

Terms of Reference (ToR) for review and revision of Indicator 3.1.7 of the ASC Salmon Standard (v1.2)

This document is publicly available on the ASC website.

A one-month (March 18 – April 18, 2019) Public Consultation Period was in effect during which comments to the draft version (v0.1) of this ToR could be made. The present document is the ToR (v1.0) effective after the consultation period concluded.

Document history

| Version | Effective date | Description of amendment | Affected section / page |
|---------|----------------|---|--|
| 0.1 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 1.0 | April 19, 2019 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Introductory sentences: ToR Public Consultation period put in past tense (currently closed); B) Current version no longer a Draft, v0.1 changed to v1.0; C) Change of dates/timelines; D) Change of ASC address, contact details. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Current page (p1) B) “Document history”, <i>Ibid.</i> C) Section 5 (“Process & Documents”); items #3, 4, 5; page 3. D) Section 10. (“Contact information”); page 10. |

1. Introduction

ASC vision and mission

The vision of ASC is a world where aquaculture plays a major role in supplying food and social benefits for mankind whilst minimising negative impacts on the environment.

The mission of the ASC is to transform aquaculture towards environmental sustainability and social responsibility using efficient market mechanisms that create value across the chain.

ASC Salmon Standard – Indicator 3.1.7

The ASC Salmon Standard is part of nine ASC-standards covering fourteen different species groups. Within the current (v1.2) and past (v1.1 and v1.0) versions of the Salmon Standard, the following indicator is included:

| Indicator 3.1.7 | |
|--|--|
| Indicator: | Requirement: |
| In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish. ⁴⁶ See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2 | 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish |

This Indicator is the scope of this review/revision.

About this document

This document serves two purposes:

1. To allow ASC to make public notice of the start of the review and revision process of the ASC Salmon Standard – Indicator 3.1.7
2. To justify the need for a review as well as practical information regarding the process and stakeholder participation.

This review and revision process adheres to the ASC Standard Setting protocol, which means amongst others that the ToR, the first draft and the second draft of the proposed revisions will be put up for public consultation. The exact steps are described in the protocol which can be found on the ASC website.

2. Justification for reviewing the Salmon Standard

The following reasons are presented to justify the revision of the Salmon Standard v1.2:

- To review if the current metric of 0.1 remains accurate and reflects best practice within the global salmon industry;
- As full ISEAL Alliance member, ASC is required to review, and revise where needed, each standard every 3-5 years.

3. Objectives of the standard review

The main objectives of the standards' review are:

- To assure that the Standard's metric indicator is set at an accurate level and that this level is substantiated through public data (during consultation & after completion).

4. Scope

Within scope of this review and revision is:

- Indicator 3.1.7 of the ASC Salmon Standard.

5. Process & documents

The table below lists the main steps for this revision process – a more detailed (general) process description can be found in the ASC Standard Setting Protocol.

| # | Activity: | Output: | Timeline | By: |
|----------|--|---|--|--------------------|
| 1 | Present project proposal and justification to SB | Concept ToR & project proposal approved by SB | September 2018 | Project Lead |
| 2 | Development of detailed ToR | Draft ToR open for consultation | March 18 – April 18, 2019 (consultation for 1 month) | Project Lead & TAG |
| 3 | Finalisation ToR | ToR v1.0 | April 2019 | Project Lead & TAG |
| 3 | Development Draft 1 | ○ Draft 1 revised | August – October 2020 | Project Lead & TAG |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--------------------|
| | | indicator 3.1.7 ○ Background document & used data | (consultation for 2 months) | |
| 4 | Development Draft 2 | ○ Draft 2 revised indicator 3.1.7 ○ Background document & used data | March – May 2021 (consultation for 2 months) | Project Lead & TAG |
| 5 | Presentation of final draft to TAG for endorsement | Final draft – Indicator 3.1.7 | November 2021 (TAG meeting) | Project Lead & TAG |
| 6 | Presentation of final draft to SB for endorsement and sign-off | Final draft – Indicator 3.1.7 | December 2021 (SB-meeting) | Project Lead & SB |

The actual review and proposed revision of the item within scope will be detailed in a Background Document. This document will present detailed background information and will also make a suggestion on revised/new standard content.

Together with this Background Document, two drafts of Salmon Standard v1.3 will be made public for consultation. Both drafts will include revised content as is proposed in the Background Document.

For the entire project, following documents will be produced, and made public via the ASC website:

Related to ToR:

1. ToR (draft & final)
2. Overview of stakeholder comments received on draft ToR and ASCs' response

Related to Draft 1:

3. Background document* for Draft 1 of Indicator 3.1.7
4. Draft 1 of Indicator 3.1.7
5. Overview of stakeholder comments received on Draft 1 and ASCs' response

Related to Draft 2:

6. Background document* for Draft 2 of Indicator 3.1.7
7. Draft 2 of Indicator 3.1.7

8. Overview of comments received on Draft 2 and ASCs' response
9. Final **Indicator 3.1.7** (after sign-off by SB) in Salmon Standard v1.3 (by then).

** Please note that the Background Document for Draft 1 and Draft 2 is one. The Background Document will have 2 sections – one for each Draft.*

6. Governance structure, working approach and decision-making procedure

The following table outlines the roles & responsibilities of the various ASC governance bodies for this particular project.

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| ASC Supervisory Board | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Final decision-making body ○ Project approval ○ Project sign-off |
| ASC Technical Advisory Group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project overview, including overview on TWG/external experts ○ Endorsement detailed ToR ○ Endorsement of Draft 1 and 2 prior to each consultation round ○ Endorsement sign-off document to SB ○ Endorsement final draft to SB |
| Steering Committee | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ n/a |
| Technical Working Group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TWG will be formed ○ TWG(s) findings are reported back to TAG periodically |
| External experts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consulted where deemed needed |

Reporting requirements:

- A dedicated webpage on the ASC website will be constructed to provide a means to communicate relevant documents.
- Minutes of the TAG-meetings are published on the ASC-website

Decision-making procedure:

- TWG advices to TAG

- TAG advises to SB on standard content by means of the final draft
- SB is the final decision-making body

TWG and TAG strive for consensus. Where views differ and consensus can't be found, various views are documented and escalated to the final decision body (SB).

Meetings:

- The ASC strives to work in a cost and time-efficient manner and has a preference to work primarily via e.g. teleconference and e-mail. Meeting schedules will be set to allow participation at reasonably convenient times.
- Need for in-person meeting(s) will be decided as the process progresses.

7. Stakeholder participation and mapping

The ASC process for reviewing this standard follows the ASC Standard Setting Protocol. It will require two public consultation rounds and other stakeholder engagement opportunities to ensure effective stakeholder participation.

The ASC will monitor the participation of stakeholders throughout the standard setting process to ensure balanced and effective stakeholder participation.

Table 1 (below) presents an overview of identified stakeholder groups and how engagement with each group is expected.

Table 1: Stakeholders mapping

| Main stakeholder group | Relevance (why they should participate in the process) | Interest in the process and standards | Outreach strategies for participation in revision | Communication means | Participation goal |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Aquaculture farms of related species (including farm trade bodies / representative organisations / Artisanal and small scale farmers) | Most directly affected group. In order for standards to be effective, requirements must be possible in practice. Farms can provide these practical insights. | Attainable standards that create added value when farms get certified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - direct contact with farms - where necessary, translation of necessary documents (e.g. this TOR, draft standards, synopsis, final standards) - via Conformity assessment bodies (CABs) - local/regional workshops, where and when necessary - participation in pilot | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E-mail newsletter (if possible) - Website (if possible) - Webinars (if possible) - In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) - Through trade associations - Through local civil society organizations - Workshop in remote areas in producers' countries will be provided if any of the mentioned means above is not available. | - Farms in all active countries and regions of the related species |
| Communities (around farms growing related species) (This group | Directly affected group. Some standards requirements are | Standards that take care of reducing negative impacts of | - where necessary, translation of certain process documents (e.g. this TOR, draft standards, synopsis, final standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E-mail newsletter (if possible) - Website (if possible) - Webinars (if possible) | - People living around certified farms in all active countries and regions |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| may be represented by NGO's, see below) | about local communities. | adjacent farms on their livelihoods. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - via social NGOS's where possible - local/regional workshops, where and when necessary - participation in pilot | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) - Through (local) social / environmental NGOs | |
| Industry (retails, processing/ trading companies) | Indirectly affected group. Credible standards that do not challenge their continued and consistent supply, and yet help strengthen their reputation. | Attainability of standards that do not create high costs for certified products. Facing end consumers, retail likes to make sure relevant issues will be covered in standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct contact with these companies (e.g. through ASC Outreach colleagues) - Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E-mail newsletter - website - webinars - In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) - Trade press | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Companies trading related species - Companies in all active countries and regions |
| Civil society organisations – _both environmental and social (NGOs) | Experience/knowledge of and insights in issues that will be in the standards | Key environmental and social concerns are addressed in the standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct contact with these organisations - Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E-mail newsletter - website - webinars - In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both local and international NGOs |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Governments (including inter- governmental agencies) | Alignment with national and international sustainability development goals (SDGs) | No impose of technical barriers to trade (TBT) in standards | - direct contact with government officials (or through consultants) - where necessary, organise discussions with government officials - Public consultation workshops | - E-mail newsletter - website - webinars - In person to the extent needed (e.g. workshops) | - Representatives of governments where related species are widely farmed |
| Scientists /Academics | Knowledge and their scientific approach | Standards are science-based | - direct contact with scientists - where necessary, organise discussions with them - Where necessary, have them do specific research on identified topics | - E-mail newsletter - website - webinars - In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) | - Scientists/researchers of the related species |
| Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) | Besides farmers and local NGOs, CABs have practical insights on field implementation of standards | Auditability of the standards and reasonable auditing costs | - Direct contact with these organisations - Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs | - E-mail newsletter - website - webinars - In person (e.g. workshops) | - Both ASC accredited and non-accredited CABs - CABs familiar with the related species |

8. Assessment of Risk

At this stage the ASC can only identify generic risks in terms of changes to the current standards in case of revision. These risks will be further elaborated once it becomes clearer regarding the direction of proposed changes. This TOR will again be updated accordingly.

No 1: Intended Identified risk

Auditors will need to be retrained to safeguard consistent implementation of any changes. It may prove difficult to have all auditors (re)trained in time, especially if an in-person training is required.

Strategy for managing risk No 1: Development of training materials and planning of training will be planned as far in advance as reasonably expected and may involve on-line delivery.

No 2: Unidentified risk

Resistance by audited farms (certified and in assessment) leading to the possibility that certified farms would leave the programme due to the changes, or some farms would be willing to join the programme. Farms would have to adjust their practices to meet changes to the standards, and possibly additional resources used to meet future compliance (e.g. training for workers, efforts to find new inputs suppliers, and lower productivity and practices).

Strategies for managing risk No 2:

To avoid risk No 2, the ASC engages various stakeholders in its standard setting, review and revision processes to make sure that the standards or changes are applicable and accessible. Besides, the ASC is also committed through other policy developments (e.g. group certification, harmonization and quality and assurance processes) that will be launched soon will also contribute to reducing implementation and certification costs for farmers, especially the small holder. The ASC is also willing to offer training for farms to raise their awareness of sustainable and responsible farming and reduce impacts of the sector as a whole, providing that funds are available to implement this strategy.

10. Contact information

- Key contact person: Javier Unibazo – Marine Cage Farming Coordinator
- Email: Javier.Unibazo@asc-aqua.org
- Address: Daalseplein 101, 3511 SX Utrecht, The Netherlands

11. Annex

n/a