

This document will enable approved certification bodies, who carry out audits on behalf of both standard owners, to conduct a single audit as the basis for two certificates.

Salmon - ASC-GLOBALG.A.P Commonalities

ALL ASC Requirements will need to be addressed by the farm for CAB to consider the farm for ASC certification.

ASC Indicator No.	Descriptions	GlobalG.A.P. CP No.	Descriptions
1.1.1 1.1.3	1.1.1 Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use 1.1.3 Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations	AB 1.1.1	Are farms operated in accordance with applicable legislation in relation to the GLOBALG.A.P Standard?
		AB 1.1.3	Are all aquaculture farms registered as such with the relevant competent authority as required by national legislation?
		AB 11.1.1	Does water abstraction and discharge meet the requirements set by the competent authority?
		AB 11.2.1	Are local limits in accordance with legislation as implemented and enforced by the relevant competent authority? Does every operator have a consent to discharge, and is able to demonstrate compliance with the consent conditions?
		GRASP 7	Do payslips / pay registers indicate the conformity of payment with at least legal regulations and/or collective bargaining agreements?
		GRASP 8	Do working hours and breaks documented in the time records comply with applicant legislation and/or collective bargaining agreements?
1.1.4	Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts	AB 1.1.2	Is the farm management able to explain how they fulfill their legal obligations with respect to the Food Safety, Animal Welfare, Environmental and Workers Health & Safety Legislation applicable to their enterprise?
		AB 11.1.2	Is inlet / outlet water quality in compliance with existing applicable local regulations? Where no such regulations exist, are there facilities for effluent treatment available in order to minimize polluting the open water and inlet treatment to promote fish welfare?
		AB 10.1.4	Is a continuously updated biodiversity-inclusive environmental impact assessment (EIA) and risk assessment (ERA) in place?
		AB 11.1.2	Is inlet / outlet water quality in compliance with existing applicable local regulations? Where no such regulations exist, are there facilities for effluent treatment available in order to minimize polluting the open water and inlet treatment to promote fish welfare?
		AB 11.1.3	If required by the authorities, does the farm have an environmental or biological parameter as a guideline for the surrounding water (environmental assimilative capacity)?

2.4.1	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	AF 5.1.1 AF 5.2.1 AB 3.2.2 AB 10.1.3 AB 10.1.4 AB 11.2.2	AF 5.1.1 Have possible waste products and sources of pollution been identified in all areas of the business? AF 5.2.1 Is there a documented farm waste management plan to avoid and/or reduce wastage and pollution and does the waste management plan include adequate provisions for waste disposal? AB 3.2.2 Does storage and disposal of empty containers and non- used chemicals take place in a manner that avoids spillage and exposure to products, humans and animals? AB 10.1.3 Is the producer committed to a formal Environmental and Biodiversity Policy, including the element of continuous improvement (supported by codes of practice, management protocols, management practices, record keeping and regulatory compliance certificates)? AB 10.1.4 Is a continuously updated biodiversity-inclusive environmental impact assessment (EIA) and risk assessment (ERA) in place? AB 11.2.2 Subject to risk assessment, is organic waste stored in an appropriate manner to reduce the risk of contamination of the environment?
2.4.2	Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs)	AB 10.4.1	Has the farm site or related facilities not been established within a designated national Protected Area (PA), PAs with IUCN categories Ia through to IV, or areas defined under international conventions (such as RAMSAR or World Heritage)? If within PA IUCN category V or VI, consent of PA management required.
2.5.7	In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that an assessment of the risk of lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences	AB 5.2.9	Is a risk assessment for animal welfare undertaken which includes farm, predatory and extraneous species present in the farm unit, taking into account the prior use of the land or site?
3.3.1	Use of transgenic salmon by the farm	AB 2.2.2	Is farming of Genetically Modified -GM (transgenic) - fish prohibited?
3.4.4	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	AB 5.7.2	Are all nets in use individually identifiable and maintained in good condition? Is the integrity of the nets visually inspected on a regular basis and after any special event (e.g. storms) to ensure that any damage that may lead to risk of fish escapes are identified and corrected? Is net strength tested yearly?
		AB 5.7.3	Is the recorded net mesh size appropriate for the size of fish to prevent escapes and risk of injuries to the fish?
		AB 10.2.2	Subject to Risk Assessment results, is there in place a regular net and predator net checking system used to reduce negative interaction with wildlife?
		AB 10.3.2	Does the EMP (see AB 10.1.5) includes a Contingency Plan and a standard operating procedure to avoid escape of farmed stock into the sea or local fresh water course?
		AB 10.3.3	Are precautions in place to prevent erosion of dams or channels that could lead to subsequent escapes?
		AF 3.3.2	Do all workers handling and/or administering veterinary medicines, chemicals, disinfectants, plant protection products, biocides and/or other hazardous substances and all workers operating dangerous or complex equipment as defined in the risk analysis in AF.3.1.1 have certificates of competence, and/or details of other such qualifications?

4.1.1 4.3.4 4.4.3	4.1.1 Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed. 4.3.4 Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products or trimmings from IUU catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 4.4.3 Evidence of disclosure to the buyer of the salmon of inclusion of transgenic plant raw material, or raw materials derived from transgenic plants, in the feed	AB 8.2.3	Do fish farms obtain from their feed suppliers a declaration of constituents for each compound diet and supplement fed to their stock and records of them are kept for two years or one year longer than the life cycle of the species farmed, whichever is longer?
		AB 5.1.1	Are fish traceable to the previous farm(s) and back to its origin, including identification of corresponding batch(es) of parent broodstock?
		AB 8.1.2	Has compound feed been manufactured by and obtained from a recognized source?
4.5.1 4.5.2	4.5.1 Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) 4.5.2 Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled	AB 3.2.3	Are unused chemicals disposed of by a legally approved chemical waste contractor or returned to the supplying company?
		AF 5.2.2	Has all litter/waste been cleared up?
		AB 10.1.1	Is there a waste management system in place?
		AB 10.1.2	Is all litter and waste collected and disposed of according to legislation? Is plastic and paper wastes NOT burnt or left in the environment?
5.1.1	Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites	AB 5.4.1	Do all farms maintain up to date legal medicine purchase and administration records including medicated feed?
		AB 5.4.2	Is the producer able to provide a complete history and current overview of fish treatments and application methods and that these are carried out according to national regulation and the VHP?
		AB 5.2.3	Is a Veterinary Health Plan available, updated during last 12 months or for last production cycle and where the need of new drugs not previously included is the case, and signed off by a veterinarian?
5.2.1	On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals 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		
		AB 5.6.1	Is mortality inspection and removal from the production units done daily?

5.1.3	Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner	AB 5.6.3	Does the farm have a system for dead fish removal, storage and disposal that ensures that environmental aspects and risk of pathogen and disease spread to own stock and wild fish species are not compromised and minimum according to national legislation?
		AB 5.6.4	Does the farm have a contingency plan to deal with mass mortalities, at a minimum in accordance with legal requirements where such exist?
5.2.2	Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries	AB 5.3.1	Do producers only use medicines and treatments that are approved by the relevant competent authority for use in aquaculture and for the named species? Is a list of all medicines that may be used available?
		AB 5.3.2	Do medicines applied do not contain one or more of the following compounds (but not limited)? Nitrofurans (or its derivatives), Triarylmethane dyes (including, but not limited to Malachite green, Crystal violet and Brilliant green), Stilbenes (including, but not limited to Stilbene, Dienestrol, Diethylstilbestrol, Hexoestrol), Chloramphenicol, Nitroimidazoles (including, but not limited to Dimetridazole, Ipronidazole, Metronidazole) or β -agonists (including, but not limited to Clenbuterol)
		AB 5.3.7	Are fish flesh residue analyses carried out based on the food safety risk analysis to verify compliance with MRLs for approved medicines and to verify no residues for non-approved substances? Are the analyses performed by an independent, ISO 17025 - accredited (or equivalent standard) laboratory? National surveillance and control program undertaken by the relevant competent authority may be used for documentation.
5.2.3	Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian	AB 5.3.3	Are medicines used at the farm prescribed by a registered veterinarian or as minimum, according to national legislation? Is the application according to the instructions in the VHP?
5.2.4	Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments	AB 5.4.4	Are pre-harvest withdrawal periods for relevant treatments, and for relevant production units, known and strictly adhered to?
5.2.7	Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments	AB 5.3.6	Are neither natural nor synthetic hormones nor antibiotic agents used with the purpose of a growth promoting effect? Are antibacterial agents only applied following the diagnosis of an infectious disease?
5.4.3	Evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code	<i>*REFER TO COMPARISON</i>	
		AB 5.2.9	Is a risk assessment for animal welfare undertaken which includes farm, predatory and extraneous species present in the farm unit, taking into account the prior use of the land or site?
6.1.1	Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference	AF 3.6.2	Do regular two-way communication meetings take place between management and workers? Are there records from such meetings?
		GRASP 3	Has a self-declaration on good social practice regarding human rights been communicated to the employees and signed by the farm management and the employees' representative and have the employees been informed? (ILO Conventions 29 and 105 on forced labor, ILO Conventions 111 on discrimination)

	representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference	GRASP 1	Is there at least one employee or an employees' council to represent the interests of the staff to the management?
6.1.2	Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights	GRASP 1	Documentation is available which demonstrates that a clearly identified, named employees' representative and / or a employees' council representing the interests of the employees to the management is elected or nominated by all employees and recognized by the management. This person shall be able to communicate complaints to the management.
6.2.1	Number of incidences of child labor	GRASP 8	Do records indicate that no minors are employed on the farm?
6.3.1	Number of incidences of forced, bonded or compulsory labor	GRASP 3	Has a self-declaration on good social practice regarding human rights been communicated to the employees and signed by the farm management and the employees' representative and have the employees been informed?
6.5.1 6.5.2 6.5.3 6.5.4 6.5.6	6.5.1 Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures and policies on a yearly basis 6.5.2 Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively 6.5.3 Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken 6.5.4 Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary 6.5.6 Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified	AF. 3.1.1	Does the producer have a written risk assessment for hazards to worker health and safety?
		AF. 3.1.2	Does the farm have written health and safety procedures addressing issues identified in the risk assessment of AF.3.1.1?
		AF 3.4.1	Do accident and emergency procedures exist; are they visually displayed, and are they communicated to all persons associated with the farm activities?
		AF. 3.5.1	Are workers, visitors, and subcontractors equipped with suitable protective clothing in accordance with legal requirements and/or label instructions and/or as authorized by a competent authority?
		GRASP 4:	The responsible person for workers' health and safety and good social practice and the employees' representative (s) have knowledge and/or access to national regulations concerning medical care.
		AB 3.1.1	AB 3.1.1 Is a product inventory documented and readily available for all chemicals in store?
		AB 3.1.2	AB 3.1.2 Are product and safety data sheet available for all chemicals?
		AB 3.1.3	AB 3.1.3 Are chemicals stored in accordance with the label instructions, legislation (including refrigeration when required) and physically separated when risk of cross contamination, in a sound, secure, lockable, well ventilated, well lit location that is located away from other materials?
		AB 3.1.4	AB 3.1.4 Is there emergency information with corresponding facilities for workers to deal with accidents during handling (e.g. eye wash, plenty of clean water) where required?
		AB 3.1.5	AB 3.1.5 Is the chemical store kept locked and access limited to workers with training (according to AF 3.3.2 and AB 4.1.1)?
		AB 3.1.6	AB 3.1.6 Are all chemicals stored in their original packaging, which must be kept in a suitable condition to allow label instructions to be clearly identified?
		AB 3.1.7	AB 3.1.7 Is the chemical store able to retain spillage and are there emergency facilities to deal with accidental spillage?
AB 3.1.8	AB 3.1.8 Are there facilities and equipment suitable for measuring and/or mixing of chemicals to assure safe and accurate dosage?		
AB 3.1.9	AB 3.1.9 Are there suitable equipment available to prevent and to deal with operator contamination?		
AB 4.1.1	Does the person(s) responsible for decision-making in the use of chemicals (including medication and treatments) have appropriate training?		
AB 4.2.3	Are diving operations carried out in accordance with relevant legislation or as a minimum in accordance with health and safety risk assessment?		

6.7.1	Percentage of workers who have contracts	GRASP 5	Can copies of working contracts be shown for the employees? Do they indicate at least full names, nationality, a job description, date of birth, date of entry, wage and the period of employment? Have they been signed by both the employee and the employer?
6.8.1	Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures	GRASP 2	Is there a complaint procedure available on the farm, through which employees can make a complaint?
6.10.1	Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws	GRASP 11	Do working hours and breaks documented in the time records comply with applicant legislation and/or collective bargaining agreements?
7.1.2	Presence and evidence of an effective policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations	AF. 7.1	Is there a complaint procedure available relating to issues covered by the GLOBALG.A.P Standard and does this procedure ensure that complaints are adequately recorded, studied, and followed up including a record of actions taken?

Non-Comparable additional ASC Salmon Indicators

1.1.2	Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws
2.1.1.	Redox potential or sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE), following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1
2.1.2	Faunal index score indicating good to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1
2.1.3	Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1
2.1.4	Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible modeling system
2.2.1	Weekly average percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO) on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4
2.2.2	Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/liter DO
2.2.3	For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets, demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently classified as having “good” or “very good” water quality
2.2.4	For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5
2.2.5	Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of the farm on a production cycle basis
2.3.1	Percentage of fines in the feed at point of entry to the farm (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2)
2.5.1	Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used
2.5.2	Prior to the achievement of 2.5.1, if ADDs or AHDs are used, maximum percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices are operational
2.5.3	Number of mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on the farm
2.5.4	Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action against a predator: 1. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action 2. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager 3. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal

ASC/GlobalGAP Communalities ASC Salmon Standard - version 1.0

Copyright (c) 2015 Aquaculture Stewardship Council.

All rights reserved by Aquaculture Stewardship Council.

2.5.5	Evidence that information about any lethal incidents on the farm has been made easily publicly available
2.5.6	Maximum number of lethal incidents on the farm over the prior two years
3.1.1	Participation in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme for managing disease and resistance to treatments that includes coordination of stocking, fallowing, therapeutic treatments and information-sharing. Detailed requirements are in Appendix III-1
3.1.2	A demonstrated commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks
3.1.3	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
3.1.4	Frequent on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available within seven days of testing
3.1.5	In areas with wild salmonids, evidence of data 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
3.1.6	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
3.1.7	In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2.
3.2.1	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
3.2.2	If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research 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
3.2.3	Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes
3.4.1	Maximum number of escapees in the most recent production cycle
3.4.2	Accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers
3.4.3	Estimated unexplained loss of farmed salmon is made publicly available
4.2.1	Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1)
4.2.2	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 (calculated according to Appendix IV-2)
4.3.1	Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries
4.3.2	Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived
4.3.3	Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2.

4.4.1	Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums and local laws
4.4.2	Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent
4.6.1	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
4.6.2	Records of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1
4.6.3	Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2
4.7.1	For farms that use copper-treated nets, evidence that nets are not cleaned or treated in situ in the marine environment
4.7.2	For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment
4.7.3	For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix I-1
4.7.4	Evidence that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight OR in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body
4.7.5	Evidence that the type of biocides used in net antifouling are approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia
5.1.2	Site visits by a designated veterinarian at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager at least once a month
5.1.4	Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis
5.1.5	Maximum viral disease-related mortality on farm during the most recent production cycle ≤10%
5.1.6	Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6%
5.1.7	A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities
5.2.5	Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII
5.2.6	For farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles
5.2.8	Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO)
5.2.9	Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle
5.2.10	If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles
5.2.11	Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production

5.3.1	Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect
5.3.2	When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site
5.4.1	Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class
5.4.2	Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, the farm has: 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance on the farm and within the ABM 3. Promptly made findings publicly available
5.4.4	If an OIE-notifiable disease is confirmed on the farm, 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 3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease 4. the farm promptly made findings publicly available
6.1.3	Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights
6.2.2	Percentage of young workers that are protected
6.4.1	Evidence of comprehensive and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices
6.4.2	Number of incidences of discrimination
6.5.5	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

6.6.1	The percentage of workers whose basic wage (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage
6.6.2	Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage
6.6.3	Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering
6.7.2	Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors
6.8.2	Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed within a 90-day timeframe
6.9.1	Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions
6.9.2	Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker
6.10.2	Overtime is limited, voluntary, paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances
6.11.1	Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g., courses, certificates and degrees)
6.12.1	Demonstration of company-level policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above

7.1.1	Evidence of regular and meaningful consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations
7.1.3	Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice 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
7.2.1	Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations
7.2.2	Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities
7.2.3	Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities
7.3.1	Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources without community approval
7.3.2	Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources