indicator: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [24] or High Conservation Value Areas [25] (HCVAs)</p> <p>Requirement: None [26]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [26]</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to requirements that farms are not sited within Protected Areas or HCVAs</p> <p>The following exceptions shall be made for Indicator 2.4.2:</p> <p>Exception #1: For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management).</p> <p>Exception #2: For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVa designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVa.</p> <p>Exception #3: For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected.</p> <p>Definitions</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 also 1.1.1a).</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 HCVa.</p>	Y	DN Naturbase map with all known protected areas defined - site operation is not in conflict with protected areas. HCVa or CAS. Also considered in Rådgivende Biologer Impact Assessment report. Dt 02.11.09. Landskapsversjoner - see above.
		<p>b. If the farm is <u>not</u> 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>B. Obtain a copy of the farm's declaration stating that the farm is not sited in a protected area or HCVa (as applicable).</p>	Y	Seen maps of areas. (Forvallingnigla for Flekkelfjord Landskapsvernområde by Fylkesmannen i Vest-Agder Oct 2010.
		<p>c. If the farm <u>is</u> sited in a protected area or HCVa, 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>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>		Not within HCVa
	<p>d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVa 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>D. Review evidence to determine whether the farm is allowed to be sited in a protected area or HCVa and hence eligible for ASC certification.</p>		NA	Not within HCVa
Footnote	[24] Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." Source: Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008), Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 86pp.				
Footnote	[25] High Conservation Value Areas (HCVa): Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVa are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical conservation values—both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high conservation values are maintained or enhanced (http://www.hcvnetwork.org/).				
Footnote	[26] The following exceptions shall be made for Standard 2.4.2: • For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management).				
Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]					
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):		
Footnote	[27] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.6.				
2.5.1	<p>Indicator: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used</p> <p>Requirement: 0, within three years of the date of publication [28] of the SAD standard (i.e. full</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>A. Confirm that farm management has prepared a written statement of commitment.</p>	Y	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor have been used. Ref. Marine Harvest statement 09.12.13 on devices not used.
		<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>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>	Y	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor have been used
		<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>	<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>	Y	Verified not in use
Footnote	[28] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.				
	<p>Indicator: Prior to the achievement of 2.5.1, if ADDs or AHDs are used,</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.5.2 - Percentage of Days that ADDs or AHDs were used</p> <p>Farms must calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that ADDs or AHDs were operated using data from the most recent complete production cycle. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 2.5.2 for the most recent complete production cycle if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the client understands how to accurately calculate percentage of days the devices were operational; - the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate the percentage of operational days based on > 6 months of data for the current production cycle; and - the client can show how plans for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. devices in operation <40% of days). 			

2.5.2	<p>maximum percentage of days [29] in the production cycle that the devices are operational</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 40%</p> <p>Applicability: All, until June 13, 2015</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.	A. Review log and cross-check with records of predator incidents.	Y		Revised log.No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used. Ref statment 09.12.13 on deviced not used.
		b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle.	B. Verify calculations and cross-check against records for the duration of the production cycle.		NA	No ADDs/AHDs in use nor has been used
		c. Confirm devices were operational ≤ 40% of the days of the production cycle.	C. Confirm devices were operational ≤ 40% of the days of the production cycle.		NA	Verified not in use
		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).	D. Confirm that client has submitted data on ADDs/AHDs to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted to ASC 14.11.14
Footnote	[29] Day: 24-hour cycle.					
2.5.3	<p>Indicator: Number of mortalities [30] of endangered or red-listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm</p> <p>Requirement: 0 (zero)</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.	A. Review list.	Y		Birdnets only
		b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.	B. Review farm records of predator incidents and cross-check against relevant records (e.g. escapes).	Y		Regs from site states 1 incidet of seagull in birdnet . Log revised.
		c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.	C. Review records for completeness. Cross-check mortality records against interviews with farm staff and community representatives.	Y		Verified on site
		d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1)	D. Review list for consistency with 2.4.1	Y		Red list from "Norsk Rødliste for arter-2010" - fra Artsdatabanken" New list 2015.
		e. Compare results from (a) through (d) above to confirm that there were no mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on farm.	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.	Y		No morts of RL species registered on site.
Footnote	[30] Mortalities: Includes animals intentionally killed through lethal action as well as accidental deaths through entanglement or other means.					
Footnote	[31] Species listed as endangered or critically endangered by the IUCN or on a national endangered species list.					
2.5.4	<p>Indicator: Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [32] against a predator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority <p>Requirement: Yes [33]</p> <p>Applicability: All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [33]</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.	A. Review list of lethal actions taken by the farm and cross-check against 2.5.3b.		NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked.
		b. For each lethal action identified in 2.5.4a, keep record of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a rationale showing how the farm pursued all other reasonable avenues prior to using lethal action; approval from a senior manager above the farm manager of the lethal action; where applicable, explicit permission was granted by the relevant regulatory authority to take lethal action against the animal. 	B. Review documentation to confirm that the farm shows evidence of compliance with requirements in steps 1-3.		NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked. Governed by Int. Procedure ID 33 0 37 and ID 31 8 80 on handling of these issues.
		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].	C. Review documentary evidence to verify actions, permissions, and approvals were taken prior to taking lethal action. If client requests exemption due to human safety, review evidence to verify [33].		NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked. Governed by Int. Procedure ID 33 0 37 on handling of these issues.
Footnote	[32] Lethal action: Action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds.					
Footnote	[33] Exception to these conditions may be made for a rare situation where human safety is endangered. Should this be required, post-incident approval from a senior manager should be made and relevant authorities must be informed.					
<p>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"</p> <p>The ASC Salmon Standard has defined "Lethal Incident" to include all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids [footnote 35]. For the purpose of assisting farms and auditors with understanding how to evaluate compliance with Indicators 2.5.5, 2.5.6, and 2.5.7, ASC has clarified this definition further:</p> <p>Total number of lethal Incidents = sum of all non-salmonid deaths arising from all lethal actions taken by the farm during a given time period</p> <p>There should be a 1:1 relationship between the number of animal deaths and the number of lethal incidents reported by the farm. For example, if a farm has taken one (1) lethal action in past last two years and that single lethal action resulted in killing three (3) birds, it is considered three (3) lethal incidents within a two year period.</p> <p>The term "non-salmonid" was intended to cover any predatory animals which are likely to try to feed upon farmed salmon. In practice these animals will usually be seals or birds.</p>						
2.5.5	<p>Indicator: Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</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.	A. Check farm records for publicizing lethal actions against the actions listed in 2.5.4a to confirm that the farm made information available within 30 days.		NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked. Hence nothing to publish ref 2.4 4a
		a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.	A. Check farm records for publicizing lethal actions against the actions listed in 2.5.4a to confirm that the farm made information available within 30 days.	Y		Registration in TQM (Total Quality Management System)
		b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).	B. Verify that required information is easily publicly available.		NA	No lethal actions taken. Int records checked. Hence nothing to publish ref 2.4 4a
Footnote	[34] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available." Shall be made available within 30 days of the incident and see Appendix VI for transparency requirements.					
2.5.6	<p>Indicator: Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior two years</p> <p>Requirement: < 9 lethal incidents [36], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.4a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required.	A. Review log.	Y		Registrations of incidents. 01 incident of entanglement recorded last cycle. Gillnets for salmon escape monitoring is cause of entanglement of eiderducks.
		b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.	B. Verify that over the previous two years there were < 9 lethal incidents in total and that ≤ 2 of those incidents were marine mammal deaths.	Y		Revised registrations. No marine mammal incidents.
		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).	C. Confirm that data on all lethal incidents has been submitted to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted to ASC 19.09.14
Footnote	[35] Lethal incident: Includes all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids.					
Footnote	[36] Standard 2.5.6 applicable to incidents related to non-endangered and non-red-listed species. This standard complements, and does not contradict, 2.5.3.					
	<p>Indicator: In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that an assessment of the risk of lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of</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.	A. Review farm records to confirm that all the farm performs an appropriate risk assessment following all lethal incidents (see list 2.5.4a).	Y		RA/Procedure Is (Forbygging mot håndtering og avliving av predatorer ID 31880 dt02.06.14) 01 incident of entanglement recorded last cycle. Procedure implemented.

2.5.7	<p>MEASURED BY: concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</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>B. Verify that the farm implements steps to reduce risk of lethal incidents.</p>	Y		<p>RA/Procedure is (Forbygging mot handling og avlving av predatorer ID 31880 dt02.06.14) 01 incident of entanglement recorded last cycle. Procedure implemented. Practice with occasional use of gillnets evaluated.</p>
PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS						
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [38,39]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[38] Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.					
Footnote	[39] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1						
According to footnote [38], farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the requirements under Criterion 3.1. More specifically, farms are only eligible for exemption from Criterion 3.1 if it can be shown that either of the following holds: 1) the farm does not release any water to the natural environment; or						
3.1.1	<p>Indicator: 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>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: 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>A. Review records of farm participation in ABM scheme. Contact other ABM participants as necessary to confirm the accuracy of client records.</p>	Y		<p>Approved Ops.Plan by F. Dir. and F. Dir overview over Flekkefjord Local Municipality, stating MHN in sole operator in Area. Records and overview over ABM in zones defined by NFSA. Weekly updates to Altinn, where info is available for all farms in zone. 100% of farms included. Records from "Lusenettverket" treatments and disease notification, if any, included.</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>B. Review description of ABM to verify that the management activities address each of the four element from indicator 3.1.1.</p>	Y		<p>Weekly on sealice to Altinn. MHN sole operator and manages 100 % of farms in area. (6SW and 1 FW)</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>C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with Appendix II-1.</p>	Y		<p>Weekly on sealice to Altinn. MHN sole operator and manages 100 % of farms in area. (6SW and 1 FW)</p>
		<p>d. Submit dates of following period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.</p>	<p>D. Confirm that client has submitted dates of following periods to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	Y		<p>Submitted to ASC dt 14.11.14 as "MHN operations calendar" for site.</p>
3.1.2	<p>Indicator: A demonstrated commitment [40] to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p>	<p>Note: Indicator 3.1.2 requires that farms demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks. If the farm does not receive any requests to collaborate on such research projects, the farm may demonstrate compliance by showing evidence of commitment through other proactive means such as published policy statements or directed outreach to relevant organizations.</p>				
		<p>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 records of 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>	Y		<p>1) Agreement on cooperation for development of sustainable aquaculture between WWF and Marine Harvest from Feb 2011 2) Wild salmon fish traps in Etne River. Cooperation between research, fisheries and authorities. 3) pilot prosjekt i Hardanger - on survival of wild salmonids (DN, F. Dir. NFSA) 4) Vossalaget - reestablishing the Vossa wild salmon stock. 5) Genetical studies - ova and smolt provided to project. Lakselus og lakselus overvåking i Romsdalsfjord (Sealice monitoring project). Salmon trap project in Guddalselva in Kvithrad. Repr. in Fagrd for Sira-Kvina vassdraget</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>B. Review how the farm and/or its operating company has provided non-financial support for research activities.</p>	Y		<p>Salmon step/tunnel in Lyngdalproject in negotiations.</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>C. As applicable, review the provided record of rejecting proposals to confirm that denials were justified and there is no consistent pattern to indicate that the farm and/or its operating company lacks a demonstrated commitment to collaborate on research activities.</p>			<p>NA</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>D. Verify that the farm's communications with researchers demonstrate a commitment to collaborate on relevant areas of research.</p>	Y		<p>In FHF PD project-mail dt 23.06.14 and agreements as described in 3.1.2.a</p>
Footnote	[40] Commitment: At a minimum, a farm and/or its operating company must demonstrate this commitment through providing farm-level data to researchers, granting researchers access to sites, or other similar non-financial support for research activities.					
3.1.3	<p>Indicator: Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II-2</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except</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>A. Review records to confirm compliance.</p>	Y		<p>NFSA set limits and govern treatment regime, reported vi Altinn. Also Int proc. In TOM "Lakselus- forbygging kontroll og behandling" ID 24.98.5. Registered on farm in AquaFarmer. Max sealice load has been set to <0.5. Achieved max weekly <0.3.</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>B. Confirm that sea lice load is reviewed annually and, if applicable, the review incorporates information from monitoring of wild salmon.</p>	Y		<p>NFSA set limits and govern treatment regime, reported vi Altinn. Continuous review by NFSA and Luse -nettverket monthly review. Report for 02.02.14 to 27.08.14 with details. No monitoring of wild salmon allowed.</p>

	<p>Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p> <p>c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the ABM has set (3.1.3.a) 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>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 lice load to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	Y			<p>NFSA set limits and govern treatment regime, reported via Altinn. Continuous review by NFSA and Luse -nettverket monthly review. Sensitive periods for wild salmon migration considered and monitoring intensified.</p> <p>In compiled doc: to ASC 14.11.14</p>	
3.1.4	<p>Indicator: Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: 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 salmonids (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 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 offsite computer to confirm that results are easily publicly available. If applicable, confirm that the farm made hardcopies of test results easily available to stakeholders.</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>	Y	Y	X	<p>Weekly sampling and regs to NFSA by Altinn. Sensitive periods for migration. Spring coordinated delicing set by NFSA for region.</p> <p>To Altinn weekly. No deviations registered. (exempt from periods with temp below 04 degrees C.</p> <p>Weekly testing from NSFA predetermined cages, according NFSA regulation. Sealice numbers and life-stage identified and recorded. Min 10 fish /cage 50 % of cages weekly</p> <p>To Altinn NFSA publishes in public reports when data is processed. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.</p> <p>No records available</p> <p>In compiled doc: to ASC 14.11.4</p>	
Footnote	[41] Testing must be weekly during and immediately prior to sensitive periods for wild salmonids, such as outmigration of wild juvenile salmon. Testing must be at least monthly during the rest of the year, unless water temperature is so cold that it would jeopardize farmed fish health to test for lice (below 4 degrees C). Within closed production systems, alternative methods for monitoring sea lice, such as video monitoring, may be used.						
Footnote	[42] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available."						
3.1.5	<p>Indicator: in areas with wild salmonids [43], evidence of data [44] and the farm's understanding of that data, around salmonid migration routes, migration timing and stock productivity in major waterways within 50 kilometers of the farm</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</p> <p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmonid Health and Migration</p> <p>In writing this indicator, the SAD Steering Committee concluded that relevant data sets on wild salmonid health and migration are publicly available in the vast majority of, if not all, jurisdictions with wild salmonids. The information is likely to come from government sources or from research institutions. Therefore farms are not responsible for conducting this research themselves. However farms must demonstrate that they are aware of this basic information in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those wild stocks.</p> <p>This Indicator requires collection and understanding of general data for the major watersheds within approximately 50 km of the farm. A farm does not need to demonstrate that there is data for every small river or tributary or subpopulation. Information should relate to the wild fish stock level, which implies that the population is more or less isolated from other stocks of the same species and hence self-sustaining. A "conservation unit" under the Canadian Wild Salmon Policy is an example of an appropriate fish stock-level definition. However, it must be recognized that each jurisdiction may have slight differences in how a wild salmonid stock is defined in the region.</p> <p>For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere [43]. Potentially affected species in these areas are salmonids (i.e. including all trout species). Where a species is not natural to a region (e.g. Atlantic or Pacific Salmon in Chile) the areas are not considered as "areas with wild salmonids" even if salmon have escaped from farms and established themselves as a reproducing species in "the wild".</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, then 3.1.5b and c 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>D. Confirm the farm's understanding of this information through interviews.</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>	Y	Y		<p>S. salar and S. trutta. No general mapping of migrating routes exists, to our knowledge.</p> <p>Migratory routes as defined in web site "environmental statistics" (miljostatus.no) on salmonid carrying rivers, and Lakseregisteret from Miljødirektoratet. Also map from DN with rivers identified.</p> <p>Tengselva near Egersund and Audna at Mandal closest rivers. Sensitive periods are outmigrating smolts in April-June (also slated to be 01.02 to 31.05 for intensified monitoring)</p> <p>Sufficient awareness and also participation related scientific projects by MH staff.</p>
Footnote	[43] For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere.						
Footnote	[44] Farms do not need to conduct research on migration routes, timing and the health of wild stocks under this standard if general information is already available. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level for salmonid populations in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those stocks.						
3.1.6	<p>Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Arctic char, with results made publicly available. See requirements in Appendix III-1.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with</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>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>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>	Y	Y		<p>IMR/NINA/NOFIMA/VI 2.2014 Risk Assessment for Norw, fish Farming report 2013, where sealice issues are covered. Nearest registrations from Hellvik, Rogaland county, on impact on wild stocks. Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law.</p> <p>As above. Private interference with wild salmonids prohibited by law.</p> <p>RA above is Assembly reports based on all available information.</p>	

	<p>representing all areas where wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]</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>D. Confirm that results are easily publicly available and that they were posted within the required timeframe.</p>	Y			IMR/NNA/NOFIMA reports publicly available
		<p>e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI.</p>	<p>E. Confirm that client has submitted monitoring results to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>	Y			Report above not submitted to ASC, although other information regarding this issue is publicly available.
3.1.7	<p>Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish [45]. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2.</p> <p>Requirement: 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish</p> <p>Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water 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>A. Confirm whether the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids based on results from 3.1.5a (above). If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.</p>	Y			S. salar and S. trutta and naturally occurring in area.
		<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>B. Review farm's designation of sensitive periods and cross-check against datasets presented in 3.1.4 and 3.1.5.</p>	Y			Migratory routes as defined in web site "Environmental statistics" (miljøstatus.no) on salmonid carrying rivers, and Lakseregisteret from Miljødirektoratet. Also map from DN with rivers identified.
		<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>C. Review records from the farm's sea lice monitoring program to confirm that lice levels are in compliance with the requirement based on farm-wide average lice levels per farmed fish (not values from individual net-pens).</p>	Y			Weekly testing from predetermined cages, according NFSA regulations. Sealice lifestage identified and recorded. (in aquafarmer and excel sheet for submittance to NSA via Altinn) Record of weekly testing for period 05.06.13 to 06.05.14 has one single sample with 0,07 mature female in avg. (dt 26.06.13 to 02.07.13). The remaining week samples have 0,000mature females per fish. i.e absent.
		<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>D. Confirm that monitoring data for lice levels are used in a feedback loop as required by Appendix II-2.</p>	Y			Continous wild fish sealice monitoring not possible, as describe above. Direct feedback loop hence impossible to obtain.
Footnote	[45] Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.						NA
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
		<p>Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.1, "area" is defined as a contiguous body of water with the bio-chemical and temperature profile required to support the farmed species' life and reproduction (e.g. the Northern Atlantic Coast of the U.S. and Canada). Appendix II-1A elaborates further on this definition: "The boundaries of an area should be defined, taking into account the zone in which key cumulative impacts on wild populations may occur, water movement and other relevant aspects of ecosystem structure and function." The intent is that the area relates to the spatial extent that is likely to be put at risk from the non-native salmon. Areas will only rarely coincide with the boundaries of countries.</p>					
3.2.1	<p>Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially produced in the area by the date of publication of the SAD standard</p> <p>Requirement: Yes [47]</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in [47]</p>	<p>a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.</p>	<p>A. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species by comparing local species (results from 3.1.5a) to the species produced. Cross-check against record from smolt suppliers (e.g. 3.3.1b). If the farm only produces a native species, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.</p>				NA S. salar native to region
		<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>B. Review evidence to confirm when the non-native species was first brought into wide commercial production in the area of the farm.</p>				NA S. salar native to region
		<p>c. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish that includes details on accuracy of sterility effectiveness.</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>				NA S. salar native to region
		<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>D. Review evidence that the farm complies with each point raised in 3.2.1d and confirm by inspection during on-site audit. Cross check against related farm records for escapes (3.4.1), unexplained loss (3.4.2), and escape prevention (3.4.4).</p>				NA S. salar native to region
		-	E. Verify compliance.				NA S. salar native to region
Footnote	[47] Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical barriers that are in place and well-maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.						
		Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.2.2 - Exceptions to Allow Production of Non-Native Species					
		<p>Farms have five years to demonstrate compliance with this standard from the time of publication of the ASC Salmon Standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017). Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior to farming activities in the area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining.</p>					
3.2.2	<p>Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research [48] completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction and these results submitted to ASC for review [49]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, within five years of publication of the SAD standard [50,51]</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI).</p>	<p>A. Confirm the farm has informed ASC which species is in production (Appendix VI).</p>				NA S. salar native to region
		<p>b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p>	<p>B. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species as for 3.2.1. If the farm only produces a native species, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply.</p>				NA S. salar native to region
		<p>c. 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>C. Confirm that the scientific research included: multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species; used credible methodologies & analyses; and underwent peer review. If the farm requests an exemption then enter "NA" and proceed to 3.2.2d.</p>				NA S. salar native to region
		<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>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>				NA S. salar native to region
		<p>e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review.</p>	<p>E. Confirm the farm submits required evidence to ASC.</p>				NA S. salar native to region
Footnote	[48] The research must at a minimum include multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species, use credible methodologies and analysis, and undergo peer review.						
Footnote	[49] If the review demonstrates there is increased risk, the ASC will consider prohibiting the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction under this standard. In the event that the risk tools demonstrate "high" risks, the SAD expects that the ASC will prohibit the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction.						
Footnote	[50] Farms have five years to demonstrate compliance with this standard from the time of publication of the final SAD standards and accompanying auditing guidelines.						

Footnote	[51] Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior to farming activities in the area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 1993 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining.					
3.2.3	Indicator: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.	A. Confirm whether the farms uses fish for sea lice control. If no, auditor response to 3.2.3A-C is "not applicable" (NA).			Cleaning fish: Rognkjeks, grøngylte, bergylte and bergnebb are all native to region NA
		b. Maintain records (e.g. invoices) to show the species name and origin of all fish used by the farm for purposes of sea lice control.	B. Review purchase records to confirm the origin and identity of all species that are used for sea lice control on farm.			Cleaning fish: Rognkjeks, grøngylte, bergylte and bergnebb are all native to region NA
		c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.	C. Review evidence for compliance with the requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature, government documentation confirming species is not non-native to the region. Acceptable first hand accounts: community testimonials and direct evidence for historical presence of the species in the water body captured with cast nets, trapping devices, or fishing.			Cleaning fish: Rognkjeks (Lumpfish), and wrasses: grøngylte, bergylte and bergnebb are all native to region NA
Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
3.3.1	Indicator: Use of transgenic [53] salmon by the farm Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon.	A. Verify declaration of no use of transgenic salmon.	Y		Statement dt Dec.2011, from genetics service provider Genomar on MOWI stock that conventional breeding and genetics only, are applied.
		b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	B. Review records to confirm compliance with the requirement.	Y		Internal genetics/ova provider Tveitevågen, supported by Genomar
		c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.	C. If the auditor suspects that transgenic fish are being cultured, test stock identity by collecting 3 fish and sending to an ISO 17025 certified laboratory for genetic analysis.	Y		Statement dt Dec 2011, from genetics service provider Genomar on MOWI stock that conventional breeding and genetics only, are applied.
Footnote	[53] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get that trait expressed in the offspring (http://www.csrees.usda.gov/nea/biotech/res/biotechnology_res_glossary.html).					
Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote [55] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.						
3.4.1	Indicator: Maximum number of escapees [56] in the most recent production cycle Requirement: 300 [57] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [57]	a. Maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.	A. Review client submission for completeness and accuracy of information. Cross-check with the estimate of unexplained loss, maintenance records for small tears in net, predator attacks, etc.	Y		No escapes registered for the last three production cycles. Aquafarmer reports. In monthly env. Reports 2013- 2014. In int proc."Risk Ananlysis escapes" with contingency plan
		b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle.	B. Review the calculation and confirm compliance with the requirement.	Y		No escapes registered for the last three production cycles. In monthly env. Reports 2013-2014. As a rule, suspicions of escapes trigger net checks and ultimately counting of fish in cage.
		c. Maintain the monitoring records described in 3.4.1a for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [57]).	C. Confirm that farm documents show continuous monitoring of escapes.	Y		As above and in Aquafarmer and Fisheries Dir. reports (www. Fishdir.no.) Last update 30.09.14
		d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [57]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the farm could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.	D. Review the farm's request for a rare exception to the Standard for an escape event. Confirm no prior exceptional events were documented during the previous 10 years, or since the date of the start of the production cycle during which the farm first applied for certification. An example of an exceptional event is vandalism of the farm. Events that are not considered exceptional include failures in moorings due to bad weather, boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the farm, human error, and predation.	Y		NA No escapes registered for at least this sites. In monthly env. Reports 2013- 2014
		e. Submit escape monitoring dataset 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 escape monitoring data to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted to ASC dt 14.11.14
Footnote	[56] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregate number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish. Data on date of escape episode(s), number of fish escaped and cause of escape episode shall be reported as outlined in Appendix VI.					
Footnote	[57] A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. See auditing guidance for additional details.					
3.4.2	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.	A. Confirm that the farm keeps records of counting accuracy for the counting technology or method used on site at stocking and harvest.	Y		Counting performed at FW site, vaccination numbers used, manually or Vaki and Aquascan and finale check at stocking with well boat Aquasca. Final accurate numbers at harvest plant where individual fish is handled and registered. Statement from VAKI (WWW.VAKI.is) and Aquascan of 98-100% accuracy.
		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).	B. Verify the client obtains information from smolt suppliers (if applicable).	Y		Vaccination numbers in FW used as accurate number stocked.
		c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).	C. Verify that the farm calibrates counting equipment as recommended by the manufacturer.	Y		Live fish carrier procedure/manual on scanner calibration pg 15 . For stocking and any grading spitting/counting operations on site.
		-	D. Confirm the stated accuracy of the farm's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98% at both stocking and harvest. Stated accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.	Y		Described in pt A and C above
		e. 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).	Y		Submitted to ASC dt 18.09.14
Footnote	[58] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.					

3.4.3	<p>Indicator: Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss The Estimated Unexplained Loss (EUL) of fish is calculated at the end of each production cycle as follows:</p> <p>$EUL = (\text{stocking count}) - (\text{harvest count}) - (\text{mortalities}) - (\text{recorded escapes})$</p> <p>Units for input variables are number of fish (i.e. counts) per production cycle. Where possible, farms should use the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count. This formula is adapted from footnote 59 of the ASC Salmon Standard.</p>					
		a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1).	A. Review records for completeness.	Y		All in Aquafarmer. Finals from last cycle 12G show 0.37 % positive number.	
		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.	B. Verify accuracy of farm calculations for estimated unexplained loss.	Y		All in Aquafarmer. Finals from last cycle show 0.37 % positive number.	
		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.	C. Verify that the farm makes the information available to the public.	N	X	The requirement is "Estimated unexplained loss" [59] of farmed salmon is to be made publicly available. Results are submitted to Altinn and NFSA publishes in public reports when data are processed, but not publicly available. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website. Direct access to data for actual site should be established e.g on MH ASC website.	
		d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	D. Confirm that client has submitted estimated unexplained loss to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		In compiled docs 14.11.14	
				E. Compare EUL values (3.4.3a) and counting accuracy (3.4.2a) to recorded escapes to check whether farm reporting is plausible. If EUL is greater than the combined margin of error related to fish counts, investigate potential sources of error as it could indicate the farm under reported mortalities or escapes.	Y		Within accepted counting error.
Footnote	[59] Calculated at the end of the production cycle as: Unexplained loss – Stocking count – harvest count – mortalities – other known escapes. Where possible, use of the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count is preferred.						
3.4.4	<p>Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and reporting of risk events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors, reporting and follow up of escape events); and worker training on escape prevention and counting technologies</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	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.	A. Obtain and review the farm's escape prevention plan prior to scheduling the first audit.	Y		In central RA in escape prev section. Contingency plan. Int proc. doc ID 27.01.7 and with contingency plan. "Romming", Doc ID 27259. Also ID 2784 on operations with risk of escapes. Site specific contingency plan. Net individually tagged. Net regs in "Egersund log" demonstrated with stretch tests and certificates available and revised. External training courses in escape prevention for all site staff. New FHL training course planned for January-15. Contingency plan posted on site.	
		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.	B. Confirm the farm's Escape Prevention Plan contains all required elements for open (net pen) systems as applicable.	Y		In procedures as in pt 3.4.4a. Diving inspection after any net handling operations. All structures have NYTEK certification by Aquastructure certificate # AS159 valid to 19.11.19.	
		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.	C. Confirm the farm's Escape Prevention Plan contains all required elements for closed systems as applicable.			NA Open system	
		d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.	D. Review documentary evidence showing implementation of the plan.	Y		Records in site logs on routine checks and training activities in competency matrix.	
		e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.	E. Review records (i.e. attendance records, meeting notes) to confirm that farm staff attend training on escape prevention planning.	Y		Escape prevention training for sitenmanagers and ohter members of site staff. Training course 2006. New training planned January 2015 for all staff.	
			F. Interview farm workers to confirm that the plan is implemented.	Y		implementation confirmed OK, e.g net strength for net in cage #1 net ID#6533 , tested dt 16.06.14	
PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER							
<i>Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed</i>							
Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):			Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds Farms must show that all feeds used by the farm are produced in compliance with the requirements of Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.4. To do so, farms must obtain documentary evidence that the feed producers (see note 1) are audited at regular intervals by an independent auditing firm or a conformity assessment body against a recognized standard which substantially incorporate requirements for traceability. Acceptable certification schemes include GlobalGAP or other schemes that have been acknowledged by the ASC (see 4.1.1c below). Results from these audits shall demonstrate that feed producers have robust information systems and information handling processes to allow the feed producers to be able to bring forward accurate information about their production and supply chains. Declarations from the feed producer that are provided to the farm to demonstrate compliance with these indicators must be supported by the audits. Farms must also show that all of their feed producers are duly informed of the requirements of the ASC Salmon Standard relating to sourcing of responsibly produced salmon feed (see 4.1.1b below).</p>							
	a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records.	A. Review feed records for completeness and confirm the number of feed suppliers to the client.	Y			Records of purchase and use in AquaFarmer period 31.08.14 to 17.10.14 and Biomar report.	

4.1.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [62].</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	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.	B. Review farm records to verify that the farm has informed all of its feed suppliers of relevant ASC requirements for feed production.	Y			In 2.mail to Biomar dt 22.08.14
		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.	C. Verify that the farm obtains current audit reports from all relevant feed producers, that these audits were performed by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme, and that audit results demonstrate compliance with requirements.	Y			Biomar statement/certification overview for plants 005202 and 1005018 dt 09.09.14 incl Global GAP CoC certificate by BV.
		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.	D. Review which method the farm will use and confirm that independent audit results (4.1.1c) show compliance of feed producers.	Y			Biomar Report from BV form audit 17-19.06.14 on GGCoC. Certificate # 40 503738100300 BV valid to 20.08.15
		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].	E. Review declaration from each feed supplier to confirm the company assures traceability to the level of detail required by Standard.	Y			Statement from BiomarNorway on complete traceability dt 09.09.14
		-	F. Cross-check the declarations against results from audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) to verify evidence of required levels of traceability.	Y			Ok Statement/certificate
		Footnote	[62] Traceability shall be at a level of detail that permits the feed producer to demonstrate compliance with the standards in this document (i.e., marine raw ingredients must be traced back to the fishery, soy to the region grown, etc.). Feed manufacturers will need to supply the farm with third-party documentation of the ingredients covered under this standard.				
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
Footnote	[63] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.						
4.2.1	<p>Indicator: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV-1)</p> <p>Requirement: < 1.35</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.2.1 - Calculation of FFDRm</p> <p>Farms must calculate the Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) according to formula presented in Appendix IV-1 using data from the most recent complete production cycle. Farms must also show that they have maintained sufficient information in order to make an accurate calculation of FFDRm as outlined below. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 4.2.1 for the most recent complete production cycle (i.e. if the FFDRm of the most recent crop was > 1.35) if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the client understands how to accurately calculate FFDRm; - the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate FFDRm (i.e. all feed specs for > 6 months) for the current production cycle; and - the client can show how feed used for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. FFDRm < 1.35). 					
		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.	A. Verify completeness of records and that values are stated in a declaration from the feed manufacturer.	Y			Feed usage Jun 13 to May 14. of 6018mt Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assessment (EEA) dt 14.11.14
		b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery).	B. Verify that the client excludes from the FFDRm calculation any fishmeal rendered from seafood by-products.	Y			Feed usage Jun 13 to May 14. of 6018mt Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assessment dt 14.11.14
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).	C. Verify that eFCR calculation was done correctly.	Y			in Biomar report: Biomar total cycle FFDR m 0,61 for 12 G
		d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.	D. Verify that FFDRm calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the requirement.	Y			in Biomar report: Biomar total cycle FFDR m 0,61 for 12 G
		e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	E. Confirm that client has submitted FFDRm to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y			Submitted to ASC 14.11.2014
4.2.2	<p>Indicator: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) 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)</p> <p>Requirement: FFDRo < 2.95 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Note: Under Indicator 4.2.2, farms can choose to calculate FFDRo (Option #1) or EPA & DHA (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values. Client shall inform the CAB which option they will use.</p>					
		a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.	A. Verify completeness of feed records as in 4.2.1A.	Y			Feed usage 01.04.14 to 22.08.14, present cycle
		b. For FFDRo 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).	B. Verify client excludes fish oil rendered from byproducts from the FFDRo or (EPA + DHA) calculation.	Y			Feed usage Jun 13 to May 14. of 6018mt Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assessment dt 14.11.14
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	C. Record which option the client chose.	Y			Option #1(FFDR) used. Feed usage 01.03.14 to 15.09.14. In Eco- efficiency assessment dt 18.09.14. attachemnt: fish source overview Q1&Q2 2014
		d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.	D. Verify that FFDRo calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the standard.	Y			in Biomar report: Biomar total FFDRo 1,22completed cycle 12 G
		e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2.	E. Verify that (EPA+DHA) calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the standard.			NA	Op 1
f. Submit FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	F. Confirm that client has submitted FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC (Appendix VI)			NA	Op t1		
Footnote	[64] Calculation excludes DHA and EPA derived from fisheries by-products and trimmings. Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption. Fishmeal and fish oil that are produced from trimmings can be excluded from the calculation as long as the origin of the trimmings is not any species that are classified as critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org).						
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
4.3.1	<p>Indicator: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries</p> <p>Requirement: < 5 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full</p>	<p>Note: Indicator 4.3.1 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.</p>					
		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 ISEAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries.	A. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible feed sourcing (e.g. programs at http://www.isealliance.org/porrait/full%20member).			NA	2017
		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	B. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent.			NA	2017
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.	C. As of June 13, 2017, confirm that the farm has sufficient evidence for the origin of all fish products in feed to demonstrate compliance with indicator 4.3.1. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.3.1c does not apply.			NA	2017		

	compliance by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All	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 ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries.	D. As of June 13, 2017, review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.3.1d does not apply.					NA	2017
Footnote	[65] This standard and standard 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.								
Footnote	[66] Meets ISEAL guidelines as demonstrated through full membership in the ISEAL Alliance, or equivalent as determined by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.								
Footnote	[67] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.								
4.3.2	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 ≥ 6 , and biomass score ≥ 8 Applicability: All, until June 13, 2017	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.2 - FishSource Score of Fish Used in Feed To determine FishSource scores of the fish species used as feed ingredients, do the following: -go to http://www.fishsource.org/ -select "Species" drop down tab to the left and select the relevant species -confirm that the search identifies the correct species, then select the top tab that reads "Scores" For first audits, farms must have scoring records that cover all feeds purchased during the previous 6-month period. Note: Indicator 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including krill) and not to by-products or trimmings used in feed.							
	a. 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).		A. Cross-check against 4.2.1a to confirm that client recorded a score for each species used in feed.						Fish source score verified in Biomar calculation and found above limits. 93% of meal and 755 ogf oil ASC compliant
	b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 8 .		B. Cross-check a sample of the farm's scores against the FishSource website to verify that no individual score is < 6 and no biomass score is < 8 .						All individual scores > 6 , BM scores > 8) according to Fish source: score overview from Biomar.
	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 a 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.		C. If the client provides an independent assessment, review the assessment and the qualifications of the independent third party to verify that the assessment was done in accordance with the FishSource methodology.					NA	Data available from CFM
	-		D. If the species does not have a FishSource score then the fish feed does not comply with the requirement.					NA	Data available from CFM
Footnote	[68] Or equivalent score using the same methodology. See Appendix IV-3 for explanation of FishSource scoring.								
4.3.3	Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All, until June 13, 2017	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.3 - Third-Party Verification or Traceability Indicator 4.3.3 requires that farms show that their feed producers can demonstrate chain of custody and traceability as verified through third-party audits. Farms may submit reports from audits of feed producers (see 4.1.1c) as evidence that traceability systems are in compliance. Alternatively, farms may show that their feed producers comply with traceability requirements of Indicator 4.3.3 by submitting evidence that suppliers, and the batches of fishmeal and oil, are certified to the International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organization's Global Standard for Responsible Supply or to the Marine Stewardship Council Chain of Custody Standard.							
	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.		A. Review evidence and confirm that a third party verified chain of custody or traceability program was used for the fishmeal and fish oil.						Biomar Report from BV form audit 17-19.06.14 on GGCoC. Certificate # 40 503738100300 BV valid to20.08.15
	b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).		B. Verify that demonstration of third-party verified chain-of-custody is in place for all species used.						Biomar Report from BV form audit 17-19.06.14 on GGCoC. Certificate # 40 503738100300 BV valid to20.08.15
4.3.4	Indicator: 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] 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 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 audit). 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).						Feed usage Jun 13 to May 14. of 6018mt Aquafarmer and Biomar report In Eco- efficiency assement dt 14.11.14 Fish meals trimmings 06% avg for Q1,2&3. Fish oils from trimmings 27% avg for Q1,2&Q3. In Attachment to report. In Biomar raw materials statement dt24.04.14. Biomar statement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.19.14 In Biomar raw materials statement dt24.04.14. Biomar stement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.09.14 Not from vulnerable fisheries
Footnote	[69] Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption.								
Footnote	[70] IUU: Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported.								
Footnote	[71] The International Union for the Conservation of Nature reference can be found at http://www.iucnredlist.org/static/introduction .								
Footnote	[72] For species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, an exception is made if a regional population of the species has been assessed to be not vulnerable in a National Red List process that is managed explicitly in the same science-based way as IUCN. In cases where a National Red List doesn't exist or isn't managed in accordance with IUCN guidelines, an exception is allowed when an assessment is conducted using IUCN's methodology and demonstrates that the population is not vulnerable.								
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					

4.4.1	<p>Indicator: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums [75] and local laws [76]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.</p>	<p>A. Review feed supplier list and cross-check against feed purchases. (See also 4.1.1a)</p> <p>B. Review policies from each feed supplier to confirm required sourcing policy is in place.</p> <p>C. Verify that the scope of third-party audits of feed suppliers includes review of policies and evidence of implementation.</p>	Y		<p>Biomar resp. sourcing statement dt 24.04.14 and feed deliveries report. (Crop moratorium and RTRS sources.)And statement "Marine Harvest's position on sustainable sources on sustainable sourcing of non-marine raw material in salmon feed" Nov 2013.Regular commercial contact info and website www.Biomar.no</p> <p>In Biomar raw materials statement dt24.04.14. Biomar statement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.09.14</p> <p>DNV Pro-sustain cert., GG reqs for sourcing and BV audit show 100% compliance Global GAP CoC certificate by BC valid to 2015 as above.</p>
Footnote	[75] Moratorium: A period of time in which there is a suspension of a specific activity until future events warrant a removal of the suspension or issues regarding the activity have been resolved. In this context, moratoriums may refer to suspension of the growth of defined agricultural crops in defined geographical regions.					
Footnote	[76] Specifically, the policy shall include that vegetable ingredients, or products derived from vegetable ingredients, must not come from areas of the Amazon Biome that were deforested after July 24, 2006, as geographically defined by the Brazilian Soy Moratorium. Should the Brazilian Soy Moratorium be lifted, this specific requirement shall be reconsidered.					
4.4.2	<p>Indicator: Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77]</p> <p>Requirement: 100%, within five years of the publication [78] of the SAD standards</p> <p>Applicability: All, after June 13, 2017</p>	<p>a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent.</p> <p>b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent)</p> <p>c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b).</p> <p>d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed.</p> <p>e. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77]</p>	<p>A. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible sourcing of soya or soya-derived feed ingredients.</p> <p>B. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent.</p> <p>C. Verify that farm notifies feed suppliers.</p> <p>D. Confirm that the farm has sufficient and supportive evidence for the origin of soya products in feed to demonstrate compliance with indicator 4.4.2</p> <p>E. As of June 13, 2017, review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.4.2e does not apply.</p>			<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>NA</p> <p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>NA</p> <p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>NA</p> <p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>NA</p>
Footnote	[77] Any alternate certification scheme would have to be approved as equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.					
Footnote	[78] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of					
4.4.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence of disclosure to the buyer [79] of the inclusion of transgenic [80] plant raw material, or raw materials derived from transgenic plants, in the feed</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [81]</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of soya and other plant raw materials in feed and whether it is transgenic.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>A. Review feed supplier declaration and ensure declarations from all suppliers are present (see also 4.4.1A).</p> <p>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</p> <p>C. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether feeds containing transgenic ingredients are used on farm (Appendix VI).</p>	Y		<p>In Biomar raw materials statement dt24.04.14. Biomar statement "krav til bærekraftige råvarer dt 09.09.14 and NON-GMO analysis certificates from soy suppliers</p> <p>MH statement on GMO non acceptance and statement Biomar sttaing <0.9% GMO in soy/plant materials in feed.</p> <p>Submitted ASC in mail dt 14.11.14</p>
Footnote	[79] The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product. This standard requires disclosure by the feed company to the					
Footnote	[80] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species					
Footnote	[81] See Appendix VI for transparency requirement for 4.4.3.					
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
4.5.1	<p>Indicator: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [83] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean.</p> <p>c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.</p> <p>d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>B. Verify the client makes a declaration.</p> <p>C. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal.</p> <p>D. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client.</p>	Y		<p>In "Avfallshåndteringsplan In MH Plan for håndtering av søppel Buksevikka 2013-2014. - source grading on land base and sent to IRS (public approved handling co. Decommissioned nets returned to Egersund Net in overview. (Decom. report). None from this site in this period.</p> <p>In MH Plan for håndtering av søppel 2013-2014. Source grading specified incl. Special wastes to approved service/receiver of waste required in plan</p> <p>Feed bags and unspecified. Bags compressed and delivered til IRS along with unspecified/domestic waste.</p> <p>Decommissioned Feed pipes and moorings equipment. Receipt /invoice from IRS millja lks dt 30.04.14 # 135383 on various types of waste received from farm base with references to declaration codes.</p>
Footnote	[83] Proper and responsible disposal will vary based on facilities available in the region and remoteness of farm sites. Disposal of non-biological waste shall be done in a manner consistent with best practice in the area. Dumping of non-biological waste into the ocean does not represent "proper and responsible" disposal.					
4.5.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>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)</p> <p>b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)</p> <p>c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken.</p>	<p>A. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal. (See also 4.5.1C)</p> <p>B. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client. (See also 4.5.1D)</p> <p>C. Review infractions and corrective actions.</p>	Y		<p>Decomm. feedpipes and decomm. nets by net provider Egersund Net. (kasserte netter Agder) from Egersund Net overview/report.</p> <p>Decomm. feedpipes and decomm. nets by net provider Egersund Net. (kasserte netter Agder) from Egersund Net overview/report.</p> <p>No infractions identified.</p>

		d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.	D. Review records to verify waste disposal and/or recycling is consistent with client description and policy.				Nets disposal by Eg. Net in overview. Feed pipes disposal by IRS Miljø IKS. Example: Invoice March 2014 and 31.05.14 on 3000kg	
Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]								
Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):				Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
Footnote	[84] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.							
4.6.1	<p>Indicator: Presence of an energy use assessment verifying the energy consumption on the farm and representing the whole life cycle at sea, as outlined in Appendix V-1</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.1 - Energy Use Assessment						
		Indicator 4.6.1 requires that farms must have an assessment to verify energy consumption. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational energy use for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. Boundaries for operational energy use should correspond to the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions (see Appendix V-1). Energy use corresponding to Scope 3 emissions (i.e. the energy used to fabricate materials that are purchased by the farm) is not required. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate energy use assessments across the board in the company.						
		a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.	A. Verify that the farm maintains records for energy consumption.					Biom prod 6250 mt for 12G is 161 622 144,KJ.
		b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kJ) during the last production cycle.	B. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy.					Calculation OK
		c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle.	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).					According to requirements
		d. Using results from 4.6.1b and 4.6.1c, calculate energy consumption on the farm as required, reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle.	D. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy.					Biom prod 6250 mt for 12G. 256, 598KJ Scope 1 and Scope 2 considered
		e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	E. Confirm that client has submitted energy use calculations to ASC (Appendix VI).					Submitted 14.11.14
f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.	F. Confirm that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the farm's energy consumption.					Scope 1 (Diesel) and scope 2 purchased el used		
4.6.2	<p>Indicator: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [85]) emissions [86] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.2 - Annual GHG Assessment						
		Indicator 4.6.2 requires that farms must have an annual Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment. Detailed instructions are presented in Appendix V-1 and references therein. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational boundaries for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate GHG accounting practices across the board in the company. Verification may be done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details).						
		a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm.	A. Verify that the farm maintains records of GHG emissions.					12G scope 1 79671 kg Co2, Scope 2 1498161, Total 1+2 = 229487 kg CO2
		b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	B. Confirm that calculations are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1.					On completed cycle
		c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors.	C. Verify that the farm records all emissions factors used and their sources.					Scope 1 diesel from diesel workboat and scope 2 is purchased el and purchased service boat diesel consumption.
		d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO ₂ gases to CO ₂ equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	D. Verify that the farm records all GWPs used and their sources.					Calculations not involving conversions. Co2 used.
		e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	E. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations to ASC (Appendix VI).					Submitted 14.11.14
f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.	F. Confirm that the farm undergoes a GHG assessments annually and that the methods used comply with requirements of Appendix V-1.					Calculations and assessment provided. Data Conv. Data from NVE, BP and Statoll.		
Footnote	[85] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO ₂); methane (CH ₄); nitrous oxide (N ₂ O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆).							
Footnote	[86] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.							
4.6.3	<p>Indicator: Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [87] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, within three years of the publication [88] of the SAD standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015)</p> <p>Applicability: All, after June 13, 2015</p>	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.3 - GHG Emissions of Feed						
		Indicator 4.6.3 requires that farms document the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) associated with any feeds used during salmon production. Farms will need to obtain this information from their feed supplier(s) and thereafter maintain a continuous record of Feed GHG emissions throughout all production cycles. This requirement takes effect on June 13, 2015 and it will apply across the entire previous production cycle. Therefore the SAD Steering Committee advises farms to inform their feed supplier(s) about this requirement long before the effective date. Specifically, the SC recommends that...						
		- the farm provides its feed suppliers with detailed information about the requirements including a copy of the methodology outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2; - the farm explain what analyses must be done by feed suppliers; and - the farm explains to feed suppliers what documentary evidence will be required by the farm to demonstrate compliance.						
		a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed).	A. Verify declaration from feed supplier(s) and confirm client has declarations from all feed suppliers.					2015 NA
		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.	B. Verify calculations cross-checking with feed purchase and use records.					2015 NA
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.	C. Verify calculations.					2015 NA		
d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	D. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations for feed to ASC (Appendix VI).					2015 NA		
Footnote	[87] GHG emissions from feed can be given based on the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) and not as documentation linked to each single product used during the production cycle. Feed manufacturer is responsible for calculating GHG emissions per unit feed. Farm site then shall use that information to calculate GHG emissions for the volume of feed they used in the prior production cycle.							
Footnote	[88] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.							
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [89,90]								
Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):				Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
Footnote	[89] Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.							
Footnote	[90] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.7.1, 4.7.3 and 4.7.4.							
4.7.1	<p>Indicator: For farms that use copper-treated nets [91], evidence that nets are not cleaned [92] or treated in situ in the marine environment</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in Footnote</p>	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.7.1 - Copper-based treatments						
		Indicator 4.7.1 requires that farms document the use of copper-based treatments on nets. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational boundaries for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate GHG accounting practices across the board in the company. Verification may be done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details).						
		a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping.	A. Review procedure for completeness.					CU treated nets not used in this cycle "Net coating" by Steen-Hansen ref safety sheet dt 11.12.13
		b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets.	B. Review documentary evidence and records for completeness, including traceability records of the nets where available.					CU treated nets not used in this cycle
c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets.	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.					CU treated nets not used in this cycle		
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.	D. Review evidence and interview farm manager to confirm that farm does not do any heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ.					CU treated nets not used in this cycle		

		c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.	C. Review the farm's justification for any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis (this situation should be a rare occurrence).	Y		No exceptional events. All morts classified according to cause after procedure. To AquaFarmer, report with details on mortality presented.
Footnote	[98] The SAD recognizes that not all mortality events will result in dead fish present for collection and removal. However, such situations are considered the exception rather than the norm.					
5.1.4	<p>Note: Farms are required to maintain mortality records from the current and two previous production cycles. For first audit, records for the current and prior production cycle are required. It is recommended that farms maintain a compiled set of records to demonstrate compliance with 5.1.3 - 5.1.6.</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis</p> <p>Requirement: 100% [99]</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	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 analyses; - qualifications of the individual (e.g. veterinarian [96], fish health manager [97]); - cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and - classification as "unexplained" when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6).	A. Review records of mortalities to verify completeness and to confirm that post-mortem analyses were done by qualified individuals or labs.	Y		Morts categorised for last 3 G, from AquaFarmer12G (4,3), (11,6,1% for 10G, For 08G 13,8% total.
		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.	B. Review records to confirm the farm had post-mortem analysis done for each mortality event and that a statistically relevant number of fish were analyzed from each mortality event.	Y		All morts diagnoses (ref unspecified numbers above). Lab analyses routinely.
		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).	C. Review records to confirm that any inconclusive on-site diagnoses were sent to an off-site laboratory for further testing.	Y		Ex Vet Inst. report dt 29.11.13 Vet visit report dt 21.05.14
		d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications.	D. Review mortality events to confirm the farm's classification was consistent with results from post-mortem analyses. Where cause was not determined verify that classification was plausible given available info.	Y		Record is in AquaFarmer, categorised
		e. 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).	E. Review evidence to confirm compliance with requirements.	Y		Records in AquaFarmer for 2008, 2010 and 2012 G
		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).	F. Confirm that client has submitted data from post-mortem analyses and cause and number of mortalities to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted to ASC 11.19.14
		Footnote	[99] If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive, this standard requires off-site laboratory diagnosis. A qualified professional must conduct all diagnosis. One hundred percent of mortality events shall receive a post-mortem analysis, not necessarily every fish. A statistically relevant number of fish from the mortality event shall be analyzed.			
5.1.5	<p>Indicator: Maximum viral disease-related mortality [100] on farm during the most recent production cycle</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 10%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease.	A. Review and confirm the calculated number of viral disease-related mortalities.	Y		1,0% viral related/diagnosed. Total viral + Unspec= 3,0%
		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.	B. Verify that the sum of confirmed viral disease-related mortalities plus unspecified & unexplained mortalities is ≤ 10% of the total number of fish produced during the most recent production cycle.	Y		1,0% viral related/diagnosed. Total viral + Unspec= 3,0%
		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).	C. Confirm that client has submitted data on mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted to ASC 14.11.14
Footnote	[100] Viral disease-related mortality count shall include unspecified and unexplained mortality as it could be related to viral disease.					
5.1.6	<p>Indicator: Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6%</p> <p>Requirement: ≤ 40% of total mortalities</p> <p>Applicability: All farms with > 6% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle.</p>	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.	A. Review, confirm, and document whether 5.1.6 is applicable to the client. If applicable, proceed to 5.1.6b.	Y		Below 6%, (3,0%)
		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.	B. Review and confirm that ≤ 40% of total mortalities were from unexplained causes for each of the two previous production cycles	Y		Below 6%, (3,0%)
		c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	C. Confirm that client has submitted data on unexplained mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	Y		Submitted to ASC 14.11.14
5.1.7	<p>Note: Farms have the option to integrate their farm-specific mortality reduction program into the farm's fish health management plan (5.1.1).</p> <p>Indicator: A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.	A. Confirm that the farm used mortalities records to assemble a detailed dataset on mortality rates which covers the required timeframe (see 5.1.4).	Y		Mortality rate reduction programme (Corporate level on <5% morts). Specified in FHMP, on site level with concrete objectives for actions to reduce to less than 5%.
		b. Use the data in 5.1.7a and advice 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.	B. Review program to confirm that targets for mortality reduction are reasonable and based on historical data.	Y		Mortality rate reduction programme (Corporate level on <5% morts). Specified in FHMP, on site level with concrete objectives for actions to reduce to less than 5%.
		c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.	C. Interview workers to confirm their understanding of mortalities recording, classification, and annual targets for reduction (see also 5.1.1, 5.1.3).	Y		Good and light communication including meeting and visits. Confirmed during interviews
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
Footnote	[101] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.2.1, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.10.					
Instruction to Clients and CABs for Criterion 5.2 - Records Related to Therapeutic Treatments						
Indicator 5.2.1 requires that farms maintain detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use. Those records maintained for compliance with 5.2.1, if all consolidated into a single place, can be used to demonstrate performance against subsequent Indicators (5.2.1 through 5.2.10) under Criterion 5.2.						

5.2.1	<p>Indicator: On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals [102] and therapeutants 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</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 therapeutant. 	<p>A. Review records of chemical and therapeutant use. Verify accuracy through cross-check with purchase orders and sales records, inventories, documentation from feed manufacturer for any in-feed treatment, and veterinary records.</p>			NA	No treatments used in previous and present production cycle.
		<p>b. If not already available, assemble records of chemical and therapeutant 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.</p>	<p>B. Confirm that farm has detailed records for chemical and therapeutant use that covers the previous two production cycles.</p>			NA	No therapeutic treatments used in previous and present production cycle.
		<p>c. Submit information on therapeutant 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).</p>	<p>C. Confirm that client has submitted therapeutant information to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>			NA	No therapeutic treatments used in previous and present production cycle.
Footnote	[102] Chemicals used for the treatment of fish.						
5.2.2	<p>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 [104]</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Prepare a list of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [104].</p>	<p>A. Review list and supporting evidence. If ASC has agreed to maintain a list of relevant therapeutants, farm can demonstrate that they have this list.</p>	Y			MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined
		<p>b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles.</p>	<p>B. Verify records.</p>	Y			NFSA mandatory testing by NIFES on site and/or at harvest line. Example report dt16.09.14. with NIFES certificate in OK programme. Also voluntary MRL testing from 2009-2014. Ref to proc dt 11.02.14 of food safety invl ASC requirements.
		<p>-</p>	<p>C. Cross-check records of therapeutant use (5.2.1a) against the list of banned therapeutants to verify compliance with requirements.</p>	Y			Correspond with reports and usage.
Footnote	[103] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance. A substance banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, as defined here, cannot be used in any salmon farm certified under the SAD, regardless of country of production or destination of the product. The SAD recommends that ASC maintain a list of a banned therapeutants.						
Footnote	[104] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.						
5.2.3	<p>Indicator: Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian</p> <p>Requirement: 100%</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Obtain prescription for all therapeutant use in advance of application from the farm veterinarian (or equivalent, see [96] for definition of veterinarian).</p>	<p>A. Review documentary evidence (on-farm records, veterinary records, and prescriptions) to confirm all therapeutants were prescribed by a qualified individual. See [96] for definition of veterinarian.</p>	Y			In Prescription register for site.Ex: Seen prescription for anaesthetics used for Finquet dt.30.07.13 By Vet. Hoel. 2 yrs duration.
		<p>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.</p>	<p>B. Cross-check with results from chemical residue testing provided under 5.2.2b.</p>	Y			Original prescription in site folder and registered in AquaFarmer with withholding periods defined in prescription and in AquaFarmer.
5.2.4	<p>Indicator: Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a).</p>	<p>A. Review the farm's fish health management plan to confirm inclusion of withholding periods and interview farm staff to verify implementation.</p>	Y			In AquaFarmer, automatically notified/blocked according to deereedays in prescription. According to FHMP/VHP on withholding periods defined in AquaFarmer and specific prescription.
		<p>b. 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.</p>	<p>B. Review documentation for completeness and accuracy. Compare to records of therapeutant use (5.2.1a).</p>	Y			In AquaFarmer, automatically notified according to deereedays in prescription.
		<p>c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Y			In Fish CV, where tmt dates are specified and compared to harvest dates. According to FHMP/VHP on withholding periods defined
5.2.5	<p>Indicator: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII</p> <p>Requirement: PTI score ≤ 13</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Using farm data for therapeutants usage (5.2.1a) and the formula presented in Appendix VII, 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.</p>	<p>A. Review the farm's calculations to verify that the PTI score was calculated correctly and that the scores are accurate. Cross-check with records of parasiticide use.</p>	Y			No treatments performed on present cycle. System blocks automatically if anyfish groups /cages entered for harvest if withhold period is not completed. Also includes short withholding periods for the cage if anaesthica aroused on 10 fish for sealice monitoring
		<p>b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score.</p>	<p>B. Verify that the farm level cumulative PTI score ≤ 13.</p>			NA	No events.
		<p>c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.</p>	<p>C. Confirm that client has submitted data on cumulative PTI score to ASC (Appendix VI).</p>			NA	No events.
5.2.6	<p>Indicator: For farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [105] is at least 15% less than of the average of the two previous production cycles</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017)</p> <p>Applicability: All farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle</p>	<p>Note: 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 compliance with Indicator 5.2.6 at some point in the future using data from the two previous production cycles.</p> <p>a. Review PTI scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTI ≥ 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>A. Review farm's cumulative PTI score to determine if Indicator 5.2.6 is applicable.</p>			NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.
		<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>B. Review the farm's calculation of parasiticide load to verify accuracy.</p>			NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.Parasiticload:0,07 matule females in avg. in one sigle week 26.06.13 ->2+7.13, most weeks have 0,00. from sealice monitoring reports in AquaFarmer and to NFSA/Alltinn
		<p>c. Calculate parasiticide load in the two previous production cycles as above (5.2.6b) and compute the average. Calculate the percent 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>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>			NA	No treatments performed on present cycle.

		d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI).	D. Confirm that client has submitted data on parasiticide load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.	Y			Submitted 14.11.14		
Footnote	[105] Parasiticide load = Sum (kg of fish treated x PTI). Reduction in load required regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined parasiticide load of the consolidated sites.								
5.2.7	Indicator: Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments [106] Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles. b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3) c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.9).	A. Review purchase records and calculate total amount procured by client. Inspect storage areas to verify quantities on-site. B. Review log of medication events to verify that the quantity of antibiotic applied by the client does not suggest prophylactic use. C. Verify that the total amount of antibiotics used in the current production cycle is equal to the total amount prescribed.			NA	No ABs used the recent cycles		
Footnote	[106] The designated veterinarian must certify that a pathogen or disease is present before prescribing medication.					NA	No ABs used the recent cycles		
5.2.8	Indicator: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO) [107] Requirement: None [108] Applicability: All	Note 1: Farms have the option to certify only a portion of the fish or farm site when WHO-listed [107] antibiotics have been used at the production facility (see 5.2.8d). To pursue this option, farms must request an exemption from the CAB in advance of the audit and provide sufficient records giving details on which pens were treated and traceability of those treated fish. Note 2: It is recommended that the farm veterinarian review the WHO list [see 107] in detail and be aware that the list is meant to a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [107]. b. If the farm has <u>not</u> used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit. c. If the farm has <u>used</u> antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit. 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.	A. Confirm that the farm has the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics. 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. 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. D. Review the farm's exemption request and supporting documents to verify that the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate traceability [108] to merit an exemption.	Y			List presented v3, no ABs used		
Footnote	[107] The third edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/CIA_3.pdf .								
Footnote	[108] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.								
5.2.9	Indicator: Number of treatments [109] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle Requirement: ≤ 3 Applicability: All	Note: for the purposes of Indicator 5.2.9, "treatment" means a single course of medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days and be applied in one or more pens (or cages). a. 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. b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation.	A. Review documents to confirm that the client maintains a record of all treatments of antibiotics. Cross-check against records of on-farm chemical & therapeutic use (5.2.1a), medication events (5.2.3a), and prescription records (5.2.3b). B. Confirm that the client used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.			NA	No ABs used		
Footnote	[109] A treatment is a single course medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days.					NA	No ABs used		
5.2.10	Indicator: 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 Requirement: Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All	Note: Indicator 5.2.10 requires that farms must demonstrate a reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites. 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. b. Calculate antibiotic load (antibiotic load = the 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. 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. d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.	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. B. Review farm's calculations for accuracy and completeness of coverage. Cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a). C. Review evidence to verify that farm complies with requirement. D. Confirm that client has submitted data on antibiotic load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.			NA	2017		
Footnote	[110] Antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotics used (kg).					NA	2017		
Footnote	[111] Reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABM					NA	2017		
5.2.11	Indicator: Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers [112] of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production Requirement: Yes	a. Prepare a procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [112] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutants used in production (see 4.4.3b). b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.	A. Review the farm's procedure and confirm implementation based on relevant documentary evidence (e.g. sales records, invoices). B. Review sales records for completeness and cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a) to verify that buyers were adequately informed about therapeutants used in production.	Y			In "Oppsett på produkt fra MOVEX" int Proc in TQM. Fish CV follows fish automatically through to customer Example is Følgeseddel (Delivery note) with fish CV 12.09.14 with any use of therapeutant used, and tracking back to farm and cage# and harvest batch ID.		
Footnote	[112] Buyer: The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product.								
Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments									
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):					
5.3.1	Indicator: Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	Instruction to Clients for indicator 5.3.1 - Identifying the 'Expected Effect' of Medicinal Treatment Indicator 5.3.1 requires that farms identify treatments that have not produced the expected effect. The SAD Steering Committee recognizes that the "expected effect" will vary with health condition and type of medicinal treatment. Therefore farms and auditors will need to review the pre- and post-treatment condition of fish in order to understand and evaluate the impact of treatment. 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. 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. 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. d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.		A. Review farm records to confirm recording of all successive medicinal treatments. B. If applicable, review how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment. 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. D. Verify that farm maintains records from bio-assays (as applicable).				NA	No treatments in present cycle.
						NA	No treatments done in present cycle.		
						NA	No treatments done in present cycle.		
						NA	No treatments done in present cycle.		

5.3.2	<p>Indicator: 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>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Review results of bio-assay tests (5.3.1d) 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - used an alternative treatment (if permitted in the area of operation); or - immediately harvested all fish on site. 	<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>			NA	No treatments done in present cycle.
						NA	No treatments done in present cycle.
Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]							
Footnote		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):		Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
[113] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.4.2 and 5.4.4.							
5.4.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class [114]</p> <p>Requirement: 100% [115]</p> <p>Applicability: 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 > 6 months for smolt inputs for 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 smolt inputs > 6 months. Inspect pens during the on-site audit to see if fish size (which may be variable) is consistent with the production of a single-year class.</p> <p>C. Verify that the available evidence shows that salmon on the site are from a single-year class.</p>	Y			F. Dir approval of Operations Plan dt 04.12.13 for all sites in area. New Ops. Plan for 2014 has not yet arrived from F. Dir. Last harvest date 12G 26.05.14, First stocking date 31.08.14.
				Y			First stocking date 31.08.14. Last 17.10.14. From Mercatus Aqua Farmer
				Y			Smolt CVs from Agder Smolt (Fjellsa) with ova /stripping/startfeeding dates(09.01.14) defined. First stocking date 31.08.14. Last 17.10.14. From Mercatus Aqua Farmer
Footnote		[114] Gaps of up to six months between inputs of smolts derived from the same stripping are acceptable as long as there remains a period of time when the site is fully fallow after harvest.					
Footnote		[115] Exception is allowed for: 1) farm sites that have closed, contained production units where there is complete separation of water between units and no sharing of filtration systems or other systems that could spread disease, or,					
5.4.2	<p>Indicator: 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"> 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM 3. Promptly [118] made findings publicly available <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, 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, $p < 0.05$) should be agreed between farm and CAB.</p> <p>b. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, record whether the farm did or did not suspect (yes or no) an unidentified transmissible agent.</p> <p>c. Proceed to 5.4.2d 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>	Y			Continuous evaluation. No events of this category. Morts categorised for last 3 G, from AquaFarmer. 12G (4,3%) Present cycle 14G (0,71%). No transmissible agents detected nor suspected.
				Y			Stocking overview from Mercatus compared to approved production plan and actual stocking documentation..
						NA	No stat. sign elevation of morts.
						NA	No stat. sign elevation of morts.
				Y			Submitted 14.11.14
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>Indicator: Evidence of compliance [119] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [120]</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	<p>Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.4.3 - Compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code</p> <p>Indicator 5.4.3 requires that farms show evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (see http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171). Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code. For purposes of the ASC Salmon Standard, this means that the farm must have written procedures stating how the farm will initiate an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm ['exotic' = not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen)]. An aggressive response will involve, at a minimum, the following actions: - depopulation of the infected site; - implementation of quarantine zones. (see note below link accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen; and</p> <p>a. Maintain 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>	Y			Current version of 1st presented (Updated 2014) - new update 2015 - valid from 01.Jan following year if changes.
				Y			Int. procedure in TQM on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Described in FHVP, Notification of diseases. Beredskapsplan MH" page 12, Notification of diseases. ID 27017
				Y			Confirmed OK
Footnote		[119] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Quarantine zones will likely incorporate mandatory depopulation of sites close to the infected site and affect some, though not necessarily all, of the ABM. Exotic signifies not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (area declared free of the pathogen).					
Footnote		[120] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171 .					
	<p>Indicator: If an OIE-notifiable disease [121] is confirmed on the farm,</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>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>	Y			OBS: Int. procedure in TQM on practices in accordance with OIE AHC" Beredskapsplan MH" page 12, Required steps not clearly defined in procedure to publish in e.g MHN web site for ASC issues. MHSor has all sites in area - hence ABM notification need reduced.

5.4.4	evidence that: 1. the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected 2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease 4. the farm promptly [123] made findings publicly available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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.	B. Record whether there were any OIE-notifiable diseases confirmed on the farm during the current or two previous production cycles.			NA	No occurrence of notifiable diseases. Actions in procures in point 5.4.3 if this should occur.
		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.	C. If applicable, review documentary evidence to verify the farm's response complied with the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4.			NA	No occurrence of notifiable diseases.
		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).	D. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm (as applicable).			NA	No occurrence of notifiable diseases.
		-	E. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm, verify that notifications were made to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (122).			NA	No occurrence of notifiable diseases.
		Footnote	[121] At the time of publication of the final draft standards, OIE-notifiable diseases relevant to salmon aquaculture were: Epizootic haematopoietic necrosis,				
Footnote	[122] This is in addition to any notifications to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.						
Footnote	[123] Within one month.						
Social requirements in the standards shall be audited by an individual who is a lead auditor in conformity with SAAS Procedure 200 section 3.1.							
PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER							
6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]							
Compliance Criteria							
Footnote	[124] Bargain collectively: A voluntary negotiation between employers and organizations of workers in order to establish the terms and conditions of employment						
6.1.1	Indicator: Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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.					DP/KRBE 02.12.14 OBS from IA 2013. The information is presented in Code of conduct and personal handbook.
		b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits "acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control of employers or employers' organizations."					DP/KRBE 02.12.14 ClosedMI NC from IA 2013. No organised workers at site. Workers aware of their right.
		c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.					The new meeting of worker representative is planned in
		d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.					Interview confirms information above
6.1.2	Indicator: Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association.					The contract has link to Code of conduct of the Company.
		b. Employer communicates that workers are free to form organizations to advocate for and protect work rights (e.g. farm policies on Freedom of Association; see 6.12.1).					Communicated via training of Code of Conduct with following test
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.					Interview confirms information above
6.1.3	Indicator: Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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.					No outstanding cases what are in conflict with standard requirements.
		b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.					Collective bargaining agreement in place as tariff agreement.
		c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).					Collective bargaining agreement in place as tariff agreement.
Criterion 6.2 Child labor							
Compliance Criteria							
6.2.1	Indicator: Number of incidences of child labor [125] [126] Requirement: None Applicability: All except as noted in [125]	a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions: - in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years (see footnote 125); or - in countries where the legal minimum age is set higher than 15 years, in which case the legal minimum age of the country is followed. If the farm operates in a country where the legal minimum ages is not 15, then the employer shall maintain documentation attesting to this fact.					Standard requirements apply
		b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).					No young workers
		c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.					Records are in place.
Footnote	[125] Child: Any person under 15 years of age. A higher age would apply if the minimum age law of an area stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling. Minimum age may be 14 if the country allows it under the developing country exceptions in ILO convention 138.						
Footnote	[126] Child Labor: Any work by a child younger than the age specified in the definition of a child.						
6.2.2	Indicator: Percentage of young workers [127] that are protected [128] Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.					General procedure ID 30681 for employees under 18 years old with risk assessment at each site.
		b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.					All young workers are identified. No young workers (youngest 23 years old) on the site.
		c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.					NA On site
		d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.					NA No young workers at present
		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.					NA No young workers at present. The general hazards that should be avoided are listed in procedure for employees under 18 years old.

		f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.				NA	The site was inspected. No interviews with young workers conducted. No young workers at present
Footnote	[127] Young Worker: Any worker between the age of a child, as defined above, and under the age of 18.						
Footnote	[128] Protected: Workers between 15 and 18 years of age will not be exposed to hazardous health and safety conditions; working hours shall not interfere with their education and the combined daily transportation time and school time, and work time shall not exceed 10 hours.						
Footnote	[129] Hazard: The inherent potential to cause injury or damage to a person's health (e.g., unequipped to handle heavy machinery safely, and unprotected exposure to harmful chemicals).						
Footnote	[130] Hazardous work: Work that, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of workers (e.g., heavy lifting disproportionate to a person's body size, operating heavy machinery, exposure to toxic chemicals).						
Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor							
Compliance Criteria							
6.3.1	Indicator: Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labor Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no 'pay to work' schemes through labor contractors or training credit programs).	Y				The contract has link to Code of conduct of the Company.
		b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.	Y				Confirmed by interview.
		c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.	Y				No cases identified
		d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.	Y				No cases identified
		e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.	Y				No cases identified
		f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y				The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[131] Forced (Compulsory) labor: All work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty for which a person has not offered himself/herself voluntarily or for which such work or service is demanded as a repayment of debt. "Penalty" can imply monetary sanctions, physical punishment, or the loss of rights and privileges or restriction of movement (e.g., withholding of identity documents).						
Footnote	[132] Bonded labor: When a person is forced by the employer or creditor to work to repay a financial debt to the crediting agency.						
Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]							
Compliance Criteria							
Footnote	[133] Discrimination: Any distinction, exclusion or preference that has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment. Not every distinction, exclusion or preference constitutes discrimination. For instance, a merit- or performance-based pay increase or bonus is not by itself discriminatory. Positive discrimination in favor of people from certain underrepresented groups may be legal in some countries.						
6.4.1	Indicator: Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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.	Y				The anti-discrimination policy is presented in Code of conduct.
		b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.	Y				Whistle blowing procedure in place.
		c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.	Y				The tariff agreement is the base of equal pay.
		d. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective.	Y				DP/KRBE 02.12.14 Closed MI NC from IA 2013. The training for managers was conducted. Training course documented in certificate "Adferd, likebehandling og diskriminering" dt 11.11.14
Footnote	[134] Employers shall have written anti-discrimination policies stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.						
6.4.2	Indicator: Number of incidences of discrimination Requirement: None Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination.	Y				No cases identified.
		b. Be advised that worker testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.	Y				Interview has confirmed absence of discrimination cases.
Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety							
Compliance Criteria							
6.5.1	Indicator: Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [135] and policies on a yearly basis Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Employer has documented practices, procedures (including emergency response procedures) and policies to protect employees from workplace hazards and to minimize risk of accident or injury. The information shall be available to employees.	Y				Procedures are in place with relation to H&S risk assessment. Training records in "Ansatte & Opplæring" matrix
		b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	Y				Employees understand the procedures. The last drills were conducted 2 years ago.
		c. Employer conducts health and safety training for all employees on a regular basis (once a year and immediately for all new employees), including training on potential hazards and risk minimization, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and effective use of PPE.	Y				DP/KRBE 02.12.14 OBS from IA 2013. Point now improved. The trainings are conducted. Also in "Kjennemansrunde" with new employees before taking on tasks.
Footnote	[135] Health and safety training shall include emergency response procedures and practices.						
6.5.2	Indicator: Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals).	Y				The register is maintained
		b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.	Y				The radio check is applied every 20 minutes. Documenting of ongoing checks for life-vests according the procedures, which states recording 4 time a year.
		c. Employees receive annual training in the proper use of PPE (see 6.5.1c). For workers who participated in the initial training(s) previously an annual refreshment training may suffice, unless new PPE has been put to use.	Y				No dates on training record. Dedicated procedure and forms in place. Training is done
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y				The interviews has confirmed above information.
	Indicator: Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions	a. Employer makes regular assessments of hazards and risks in the workplace. Risk assessments are reviewed and updated at least annually (see also 6.5.1a).	Y				Risk assessment is conducted annually. Last 2014-09-22 and
		b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).	Y				Annual risk assessment scheme is used. Via Brain Safe training.

6.5.3	taken Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.	Y			The procedures are adapted in relation to risk assessment and H&S accidents investigation results.
6.5.4	Indicator: Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.	Y			The TQM system database is used.
		b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations.	Y			The TQM system database is used.
		c. Employer implements corrective action plans in response to any accidents that occur. Plans are documented and they include an analysis of root cause, actions to address root cause, actions to remediate, and actions to prevent future accidents of similar nature.	Y			Corrective action plan for accidents are developed and implemented, Root cause analysis included.
		d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.	Y			No accidents took place at this site. Information from other sites provided via e-m-mail.
6.5.5	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 Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains documentation to confirm that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries (if not covered under national law). Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers. Written contract of employer responsibility to cover accident costs is acceptable evidence in place of insurance.	Y			Insurance is provided.
6.5.6	Indicator: Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	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 compliance with Indicator 6.5.6. It is the farm's responsibility to obtain copies of relevant documentation (e.g. certificates) from the dive company.				
		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. b. Employer maintains evidence of diver certification (e.g. copies of certificates) for each person involved in diving operations. Divers shall be certified through an accredited national or international organization for diver certification.	Y			Evaluations of Diver companies are in place. The records of diving activities maintained. Copies of divers certificates are maintained.
Criterion 6.6 Wages						
Compliance Criteria						
6.6.1	Indicator: The percentage of workers whose basic wage [136] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [137] Requirement: 0 (None) Applicability: All	a. Employer keeps documents to show the legal minimum wage in the country of operation. If there is no legal minimum wage in the country, the employer keeps documents to show the industry-standard minimum wage.	Y			Salaries are defined in protocols of collective bargaining agreements' with TU.
		b. Employer's records (e.g. payroll) confirm that worker's wages for a standard work week (≤ 48 hours) always meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. If there is no legal minimum wage, the 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.	Y			Timesheets are managed at sites.
		c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y			Interview confirms fair salaries
Footnote	[136] Basic wage: The wages paid for a standard working week (no more than 48 hours).					
Footnote	[137] If there is no legal minimum wage in a country, basic wages must meet the industry-standard minimum wage.					
6.6.2	Indicator: Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [138] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and the use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages. Includes review of any national basic needs wage recommendations from credible sources such as national universities or government.	Y			The BNV calculation based on statistical data.
		b. Employer has calculated the basic needs wage for farm workers and has compared it to the basic (i.e. current) wage for their farm workers.	Y			DP/KRBE 02.12.14 Closed MI NC from IA 2013. Comparison is done.
		c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	Y			It is paid above the BNV
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.					
6.6.3	Indicator: Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [139] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.	Y			The contracts refer to internal MH documents
		b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.	Y			Method is understood by workers,
		c. Employer renders wages and benefits in a way that is convenient for the worker (e.g. cash, check, or electronic payment methods). Workers do not have to travel to collect benefits nor do they receive promissory notes, coupons or merchandise in lieu of payment.	Y			Payments are made into personal bank accounts.
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y			The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[139] Payments shall be rendered to workers in a convenient manner.					
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting						
Compliance Criteria						
6.7.1	Indicator: Percentage of workers who have contracts [141] Requirement: 100% Applicability: All	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.	Y			Contracts are maintained
		b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.	Y			No Labour-only contracting
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y			The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[141] Labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes are not acceptable. This includes revolving/consecutive labor contracts to deny benefit					
6.7.2	Indicator: Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible practices and policies.	Y			The MH CoC of included into contracts with subcontractors and suppliers
		b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.	Y			Criteria present for evaluation of suppliers and contractors against requirements in clause 6 of the standard. Critical suppliers list, e.g 2nd party checklist with reference to MHN CoC doc. Evaluation of diving service provider ROV&Dykk dt 03.06.13
		c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.	Y			Doc Adeco example.
Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution						
Compliance Criteria						

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>	a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.	Y		
		b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access.	Y		DP/KRBE 02.12.14 OBS from IA 2013. Point now improved. Policy is in place p.6 in CoC and confirmed at point of signing work contracts.
		c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. complaint or grievance filings, minutes from review meetings) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y		No complaints.
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>	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised.	Y		No cases reported
		b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed.	Y		No records, as there were no cases.
		c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe.	Y		No records, as were no cases.
Footnote	[142] Addressed: Acknowledged and received, moving through the company's process for grievances, corrective action taken when necessary.				
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices					
Compliance criteria					
6.9.1	<p>Indicator: Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity.	Y		No evidences of incorrect behaviour.
		b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors.	Y		It is checked during OHS checks at the site. HR organised annual personnel surveys as well.
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.	Y		The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[144] Mental Abuse: Characterized by the intentional use of power, including verbal abuse, isolation, sexual or racial harassment, intimidation or threat of physical				Communication to employees on requirements. Presented in Code of conduct
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>	a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [143].	Y		
		b. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. worker evaluation reports) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that the disciplinary action policy is fair and effective.	Y		DP/KRBE 02.12.14 OBS from IA 2013. Point now improved. The interviews has confirmed fair and effective disciplinary policy.
Footnote	[143] If disciplinary action is required, progressive verbal and written warnings shall be engaged. The aim shall always be to improve the worker; dismissal shall be				
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime					
Compliance criteria					
Note: Working hours, night work and rest periods for workers in agriculture should be in accordance with national laws and regulations or collective agreements (e.g. The Safety and Health in Agriculture Convention, 2001). Additional information can be found on the website of the International Labour Organization (www.ilo.org).					
6.10.1	<p>Indicator: Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [145]</p> <p>Requirement: None</p> <p>Applicability: All</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.	Y		The scheme is used as agreed with Trade unions.
		b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law.	Y		The working time is managed within legal requirements with exception to case in 6.2.2.
		c. If an employer requires employees to work shifts at the farm (e.g. 10 days on and six days off), the employer compensates workers with an equivalent time off in the calendar month and there is evidence that employees have agreed to this schedule (e.g. in the hiring contract).	Y		The scheme 12-9 is used as agreed with Trade unions.
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	Y		The interviews has confirmed above information.
Footnote	[145] In cases where local legislation on working hours and overtime exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime), the				
6.10.2	<p>Indicator: Overtime is limited, voluntary [146], paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All except as noted in [146]</p>	a. Payment records (e.g. payslips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours.	Y		Overtime is paid at premium rate
		b. Overtime is limited and occurs in exceptional circumstances as evidenced by farm records (e.g. production records, time sheets, and other records of working hours).	Y		Overtime is limited to exceptional circumstances
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that all overtime is voluntary except where there is a collective bargaining agreement which specifically allows for compulsory overtime.	Y		The interviews has confirmed voluntary overtime with exception to cases agreed in collective bargaining agreement.
Footnote	[146] Compulsory overtime is permitted if previously agreed to under a collective bargaining agreement.				
Footnote	[147] Premium rate: A rate of pay higher than the regular work week rate. Must comply with national laws/regulations and/or industry standards.				
Criterion 6.11 Education and training					
Compliance criteria					
6.11.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g., courses, certificates and degrees)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All</p>	a. Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers. Company provides incentives (e.g. subsidies for tuition or textbooks, time off prior to exams, flexibility in work schedule) that encourage workers to participate in educational initiatives. Note that such offers may be contingent on workers committing to stay with the company for a pre-arranged time.	Y		Policy in place. The financial support for training is given.
		b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).	Y		Records available in personal files
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	Y		The interviews has confirmed education encouraging by managers.
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility					
Compliance criteria					
6.12.1	<p>Indicator: Demonstration of company-level [148] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above</p>	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.	Y		The corporate MH CoC is used over the world. The Norway companies used the same documents.
		b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located.	Y		Approved

	Requirement: Yes	c. The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covers all company operations relating to salmonid production in the region (i.e. all smolt production facilities, grow-out facilities and processing plants).	Y			Applied in whole company
	Applicability: All	d. The site that is applying for certification provides auditors with access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above).	Y			Policies verified
Footnote	[148] Applies to the headquarters of the company in a region or country where the site applying for certification is located. The policy shall relate to all of the company's operations in the region or country, including grow-out, smolt production and processing facilities.					
Social requirements in the standards shall be audited by an individual who is a lead auditor in conformity with SAAS Procedure 200 section 3.1.						
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN						
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement						
Compliance Criteria						
7.1.1	Indicator: Evidence of regular and meaningful [149] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).	Y			Meetings are held several meetings in 2013 and 2014
		b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.	Y			Content of consultations meets requirements of the standard
		c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.	Y			The participation of representatives ensured.
	Requirement: Yes	d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3).	Y			Content of consultations meets requirements of the standard
	Applicability: All	e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.	Y			DP/KRBE 02.12.14 Closed MI NC from IA 2013. Minutes of meetings available
		f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y		NA	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[149] Regular and meaningful: Meetings shall be held at least bi-annually with elected representatives of affected communities. The agenda for the meetings should in part be set by the community representatives. Participatory Social Impact Assessment methods may be one option to consider here.					
7.1.2	Indicator: Presence and evidence of an effective [150] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations.	Y			Procedure is developed for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders.
		b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder describing corrective actions).	Y			No complains received.
		c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).	Y			No complains received.
	Requirement: Yes	d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y		NA	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[150] Effective: In order to demonstrate that the mechanism is effective, evidence of resolutions of complaints can be given.					
7.1.3	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	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)	Y			The signs will be used at the sites during the treatment.
		b. Notices (above) are posted where they will be visible to affected stakeholders (e.g. posted on waterways for fishermen who pass by the farm).	Y			No application of signs were needed.
		c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1)	Y			It was communicated during consultation meetings.
	Requirement: Yes	d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.	Y		NA	No interview were used with stakeholders
Footnote	[151] Signage shall be visible to mariners and, for example, to fishermen passing by the farm.					
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories						
Compliance Criteria						
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 7.2 - Traditional Territories of Indigenous Groups						
7.2.1	Indicator: Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations	a. Documentary evidence establishes that the farm does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]). If not then the requirements of 7.2.1 do not apply.			NA	It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.
		b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
	Requirement: Yes	c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
	Applicability: All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
7.2.2	Indicator: Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
		b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
Footnote	[152] All standards related to indigenous rights only apply where relevant, based on proximity of indigenous territories.					
7.2.3	Indicator: Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [153] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
		b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) reached a protocol agreement with the indigenous community and this fact is documented; or 2) continued engagement in an active process [153] to reach a protocol agreement with the indigenous community.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
	Requirement: Yes	c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.			NA	No indigenous groups in area.
Footnote	[153] To demonstrate an active process, a farm must show ongoing efforts to communicate with indigenous communities, an understanding of key community concerns and responsiveness to key community concerns through adaptive farm management and other actions.					
Criterion 7.3 Access to resources						
Compliance Criteria						
7.3.1	Indicator: Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [154] without community approval	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).			NA	All permissions to operate sites give no special issues.
		b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.			NA	Process via permission approval procedure.
	Requirement: None	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.			NA	No interview

Footnote	[154] Vital community resources can include freshwater, land or other natural resources that communities rely on for their livelihood. If a farm site were to block, for example, a community's sole access point to a needed freshwater resource, this would be unacceptable under the Dialogue standard.						
7.3.2	Indicator: Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources	a. There is a documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources. Can be completed as part of community consultations under 7.1.1.	Y			It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites.	
	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.				No interview were used with stakeholders	
INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION							
Footnote	[155] The SAD SC proposes this approach to addressing environmental and social performance during the smolt phase of production. In the medium term, the SC						
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT							
<i>Standards related to Principle 1</i>							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			Internal smolt supplier 10581 Agder Smolt (Fjellsæ)	
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 VI).	A. Review the farm's list of smolt suppliers. Confirm that the client submitted to ASC information on the type of production system used by smolt suppliers (Appendix VI).		Y	Agder Smolt/Fjellsæ Fylkes mannen Discharge permit for "Fjellsæ"10581, 29.04.13. 2,5 mill smolt 200 t MTB. Mechanical filtering of discharge imposed. NVE water permit: dt 25.11.10 for 30m ³ /min. Minimum residual flow in water source. Minimumlevels of lake defined.	
		b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.	B. Verify that client obtains copies of legal authorisation from smolt suppliers (if applicable).		Y	Agder Smolt/Fjellsæ Fylkes mannen Discharge permit for 10581 "Fjellsæ", 29.04.13. 2,5 mill smolt 200 t MTB. Mechanical filtering of discharge imposed. NVE water permit: dt 25.11.10 for 30m ³ /min. Minimum residual flow in water source. Minimumlevel of lake defined.	
		c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	C. Verify that farm obtains records from smolt suppliers to show compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements.		Y	NVE inspection report dt 15 04.12 OK, requires fixed measuring points in lake. Accomplished and approved.	
		-	D. Verify that farm keeps records to show how smolt suppliers comply with regulations on discharge and applicable permitting requirements related to water quality.		Y	Internal report "Miljørapport Fjellsæ" same for Kvingo for 2013, with records and objectives for surrounding environment	
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.	A. Verify farm obtains declaration from smolt suppliers.		Y	According to points 6 and 7 above, since fully owned MH plants. Int. statement presented (Code of conduct) an "Personalguiden" int handbook (online) on labor issues. With internal rules and public regulations. MH mob. Phone app. for reporting/communicating e.g OHAS issues. Internal OHAS inspeitions performed twice a year, included elected employee representative.	
		b. Keep records of supplier inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation; see 1.1.3a)	B. Verify that farm obtains inspection records from suppliers (as applicable).		Y	According to points 6 and 7 above, since fully owned MH plant. MH OHAS coordiantor states no inspections relating labour conditions/issues has been held by authorities.	
<i>Standards related to Principle 2</i>							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
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 Applicability: All Smolt Producers	Note: If the smolt facility has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory					
		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.	A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I-3.		Y		Konsekvens utredning dt 02.05.06. for Fjellsæ. By "Rådgivende Biologer" considering watersource, resipient and surrounding aquatic and terrestrial wildlife.
		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.	B. Review declaration.		Y	Resulted in production increase from authorities, since no relevant conflicts were uncovered.	
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 SAD standards, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period Applicability: All Smolt Producers	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.4 - Calculating Total Phosphorus Released per Ton of Fish Produced					
		a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months.	A. Verify that farm has records for feeds used by smolt suppliers over the relevant time period.		Y		2013 Miljørapport Agder Smolt/ Fjellsæ 135 746 kg feed.
		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).	B. Verify that farm has records showing that smolt supplier determined phosphorus content in feeds.		Y		Declaration per feed type and particle size from feed supplier. (weighted value 1,44%)
		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.	C. Confirm that calculations are done according to Appendix VIII-1.		Y		Calculated: Agder/Fjellsæ has 1,78 kg P/mt biomass produced. (Productiondata)
		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	D. Verify that farm obtained from the smolt supplier all records needed to calculate the amount of biomass produced during the past 12 months.		Y		136700kg
		e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1.	E. Confirm that calculations are done according to Appendix VIII-1.		Y		Agder/Fjellsæ has 1,78 kg p/mt biomass produced. (Productiondata)
		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.	F. As applicable, verify farm has records showing that smolt supplier determined the amount of phosphorus removed from the system as sludge.		Y		Filtering of effluent. (Content in sludge measured and used in calculation)
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.	G. Review calculations to confirm that the farm's smolt supplier(s) do not exceed requirements for release of phosphorus.		Y		Variation Request accepted by ASC 09.14		
<i>Standards related to Principle 3</i>							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				

8.5	<p>Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication [156] of the SAD standards</p> <p>Requirement: Yes [157]</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [157]</p>	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.	A. Verify that the farm has evidence that their smolt suppliers do not produce non-native species. If the farm can show that smolt suppliers produce only native species, then Indicator 8.5 does not apply.			NA	No non-native specie
		b. Provide the farm with documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard. (See definition of area under 3.2.1.)	B. If applicable, verify the farm has evidence from smolt suppliers confirming when the non-native species was first brought into wide commercial production in the area where production is occurring now.			NA	No non-native specie
		c. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish.	C. Review evidence to confirm that smolt suppliers use only 100% sterile fish.			NA	No non-native specie
		d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b or 8.5c, provide documented evidence 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; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.	D. Review evidence that the farm's smolt suppliers comply with each point raised in 8.5d.			NA	No non-native specie
		e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.	E. Verify that farm retains evidence of compliance by all smolt suppliers.			NA	S. salar native to region.
Footnote	[156] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of						
Footnote	[157] Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild by effective physical						
8.6	<p>Indicator: Maximum number of escapees [158] in the most recent production cycle</p> <p>Requirement: 300 fish [159]</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [159]</p>	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers maintained monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.	A. Review the farm's records for escape monitoring by the smolt supplier to confirm completeness and accuracy of information.	Y			Int RA with instruction for regs and repor tin. No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Dir. escape incidents overvriw (www.F.Dir.no)
		b. Using smolt supplier records from 8.6a, determine the total number of fish that escaped. Verify that there were fewer than 300 escapees from the smolt production facility in the most recent production cycle.	B. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that the smolt supplier complied with the requirement.	Y			No incident reported. Verified by Fisheries Dir. escape incidents overvriw (www.F.Dir.no)
		c. Inform smolt suppliers in writing that monitoring records described in 8.6a must be maintained for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which the farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [159]).	C. Confirm that the farm informs their smolt suppliers that they must maintain records for escape monitoring for > 10 years.	Y			Internal smolt supplier. Common QM system.
		d. If an escape episode occurs at the smolt production facility (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [159]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the smolt producer could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.	D. Review the farm's request for a rare exception to the Standard for an escape event at the smolt production site. Confirm no prior exceptional events were documented during the previous 10 years, or since the date of the start of the production cycle during which the farm first applied for certification. An example of an exceptional event is vandalization of the farm. Events that are not considered exceptional include failures in moorings due to bad weather and boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the smolt production facility.	Y		NA	Int RA with instruction for regs and reporting. No incident reported.
		Footnote	[158] Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregated number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish.				
Footnote	[159] A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside of the farm's control. Only one such						
8.7	<p>Indicator: Accuracy [160] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish</p> <p>Requirement: ≥98%</p>	a. Obtain records showing the accuracy of the counting technology used by smolt suppliers. Records must include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts.	A. Confirm that the farm keeps records of counting accuracy for the counting technology or method used on site at stocking and harvest.	Y			AquaScan counter technical specs show 98-100% accuracy. VAKI for counting into wellboat technical specs states > 99% accuracy.
		b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	B. Verify that farm has records showing that the accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%.	Y			Production and harevst record reviewed.
Footnote	[160] Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand counts.						
Standards related to Principle 4							
8.8	<p>Indicator: Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	a. From each smolt supplier obtain a policy which states the supplier's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the supplier's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation.	A. Confirm that the farm has relevant policies on file from each smolt supplier and review those policies to verify the farm's suppliers are in compliance with the requirement.	Y			Avfallsplan MHN ferskvann ID 29769 01.02.13 covers source grading of NB waste. Contract with local service provider "Agder Veittransport" 09.05.11.
		Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.1.					
8.9	<p>Indicator: Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection 1 for guidance and required components of the records and assessment)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle</p> <p>Applicability: All Smolt Producers</p>	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year.	A. Verify that the farm obtains records for energy consumption from smolt suppliers.	Y			Records OK
		b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kJ) during the last year.	B. Verify that the farm has reviewed the supplier's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	Y			Fjellsæ 8 628 622 kJ
		c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year.	C. Verify that the farm has supplier records for total weight of fish produced during the last year.	Y			Fjellsæ 141 967 kg
		d. Confirm that the smolt supplier used results from 8.9b and 8.9c to calculate energy consumption on the supplier's facility as required and that the units are reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle.	D. Verify that the farm has records to show that the smolt supplier's calculations are complete and accurate.	Y			Fjellsæ 60.8KJ /mt Biomass produced.
		e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a-e.	E. Verify that the farm has evidence that its smolt supplier(s) has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the supplier's energy consumption.	Y			In Miljørapport Fjellsæ /Produksjondata
8.10	<p>Indicator: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [161]) emissions [162] at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment (See Appendix V, subsection 1)</p> <p>Requirement: Yes</p>	a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility.	A. Verify that the farm obtains records of GHG emissions from smolt suppliers.	Y			Fjellsæ 523 906 kg CO2 from fuel. 305849 kg CO2 for purchased el 2011, also for 2012 and 2013.
		b. Confirm that, on at least an annual basis, the smolt supplier calculates all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	B. Verify that the farm confirms that calculations by smolt suppliers are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1.	Y			Fjellsæ 523 906 kg CO2 from fuel. 305849 kg CO2 for purchased el 2011, also for 2012 and 2013.
		c. For GHG calculations, confirm that the smolt supplier selects the emission factors which are best suited to the supplier's operation. Confirm that the supplier documents the source of the emissions factors.	C. Verify that the farm has records from smolt suppliers for all emissions factors used and their sources.	Y			Fjellsæ 523 906 kg CO2 from fuel. 305849 kg CO2 for purchased el 2011, also for 2012 and 2013. (Scope 1&2)
		Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.2.					

	Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO2 gases to CO2 equivalents, confirm that the smolt suppliers specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source. e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually.	D. Verify that the farm has records from smolt suppliers for all GWP's used and their sources. E. Verify that the farm has evidence that smolt suppliers undergo a GHG assessment annually and that the methods used are in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.				CO2 used. In Carbon Disclosure Project (www.marineharvest.com) NA CO2 used Carbon Disclosure Project (www.marineharvest.com) NA
Footnote	[161] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO ₂); methane (CH ₄); nitrous oxide (N ₂ O);						
Footnote	[162] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.						
Standards related to Principle 5							
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):				
8.11	Indicator: Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt	a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites. b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.	A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of fish health management plans from smolt suppliers. B. Verify that farm has evidence that supplier's fish health management plan was approved by designated veterinarian.	Y			Regional Fish Health Plan ID 24817 and Local Fish Health Plan cover all aspect of relevant diseases and parasite diagnostics and control measures. In., vet service Int. supplier. Seen FHMP, approval dt 19.12.13 documented. With responsibilities named
8.12	Indicator: Percentage of fish that are vaccinated for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists [163] Requirement: 100% Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Maintain a list of diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region, developed by farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence. b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence. c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received. d. Demonstrate, using the lists from 8.12a-c above, that all salmon on the farm received vaccination against all selected diseases known to present a significant risk in the regions for which an effective vaccine exists.	A. Review list and the supporting analysis. B. Review list and the supporting analysis. C. Verify client has the list from the smolt supplier(s). D. Cross-check lists to verify that all required vaccines were received by all batches of smolt received by the farm during the current production cycle.	Y			In FHMP/VHP (Regional and Local) type of disease and control monitoring strategy, vaccine/pathogen type/product name. In FHMP/VHP type of disease and control monitoring strategy, vaccine/pathogen type/product name. In smolt CV with dates ant type for smolts in Skipningsdalen site, 100% vaccination is a legal requirement controlled by NFSA 100% vaccinated according to legislation. And verified in smolt CV verified towards reqs. In FHP.
Footnote	[163] The farm's designated veterinarian is responsible for undertaking and providing written documentation of the analysis of the diseases that pose a risk in the						
8.13	Indicator: Percentage of smolt groups [164] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm Requirement: 100% Applicability: All Smolt Producers	Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.13 – Testing of Smolt for Select Diseases a. Obtain from the smolt supplier a list of diseases of regional concern for which smolt should be tested. List shall be supported by scientific analysis as described in the instruction above. b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration and records confirming that each smolt group received by the farm has been tested for the diseases in the list (8.13a).	A. Review list. If auditor has questions about the list, request and review supporting analysis. B. Verify records show that each smolt group was tested prior to entering the water at the farm (the grow-out site).	Y			Vets visits, list, according to local VHP predetermined sampling and visits regime defined in plan.. Vets visits according to VHP. Smolt group health certificate dt 28.08.14 by Int. Vet Report, signed Vet. E. Hoel
Footnote	[164] A smolt group is any population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents						
8.14	Indicator: Detailed information, provided by the designated veterinarian, of all chemicals and therapeutants used during the smolt 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 Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use for the fish sold to the farm that is signed by their veterinarian and 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 therapeutant.	A. Review records of chemical and therapeutant use for completeness and confirm the records were signed by a qualified veterinarian.	Y			Vaccines only therapeutant used, as in fish CV in AquaFarmer according to FHP - type and producer and batch. Prescription signed by resp. FHB/vet. No other therapeutant used on fish. Vaccines by Pharmaq and Novax. Formalin treatment and anaesthetics only.
8.15	Indicator: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [165] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [166] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [166]. b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification. c. Compare therapeutant records from smolt supplier (8.14) to the list (8.15a) and confirm that no therapeutants appearing on the list (8.15a) were used on the smolt purchased by the farm.	A. Verify list has been provided and is consistent with the list in 5.2.2a. B. Verify that the farm informed the smolt supplier. C. Review farm's comparison to verify accuracy.	Y			In smolt CV in AquaFarmer report. No treatments registered. MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined. Internal smolt supplier. Vaccines only as in fish CV in AquaFarmer - type and producer and batch. Prescription signed by resp. FHB/vet. Anaesthetics and antiparasite treatment formalin. OK according to list.
Footnote	[165] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance.						
Footnote	[166] For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.						
8.16	Indicator: Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a). b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.	A. Verify farm obtains treatment records from smolt supplier (See also 8.14A). B. Confirm that the smolt supplier used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.				NA NA
8.17	Indicator: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [167] Requirement: None [168]	a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [167]. b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	A. Confirm that the farm provided smolt supplier with the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics. B. Verify that the farm informed the smolt supplier.	Y			MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances - strictest market requirements used) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined.; against WHO critical list. MH Positive list (allowed and banned substances) from TQM with market acceptance status and levels defined

	Applicability: All Smolt Producers	c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm.	C. Review farm's comparison to verify accuracy.	Y		No AB used. Seen fish CV with all treatments identified Compared to WHO critical list.
Footnote	[167] The 3rd edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at:					
Footnote	[168] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for					
		Note: see instructions for Indicator 5.4.3 regarding evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.				
8.18	Indicator: Evidence of compliance [169] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [170] Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Provide the smolt supplier with a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (or inform the supplier how to access it from the internet). b. Inform the supplier that an ASC certified farm can only source smolt from a facility with policies and procedures that ensure that its smolt production practices are compliant with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. c. Obtain a declaration from the supplier stating their intent to comply with the OIE code and copies of the smolt suppliers policies and procedures that are relevant to demonstrate compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	A. Verify that farm has provided the smolt supplier with copies of (or access to) the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. B. Confirm that the farm informed its smolt supplier(s) that any supplier to an ASC certified farm must show compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. C. Review the smolt supplier's declaration and supporting policies and procedures to verify compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Y Y Y		Norway is member, national regulation aligned with OIE codes - links on internal rules and regs. OIE list in internal system. Procedures and instructions in common system. Norway is member, national regulation aligned with OIE codes - links on internal rules and regs. OIE list in internal system. Procedures and instructions in common system. Norway is member, national regulation aligned with OIE codes - links on internal rules and regs. OIE list in internal system. Procedures and instructions in common system.
Footnote	[169] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard,					
Footnote	[170] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171 .					
Standards related to Principle 6						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.19	Indicator: Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11 Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain copies of smolt supplier's company-level policies and procedures and a declaration of compliance with the labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11. b. Review the documentation and declaration from 8.19a to verify that smolt supplier's policies and procedures are in compliance with the requirements of labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	A. Verify that farm obtains copies of company-level policies and procedures from all of its smolt suppliers and a declaration of compliance. B. Review supplier documents provided by the farm to verify compliance of the smolt supplier's policies and procedures with labor requirements.	Y Y		Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used. Company documents apply: the internal Smolt supplier used.
Standards related to Principle 7						
		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):			
8.20	Indicator: Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations Requirement: Yes	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community. b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements.	A. Verify that farm obtains required information from each smolt supplier. B. Review evidence for compliance.	Y Y		Meetings were organised 2014-08-18 The documents were reviewed.
8.21	Indicator: Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.	A. Verify that farm obtains copies of supplier's complaints procedures from each of its smolt suppliers.	Y		Internal Smolt supplier used. Company procedures are used. See Principle 7.1.2.
8.22	Indicator: Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to 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. 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.	A. Review evidence to determine whether Indicator 8.22 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s). B. Verify that the smolt supplier complies with relevant requirements.	Y		N/A It is communicated during the application processing to start the sites. No indigenous groups present in neighbourhood. N/A
8.23	Indicator: Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier. b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.	A. Review evidence to determine whether Indicator 8.23 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s). B. Review documentary evidence to confirm that the smolt supplier has undertaken proactive consultations.	Y		N/A
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT						
Instruction to Clients for Indicators 8.24 through 8.31 - Requirements for Smolt Produced in Open Systems						
		Scope of Exemption Allowed Under Indicator 8.24:				
8.24	Indicator: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids Requirement: None Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids. 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. 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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains relevant declarations from its smolt supplier(s). B. Confirm that the farm obtains information on the water bodies in which its suppliers are operating net pens for smolt production. 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).		NA NA NA	Semi closed system discharging directly to Sea water
8.25	Indicator: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body	a. Take steps to ensure that by June 13, 2017 the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens.	A. Prior to the effective date, confirm that the client understands the requirement of Indicator 8.25. After the effective date, confirm that the farm is in full compliance with the requirement.		NA	
	Indicator: Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body has been established by a	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. b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.	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. B. Verify that the assessment was done by a reliable entity (e.g. government body or academic institution).		NA NA	

8.26	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) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	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. d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a). 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.	C. Verify that the assessment report is in compliance with requirements. D. Verify that the farm confirms that total biomass in the water body does not exceed carrying capacity. E. Verify that the farm requests an updated assessment (< 2 years old) if there was a significant increase in nutrient inputs to the water body.					NA	
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								
Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.27 and 8.28 - Monitoring TP and DO in Receiving Water for Open Smolt Systems									
8.27	Indicator: Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) Requirement: ≤ 20 µg/l [174] Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements of Appendix VIII-6. b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations. c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station. d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body. 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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of the smolt supplier's monitoring records (datasets, protocols, reports). B. Review and confirm that the spatial arrangement of sampling stations complies with requirements of Appendix VIII-6. C. Review TP monitoring results. D. Repeat comparison. E. Verify that TP ≤ 20 µg/l in the receiving water body.					NA	
Footnote	[173] This concentration is equivalent to the upper limit of the Mesotrophic Trophic Status classification as described in Appendix VIII-7.								
8.28	Indicator: Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimeters above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) Requirement: ≥ 50% Applicability: All Smolt	a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a). b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months. c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.	A. Verify as above (see 8.27A). B. Verify that farm has copies of supplier's DO monitoring results. C. Review the supplier's monitoring results to verify compliance with requirements.					NA	
8.29	Indicator: Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable). 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. 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 the observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months. d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported for all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change.	A. Verify that farm obtains evidence from suppliers (as applicable). B. Review how supplier determined trophic status (as applicable). C. Verify that the farm conducts a review of the supplier's results and conclusions regarding trophic status of the water body. D. Review the farm's conclusion to verify compliance with the requirement.					NA	
8.30	Indicator: Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) Requirement: 25% Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable. b. Compare the baseline TP concentration (result from 8.30a) to the average observed TP concentration over the past 12 months (result from 8.27e). c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration.	A. Verify that farm has supplier's records for baseline TP concentrations in the water body. B. Repeat comparison. C. Repeat calculation to verify compliance with the requirement.					NA	
8.31	Indicator: Allowance for use of aeration systems or	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use	A. Verify that the farm obtains relevant declarations from its smolt supplier(s).					NA	
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS									
Instructions to Client for Indicators 8.32-8.35 - Requirement for smolts produced in open systems									
Footnote	[176] Production systems that don't discharge into fresh water are exempt from these standards.								
8.32	Indicator: Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) Requirement: Yes [177] Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed	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. b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness. 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.	A. Verify that farm has records to show smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring at the required frequency and duration. 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, TSS). C. Confirm that client has submitted to ASC the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix for the last 12 month period.					NA	Semi closed system discharging directly to Sea water
Footnote	[177] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.32.								
8.33	Indicator: Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2) Requirement: 60% [178,179] Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b). b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation. 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).	A. Verify that the farm obtains water quality monitoring records from its smolt supplier(s). B. Review the supplier's monitoring results to verify compliance with requirements. C. Verify that the farm obtained evidence for enhanced DO monitoring by the smolt supplier (as applicable).					NA	
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								
Footnote	[179] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.33.								
8.34	Indicator: Macro-invertebrate surveys downstream from the farm's effluent discharge demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3)	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys. b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3). 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.	A. Verify that the farm has documentation of macro-invertebrate benthic surveys from its smolt supplier(s). B. Review documents from the farm's smolt supplier to verify the surveys were conducted as required in Appendix III-3. C. Review documents to verify that survey results demonstrate compliance with requirements.					NA	

8.35	Indicator: Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.	A. Review the supplier's biosolids management plan for compliance with Appendix VIII-2.				NA
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly.	B. Review the supplier's biosolids process flow diagram for compliance with Appendix VII-2.				NA
		c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months.	C. Confirm that farm obtains declarations from smolt suppliers.				NA
		d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2.	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.				NA