

**Technical Working Group 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.

Document history

Version	Effective date	Description of amendment	Affected section / page
0.1	n/a	n/a	n/a
0.2	18/09/2019	Inclusion of TWG ToR	From Section 9
0.3	27/11/2019	Non-content related editing	Whole document

1 Introduction

1.1 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.

1.2 ASC Salmon Standard – Indicator 3.1.7

The ASC Salmon Standard is part of eleven ASC-standards covering seventeen 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.

1.3 About this Document

This document serves three purposes:

1. To provide information about the review and revision process of the ASC Salmon Standard – Indicator 3.1.7 and the stakeholder participation
2. To describe the objective, role and responsibilities of the Technical Working Group (TWG) for the review and revision process.
3. To describe the designed methodology for the formation of the TWG

This review and revision process adheres to the ASC Standard Setting Protocol, https://www.asc-aqua.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/ASC-Standard-Setting-Procedure_v.1.0_including-forms.pdf

2 Justification for Reviewing the Salmon Standard

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

- To review whether 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. The last revision of the ASC Salmon Standard ended in April 2017 with the release of v1.1. In March 2019 an update to meet the ASC style requirements was released, the ASC Salmon Standard v.1.2, but the content, as defined by criteria/indicators/requirements under the Principles (1-7), remained unchanged.

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 scientific data. Data will be publicly available during consultation and after completion.

4 Scope

Within the scope of this review and revision is:

- Indicator 3.1.7 of the ASC Salmon Standard v.1.2.

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
4	TWG Formation	TWG formed	September 2019	Project Lead & TAG
5	Development Draft 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Draft 1 revised indicator 3.1.7 ○ Background document & used data 	June – July 2020 (consultation for 2 months)	Project Lead & TAG
6	Development Draft 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Draft 2 revised indicator 3.1.7 ○ Background document & used data 	March – Feb. 2021 (consultation for 2 months)	Project Lead & TAG
7	Presentation of final draft to TAG for endorsement	Final draft – Indicator 3.1.7	August 2021 (TAG meeting)	Project Lead & TAG
8	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 the scope will be detailed in a Background Document. This document will present detailed background information which will support the work of the TWG and will also make a suggestion on revised/new standard content.

Together with the Background Document mentioned above, 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, the following documents will be produced, and made public via the ASC website:

5.1 Related to ToR:

1. ToR (draft & final)
2. Overview of stakeholder comments received on draft ToR and ASCs' response
3. ToR for TWG (this document)

5.2 Related to Draft 1:

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

5.3 Related to Draft 2:

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

** The Background Document for Draft 1 and Draft 2 is one document. 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.

Body	Roles & Responsibilities
ASC Supervisory Board (SB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Final decision-making body ○ Project approval ○ Project sign-off
ASC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project overview, including an overview of TWG/external experts ○ Endorsement detailed ToR ○ Endorsement of Draft 1 and 2 prior to each consultation round ○ Endorsement sign-off document to SB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Endorsement final draft to SB
Steering Committee (SC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ n/a
Technical Working Group (TWG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise the current version of 3.1.7 and based on Background Document, discuss and recommend whether changes are necessary to the existing requirement ○ Analyse, discuss, and develop a new indicator for 3.1.7 ○ Provide detailed input into the development of draft versions and on comments received during the public consultation
External experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consulted where deemed necessary

6.1 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

6.2 Decision-Making Procedure:

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

TWG and TAG strive for consensus (see Terms and definitions). Where views differ and consensus cannot be achieved, the majority decision will prevail. Arguments for and against shall be documented and escalated to the final decision body (SB).

In all cases, outstanding concerns of individual TWG members shall be documented and forwarded to the SB with the final draft document presented for final decision.

If the TWG is not able to agree on a final draft within four months after the second round of public consultation, the SB shall take a decision on how to move forward with the process.

A facilitator may be appointed for specific working group meetings to support the group in running it in an efficient manner.

ASC staff and any other supportive personnel shall not participate in any decision-making.

7 Stakeholder Participation and Mapping

According to the ASC Standard Setting Protocol, the process for reviewing this standard 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 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 the 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 pilots (if applicable) 	<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 organisations - 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	Directly affected group. Some standards	Standards that take care of reducing negative	- where necessary, translation of certain process documents (e.g. this TOR, draft standards,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E-mail newsletter (if possible) - Website (if possible) 	- People living around certified farms in all active countries and

species) (This group may be represented by NGO's, see below)	requirements are about local communities.	impacts of adjacent farms on their livelihoods.	<p>synopsis, final standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - via social NGOS's where possible - local/regional workshops, where and when necessary - participation in pilots (if applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Webinars (if possible) - In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) - Through (local) social / environmental NGOs 	regions
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 trading countries and regions
Civil society organisations – _both environmental and social (NGOs)	Experience/knowledge of and insights into 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) 	- Both local and international NGOs

Governments (including inter- governmental agencies)	Alignment with national and international sustainability development goals (SDGs)	No imposition of technical barriers to trade (TBT) in standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - direct contact with government officials (or through consultants) - where necessary, organise discussions with government officials - Public consultation workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E-mail newsletter - website - webinars - In person to the extent needed (e.g. workshops) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representatives of governments where related species are widely farmed
Scientists /Academics	Knowledge and their scientific approach	Standards are science-based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - direct contact with scientists - where necessary, organise discussions with them - Where necessary, have them conduct specific research on identified topics 	<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"> - 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	<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 (e.g. workshops) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. The correspondent revision ToR will 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, harmonisation and quality and assurance processes) that will be launched soon and which will also contribute to reducing implementation and certification costs for farmers, especially the smallholder. 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.

9 Technical Working Group for Review and Revision of the Indicator 3.1.7 of the ASC Salmon Standard v1.2

9.1 Background Information

Background information is presented below with the aim of informing the TWG on the Indicator 3.1.7 approach to sea lice, including its limitations, aspects that have been explored during preliminary research carried out through conduct of literature review and communication with key stakeholders. It is envisaged that the issues relating to the identified limitations will serve as one of the elements which will drive the review work of the TWG, which will assess whether these limitations are valid, or whether others may exist. Any proposed changes to the Indicator will need to ensure that the new metric is set at an accurate level and that this level is substantiated through analysis of numerical data on sea lice infection at the farm level. This latter is considered a second key element of the review work, aiming to provide an understanding of data and assumptions that will allow ASC and interested parties to understand the reason for the selected metric.

9.1.1 Indicator 3.1.7 approach to sea lice

Sea lice are copepods which are members of the family Caligidae and largely belong to the genera *Caligus* and *Lepeophtheirus*. These parasites feed on the blood, skin and mucus of the salmon by attaching to the skin of the fish. Principal effects on fish health and welfare result from physiological impacts related to stress, osmoregulatory imbalance, changes in blood composition and impaired swimming performance that make fish husbandry difficult (Finstad *et al.* 2000; Torrissen *et al.* 2013). In addition, sea lice of farm origin can present, in some locations and for some wild salmonids populations, a significant threat (Costello 2009; Thorstad & Finstad 2018).

Principle 3 of the ASC Salmon Standard - Protect the health and genetic integrity of wild populations - aims to ensure that salmon farms do not harm the health of wild fish populations. This principle addresses impacts associated with disease and parasites, escapes and siting. Requirements under Criterion 3.1 of this Principle - Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens - seek to address these concerns by establishing best practices in managing potential disease and parasite risks to wild populations. Indicator 3.1.7, require farms located in areas of wild salmonids to demonstrate precautionary low lice levels, near zero, during sensitive periods for wild fish, such as during juvenile out-migration and immediately prior.

As the Indicator currently stands, the only issue of concern is the interaction of sea lice from farmed fish with the wild salmonids populations and the standard addresses this issue by applying a global limit of 0.1 mature female lice per salmon during the wild salmon migration period, a limit seen by the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue (SAD) as an appropriately precautionary level and which corresponded to the most stringent regulation to be found in industry at the time of the development of the standard (the Norwegian regulation).

In many instances it is likely that the increased host density associated with salmon farming promotes transmission and population growth of the salmon lice and therefore that salmon lice originating from farms may negatively impact wild stocks of salmonids, although the extent of the impact is a matter of debate. As concluded by Torrissen (2013), this is due to:

- The populations of lice in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans being genetically distinct.
- Gene flow among populations appears high and most likely results from association with highly migratory hosts.
- There are distinct differences in the susceptibility to salmon lice infections among salmonid fish species (and even between stocks).

The conclusion above highlights the first limitation of the current standard approach of having one global limit for an issue that is perceived to be species and population/area specific. This issue has been addressed by ASC through the Variance Request (VR) mechanism. A Variance Request (VR) is a request to adapt an ASC indicator/performance level to a unique local circumstance that the ASC Standard(s), being global, were not able to, for whatever reason, foresee during the Standard Setting Process. In this context, and for the Indicator 3.1.7, there are currently four approved variances:

- VR's 88 & 141 - which allows farms in British Columbia, Canada, to adhere to their regulation - i.e. 3 motile sea lice per fish.
- VR 227 - which allows Norwegian farms to adhere to their regulation - i.e. 0.2 adult female lice per fish.
- VR 279 - which allows Faroes farms to adhere to their regulation - i.e. 1.5 adult female lice per fish.

A second identified limitation of the current approach is that the Indicator does not address issues related to sea lice and its impact on the farmed fish welfare. Studies show that sea lice have an effect on the welfare of the farmed fish and that the degree of this effect varies among different salmonids species. González (2015) suggest that heavy infestations of *Caligus rogercresseyi* lead to an acute stress response, metabolic reorganisation, and increased mucus production in *Salmo salar* under heavy infestation conditions. Vargas-Chacoff (2016) demonstrated that Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and Coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) display differential metabolic changes in response to infestation by *C. rogercresseyi*. Another study concluded that sub lethal infection by sea lice *L. salmonis* compromised the overall fitness of Atlantic salmon (Wagner *et al.* 2003). It has been also demonstrated that the presence of *L. salmonis* elevated stress indicators in relation to the specific sea lice stage (Bowers *et al.* 2001). This was believed to be a direct result of the sea lice development into the larger life stages, thus increasing the level of host damage.

A third identified limitation that the standard is silent on is the potential for impact of sea lice from farmed fish upon other wild fish species. This is especially relevant to Chile, where wild salmonid populations are not present and thus the Indicator 3.1.7 is not applicable. In the context of that country, it has been identified that the Chilean native fish, *Eleginops maclovinus*, is a species that hosts *C. rogercresseyi* (Henriquez *et al.* 2011). According to Carvajal (1998), this fish species is the most likely responsible for transmission of caligid

parasites to salmonids, since they share spawning and feeding areas with salmon farming and are found in close association with net pens. As a result of the increased host density associated with salmon farming, this transmission may have a detrimental effect on *E. maclovinus* populations or on other native fish, however, to assess whether this type of effect exists, and to establish its degree, more research might be needed.

It is envisaged that issues relating to the three limitations described above will be considered as part of the TWG review of the Indicator 3.1.7.

9.1.2 Regulation of sea lice levels

Country level policies for managing sea lice differ according to local circumstances (different species of sea lice, the presence or absence of wild salmonids, etc.). The fundamental starting point for managing sea lice in the salmon industry is to establish a “trigger limit” - or a point at which treatments or sea lice control methods are applied or key decisions made. Trigger limits are established by regulators either for the number of adult female lice or the number of mobile adult lice. Likewise, most countries divide sea lice requirements into two seasons - the smolt outmigration and the rest of the year (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary Table of Sea Lice Regulatory Requirements

	ASC	Norway	Chile	Scotland	Canada (B. C.)	Ireland	Faroe Is.
Sea lice monitoring (sensitive/normal)	Weekly/monthly	Weekly if water temperatures are >4 °C. Bi-weekly if < 4 °C	Weekly	Weekly	By-weekly/monthly	By-weekly/monthly	By-weekly
Sea lice count threshold during migration of wild salmon	0.1 mature lice per fish	0.2 adult female lice during wild salmon migration period, otherwise 0.5	3 ovigerous female lice per fish at all times	3 adult female lice per fish at all times. If more than 8 lice per fish the Government's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) will intervene	3 motile lice per fish at all times	0.5 ovigerous female lice during the wild salmon migration period, otherwise 2	1.5 adult female lice per fish

During development of the standard, the SAD adopted the most stringent regulation found in the industry at that time, which corresponded to the Norwegian regulation of 0.1 adult female lice during the wild salmon migration period. This threshold was reviewed by the regulator and modified to the current level of 0.2 in 2017. Among the reasons for this change is that this low threshold resulted in high treatment rates (Kragesteen *et. al.* 2019) and increased resistance built-up consequently. Scotland also revised its sea lice policy in 2017 and established a threshold of 3 adult female lice per fish at all times. Previously, the only threshold that existed in that country was set by the voluntary requirement established in Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) of 0.5 adult female lice per fish during the period of outward migrating salmon and 1.0 adult female lice per fish for the rest of the year. A couple of years before, in 2015, Chile also reviewed its policy and established its current threshold of 3 female lice per fish. Previously it was set at ≥ 9 adult sea lice per fish.

It is envisaged that matters relating to country-specific regulations, and the rationale for their establishment and recent changes, will be also considered as part of the TWG review of the Indicator 3.1.7

9.2 Objective of the TWG

To review the Indicator 3.1.7 of the ASC Salmon Standard v1.2 and design a metric ensuring that it is set at an accurate level and that it reflects best practice within the global salmon industry.

9.3 Design of the TWG

Due to the number of salmon producing regions which are affected by sea lice and the, sometimes, different particularities arising from each of these regions (i.e. different species of sea lice, presence of wild salmonids populations, genetically distinct variants amongst same sea lice species in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and differences in the natural susceptibility to salmon lice infections between salmonid fish species), and aiming to include the view on most of these particularities, it was envisaged that a TWG formed for the purpose of this review will comprise a considerable number of members. In this context, and in order to favour a dynamic focused on discussion and consultation within the group, a method was developed for the design and formation of such TWG. The methodology comprises the consideration of three components: 1) producer countries, 2) identified thematic areas around sea lice and 3) identified relevant stakeholder groups; and the establishment of a two-layer TWG.

9.3.1 Producer countries

According to Kontali Analyse (www.kontali.no), the four major salmon producer countries are Norway, Chile, Canada and Scotland. Other producer countries are the Faroe Islands, Ireland, Tasmania, Iceland, and Russia. The TWG will have members from each of the four major producer countries and from the other producer countries.

9.3.2 Thematic areas

The identified thematic areas around sea lice are:

- a) Regulation
- b) Disease Management/Resistance
- c) Fish Welfare
- d) Data
- e) Technology
- f) Environment (interaction wild salmonids/fish)

For the purpose of the TWG design and formation, the thematic areas will be used to match them with the relevant skills needed within the TWG members.

9.3.3 Stakeholders

From the stakeholder mapping above, Table 1, and for the purpose of this review and revision, five stakeholders group will be considered for participation in the TWG:

- a) Governments;
- b) Aquaculture industry;
- c) NGOs;
- d) Scientists;
- e) CABs.

9.4 TWG Formation

The TWG will be formed by twenty members in a (desirable) configuration as follows:

- a) One member from each of the following identified stakeholders' groups: governments, aquaculture industry, NGOs and scientists from each of the four major producer countries;
- b) Three members from the other producer countries;
- c) One member from CABs.

The TWG will be composed by two groups: A Technical Group (TG) and a Technical Consultation Group (TCG), facilitating a staged consultation approach.

The TG will be formed by six (6) members: one member for each of the identified thematic areas of the review. The TCG will be formed by the remaining fourteen (14) members.

In case that this configuration is not achieved, an alternative will be sought ensuring that the proposed dynamic structure is maintained.

9.5 Role and Responsibilities of the TWG

9.5.1 Technical Group

The TG will have the responsibility of:

- a) Revising the current version of Indicator 3.1.7 and, based on the Background Document, analysing, discussing and collaborating in the development of the revised Indicator;
- b) Provide input into the development of the two draft versions of the revised Indicator;
- c) Seek feedback from the TCG on the two draft versions of the revised indicator prior to their public consultation periods;
- d) Decide when a draft is ready for public consultation;
- e) Assess and advise on stakeholders' comments after each public consultation;
- f) Decide when the final draft is ready to be submitted to the TAG;
- g) Attend the TWG meetings or other in relation to this review as necessary and/or required by the Project Leader.

9.5.2 Technical Consultation Group

The TCG will have the responsibility of:

- a) Revising the current version of the Indicator 3.1.7 and, based on the Background Document, analysing, discussing and collaborating in the development of the revised Indicator;
- b) Provide input into the development of two draft versions of the revised Indicator;
- c) Providing feedback to the TG on the two draft versions of the revised indicator prior to their public consultation periods;
- d) Assessing and advising on stakeholders' comments after each public consultation;
- e) Attending the TWG meetings or others in relation to this review as necessary and/or required by the Project Leader.

An overview of the review and revision process, including a staged summary of the role and responsibility of each group, is presented in Annex 1.

9.6 Selection of the Members of the TWG

Apart from the rationale on 9.4 above, the members of the TWG will be selected according to the following criteria:

- a) Experience in the aquaculture industry (work or research experience);
- b) Experience in working with and knowledge of government, NGOs, or private industry in the aquaculture industry and/or salmon supply value chain;
- c) Knowledge of salmon farming;
- d) Successful track record on making policy and implementation recommendations;
- e) Strong analytical and strategic thinking skills and demonstrated research skills;
- f) Ability to review and comment on documents submitted in the working language agreed for the TWG.

9.6.1 Academic qualifications

Advanced degree in Environmental, Biology, Aquatic Animal Health, Sustainable Management, Economics, Fisheries/Agriculture, Development Studies, Social science or Aquaculture.

9.6.2 Experience

At least 10 years' experience in any of the following areas: salmon aquaculture farming, hatcheries, environmental management of salmon farms, social aspects, NGOs related to the salmon and aquaculture industry.

Competencies:

- Strong communication and interpersonal skills
- Good analytical ability and report writing skills
- Good understanding of transparency and governance issues is preferred.
- Demonstrated cultural sensitivity and sound judgment
- Good understanding of the ASC Salmon Standard is preferred.
- Fluency in English is a requirement.

The list of the TWG members it is found in Annex 2 (not available at this time)

9.7 Meetings

The ASC strives to work in a cost and time-efficient manner and has a preference for working primarily via e.g. teleconference and e-mail. Meeting schedules will be set to allow participation at reasonably convenient times and will aim for full participation.

Need for in-person meeting(s) will be decided as the process progresses but it is envisaged that two face-to-face TG meetings will occur during the review process, an initial meeting and a meeting after the first public consultation.

9.8 Hours of Dedications

It is not expected that the hours dedicated to the TWG exceed 1 hour per week, on average, at times where participation is required.

9.9 Expenses and Remuneration of the TWG

Participation in the TWG takes place on a voluntary non-paid basis. ASC covers reasonable travel and accommodation expenses related to the work of the TWG upon submission of the respective invoices and receipts, and if expenses are agreed upon in advance.

9.10 Language

The working language of the TWG is English.

9.11 Start Date

The expected start-date for the TWG is October-November 2019, with targeted completion by August 2021.

9.12 Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest

- TWG members shall sign a confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement with ASC at the beginning of their work.
- All documents prepared by or presented to the TWG are assumed to be public unless identified otherwise by ASC and agreed by the TWG.
- The TWG operates according to Chatham House Rules so, members of the TWG are free to use the non-confidential information received but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the individual(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed.
- The default approach of the TWG is that the non-attributable content of discussions and papers is not confidential unless so specified.
- Members are expected to declare any conflicts of interest, where they arise.

10 Terms and Definitions

For consistency and convenience, some of the terms in this procedure are adopted and/ or adapted from the ISEAL Standard Setting Code as well as the ISO/ IEC Guide 2:2004.

Consensus: General agreement, characterised by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important stakeholder group.

NOTE: Consensus should be the result of a process seeking to take into account the views of interested parties, particularly those directly affected, and to reconcile any conflicting arguments. It need not imply unanimity.

11 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

12 Annexes

- 1) Overview of the review process including timeline.
- 2) List of TWG members (not available at this time).
- 3) Principles for an effective process (not available at this time).

13 References

Bowers J. M., Mustafa A., Speare D. J., Conboy G. A., Brimacombe M., Sims D. E., Burka J. F. (2001). The physiological response of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, to a single experimental challenge with sea lice, *Lepeophtheirus salmonis*. J. Fish Dis. 23, issue 3, 165–172. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2761.2000.00225.x>

Carvajal J., González L., George-Nascimento M. (1998). Native sea lice (Copepoda: Caligidae) infestation of salmonids reared in netpen systems in southern Chile. Aquaculture, 166, 241–246. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486\(98\)00301-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(98)00301-9)

Costello, M. J. (2009). How sea lice from salmon farms may cause wild salmonid declines in Europe and North America and be a threat to fishes elsewhere. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, rspb20090771. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.0771>

Finstad, B., Bjør, P.A., Grimnes, A., Hvidsten, N.A. (2000). Laboratory and field investigations of salmon lice [*Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer)] infestation on Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) post-smolts. Aquac. Res. 21, 795–803.

González M. P., Vargas-Chacoff L., Marín S. L. (2015). Stress response of *Salmo salar* (Linnaeus 1758) when heavily infested by *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo 2000) copepodids. Fish Physiol Biochem. (2016) 42:263–274.

Henriquez V. P., Gonzalez M. T., Licandeo R., & Carvajal J. (2011). Metazoan parasite communities of rock cod *Eleginops maclovinus* along southern Chilean coast and their use as biological tags at a local spatial scale. Journal of Fish Biology, 79, 1851–1865. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2011.03126.x>

Kragesteen T. J., Simonsen K., Visser A. W., Andersen K. H. (2019). Optimal salmon lice treatment threshold and tragedy of the commons in salmon farm networks. Aquaculture Volume 512, 15 October 2019, 734329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.734329>

Thorstad E.B., Finstad B. (2018). Impacts of salmon lice emanating from salmon farms on wild Atlantic salmon and sea trout. NINA Report 1449: 1-22.

Torrissen, O., Jones, S., Asche, F., Guttormsen, A., Skilbrei, O.T., Nilsen, F., Horsberg, T.E., Jackson, D. (2013). Salmon lice – impact on wild salmonids and salmon aquaculture. J. Fish Dis. 36, 171–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfd.12061>

Vargas-Chacoff L., Muñoz J.L.P., Hawes C., Oyarzún R., Pontigo J.P., Saravia J., González M.P., Morera F.J., Labbé B.S., Bertrán C., Mardones O., Pino J., Wadsworth S. (2016) Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and Coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) display differential

metabolic changes in response to infestation by the ectoparasite *Caligus rogercresseyi*.
Aquaculture 464 (2016) 469–479.

Wagner G. N., Mckinley R.S., Bjørn P. A., Finstad B. (2003). Physiological impact of sea lice on swimming performance of Atlantic salmon. J. Fish Biology 62, issue 5, 1000-1009.
<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1095-8649.2003.00091.x>