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Consultation Summary

Project Objective

The ASC regularly reviews its standards as part of its standard-setting protocol and in compliance with the ISEAL Code of Good Practice. The metric requirements for *P. monodon* and *P. vannamei* is part of the Shrimp Standard v1.1 revision process in order to ensure that the standard continues to demand best practices and performance levels. The revision was based on the current draft version of the ASC Metrics Methodology. An integral part of the revision is the acquisition of sufficient data from non-certified farms as well as from literature.

The results of the initial revision and the data obtained, and the resulting recommendations, are now (March 2020) being presented to all stakeholders for public consultation in order to ensure a transparent standard-setting process in compliance with ISEAL requirements.

Purpose of consultation

An integral part of the revision is the acquisition of sufficient data from non-certified farms as well as literature and general stakeholder feedback on the standard. This part of the revision is focussed on the metrics within the ASC Shrimp Standard.

Recommendations are based on all data received until January 2020. Additional data submission by all stakeholders is specifically welcomed during this revision process. More information on the data sets and statistical analysis can be found in the full Data Overview Document.

Proposal

The following changes to the metric indicators are proposed within this revision. Feedback on each of the proposed changes is welcome.

---

1 The ASC’s Technical Advisory Group (TAG) supported in November 2019 the proposal that based on recent research re. phylogenetic analyses of several shrimp within the family Penidae, the *Penaeus* genus should be used to define all potential new saltwater shrimp species. This also means that from the Shrimp Standard Review’s public consultation of March 2020, references to the ‘Litopenaeus’ genus will be removed and replaced by ‘Penaeus’, and/or used interchangeably. Notably, the Whiteleg shrimp *may* be referred to by ASC as ‘Penaeus (Litopenaeus) vannamei’ – or ‘P. vannamei’ – and if so: this latter species refers to the same as the one listed in the scope of the Shrimp Standard v1.1 as ‘Litopenaeus vannamei’ or ‘L. vannamei’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.5.3</th>
<th>Water specific conductance</th>
<th>No changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 5.1.3</td>
<td>survival rate</td>
<td>Increase survival rate by 5% for each category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7.4.1</td>
<td>Feed Fish Equivalence Ratio</td>
<td>Decrease FFER for <em>P. vannamei</em> from 1.35 to 1.3 Decrease FFER for <em>P. monodon</em> from 1.9 to 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7.4.2a</td>
<td>Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR)</td>
<td>No changes (i.e. ‘only reporting required’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7.4.2b</td>
<td>Protein Retention Efficiency (PRE)</td>
<td>Start making this a requirement, starting with a PRE &gt; 20% for both species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7.5</td>
<td>Effluent Contaminant Load</td>
<td>No changes (will be addressed in the Alignment Project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation Questions**

- Do you agree with the drawn conclusions and understand the rationale behind it?
- The Protein Retention Efficiency (PRE) is used to determine how efficiently the fed protein is used. The ASC currently asks farmers to calculate and report this value to collect data and be able to set a limit within the revision. Do you consider adding the PRE as an Indicator beneficial?
- Are there objections to any of the proposed changes? And if so: can you provide data to support your viewpoint?
- Is there any additional data source that you think the ASC should consider?

**Next steps**

The quality and amount of feedback and additional data submissions will help determine the necessity and appropriateness of setting another round of public consultation. This will be decided upon after the public consultation period ended and will be communicated to all stakeholders in due time.