



GLOBAL BENCHMARK TOOL

GSSI Benchmark Report

Scheme: Aquaculture Stewardship Council

Scope: Salmon (v1.3) and Shrimp (v1.1) Standard

Date: 10th October 2023

STATEMENT OF RECOGNITION

Scheme	Aquaculture Stewardship Council
Scope	Salmon (v1.3) and Shrimp (v1.1) Standard
Date	10th October 2023

The Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI) Steering Board recognizes the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) to be in alignment with all applicable essential components of:

A	Section A. Governance of Seafood Certification Schemes
B	Section B. Operational Management of Seafood Certification Schemes
C	Section C. Aquaculture Certification Standards
D	Section D. Fisheries Certification Standards

Thereby, GSSI considers the above seafood certification scheme to be in alignment with the FAO Guidelines for the Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine/Inland Capture Fisheries.

This Report lists evidence of alignment with applicable GSSI Essential Components and GSSI Supplementary Components, where implemented.

CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF RECOGNITION	2
--------------------------------	---

SCHEME OVERVIEW	4
-----------------------	---

FROM APPLICATION TO RECOGNITION	5
---------------------------------------	---

WHO IS INVOLVED	6
-----------------------	---

EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT	7
-----------------------------	---

Section A. Governance of Seafood Certification Schemes	8
<i>A.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>	

Section B. Operational Management of Seafood Certification Schemes	58
<i>B.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>	








Section C. Aquaculture Certification Standards	107
<i>C.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>	

Section D. Fisheries Certification Standards	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<i>D.1 Evidence of Alignment</i>	

SCHEME OVERVIEW

Scheme name	Aquaculture Stewardship Council
Standard	Salmon (v1.3) and Shrimp (v1.1) Standard
Headquarters location	London

FROM APPLICATION TO RECOGNITION

	1 ↓	Application Received	The Benchmark Process begins once a Scheme Owner decides to apply for recognition and contacts the Secretariat, who provides an overview of the process.
	2 ↓	Desktop Review	This step helps to assess the Scheme Owner's capability to proceed and successfully complete the Benchmark Process within the expected timeframe.
	3 ↓	Office Visit	The Office Visit may be conducted by the Process IE or both IEs, depending on the outstanding issues of the Desktop Review.
	4 ↓	Benchmark Committee Meeting	The Benchmark Committee acts as the 'Quality Assurance' for the work undertaken by the IE team in the Desktop Review and Office Visit.
	5 ↓	Public Consultation	If recognition is recommended by the Benchmark Committee, the Scheme Owner's approval is required to publish the Benchmark Report for a four-week Public Consultation.
	6 ↓	Recognition Decision by Steering Board	The Steering Board is briefed by the Steering Board Liaison on the Benchmark Report and the Benchmark Committee's recommendation for recognition.
	7	Monitoring of Continued Alignment	GSSI ensures continued alignment of recognized schemes with GSSI Essential Components through an annual reporting process of relevant changes.

Read more about the steps to recognition [here](#).

WHO IS INVOLVED



**Scheme
Representative**

Renee Hamel



**Independent
Expert (Process)**

Sally Surangpimol



**Independent
Expert (Technical)**

Sophie Fridman



**Steering Board
Liaison**

Ingrid Kelling



**GSSI Secretariat
Representative**

Georgia Armitage



**Steering Board
Members**

Angel Matamoro Irago
Annika Mackensen
Sonia Cordera
Han Han
Ingrid Kelling
Jason Clay
Laurent Develle
Nianjun Shen
Trent Hartill
Marcelo Hidalgo
Judy Panayos
Adriana Sanchez



**Benchmark
Committee
Members**

Anne Vanderhoeven
Osires de Melo
John Hargreaves

EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A	Section A. Governance of Seafood Certification Schemes
B	Section B. Operational Management of Seafood Certification Schemes
C	Section C. Aquaculture Certification Standards
D	Section D. Fisheries Certification Standards

**SECTION A.
GOVERNANCE OF
SEAFOOD
CERTIFICATION
SCHEMES**



A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.01 Legal Status		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner is a legal entity, or an organization that is a partnership of legal entities, or a government or inter-governmental agency.	<p>Scheme Owner is an entity which could be held legally responsible for its operations.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- an official document showing registration with legal authorities and current legal status of organization. Examples include incorporation papers, statutes, business licenses and registration with tax authorities. <p>For government Scheme Owners, clear lines of responsibility and authority on decision making should be identified.</p> <p>Pre-application to require scheme to identify legal registered entity or lead government agency/department.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <p>1) the detail provided within the Deed of Incorporation of Stichting Aquaculture Stewardship Council Foundation shows that ASC is incorporated as a Foundation and has adopted Articles of Association in which it is governed.</p> <p>2) ASC is also a registered charity (1150418) as of Jan 9, 2013 and is incorporated as a private limited company (8172832) since Aug 8, 2012</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Registration Certificate• ASC Deed Stichting ASC Foundation• ASC UK Certificate of Incorporation

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.01.01 Legal Status

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner has insurance or reserves to cover the operations of the scheme.</p> <p>Note: This does not apply to government-run schemes as they are self-insured.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner shall be able to demonstrate that it has evaluated the risks arising from its activities and that it has adequate arrangements (e.g. insurance and/ or reserves) to cover liabilities arising from its operations in each of its fields of activities and the geographic areas in which it operates. (adapted ISO 17021 5.3 and ISO 17065 4.3)</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - system for business risk assessment, insurance policy, - clauses in accreditation body and/or certification body contracts addressing liability. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <p>1) the review of the Directors' Report and Combined Financial Statements (31 Dec 2020) indicates there is strong evidence of financial stability and good governance. On page 14, there is a description of a robust risk management plan and on Page 15 there is a detailed description of the Reserves Policy which holds sufficient reserves in place given the size of the organisation. Within the notes of the Statement on Page 21 there is a section 'Going Concern' where there is confirmation of adequate reserves and the ability of the organisation to withstand any unforeseen issues.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i><u>IASC Directors Report and Combined Financial Statements 2020</u></i>

A.1.02 Impartiality

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner is not directly engaged in the operational affairs (auditing or certification) of</p>	<p>Scheme Owner is not directly engaged in auditing, certification or accreditation activities in order to ensure freedom of commercial or financial pressure of assurance processes and decision making.</p> <p>This does not include complaint resolution or performance reviews.</p>

A . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.1.02 Impartiality		
the certification or accreditation program.	Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - impartiality policy, impartiality clauses in certification body and accreditation body contracts, management control procedures	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <p>1) ASC has appointed ASI, an independent organisation as its exclusive approval body.</p> <p>In the ASI_ASCI_Service Agreement , Under Annex 2 – Terms of Reference, ASI agree to:</p> <p>1.1.4.2 carry out accreditation / approval assessments and audits as required by ASI Accreditation / Approval Requirements and all applicable scheme related documents, e.g. sampling policy, ASC instructions (if any) and produce reports accordingly;</p> <p>The oversight process that ASI follows for CABs is detailed in the ASI Accreditation Requirements – main pertinent procedures for which are listed in the ASI website.</p> <p>ASI is not a member of the International Accreditation Forum (IAF). However, they have developed a Two-Tier Assurance Program to be implemented together with Participating NABs (National Accreditation Bodies) – that are members of IAF – and operate under the framework of (EC) 765/2008 in the European Economic Area (EEA); and of UKAS, operating under the regulation on Accreditation and Market Surveillance No 765:2008 (GB RAMS) in the UK.</p> <p>2)ASC uses third-parties to conduct certification audits and does not certify entities directly. From ASC CAR 2.2 Section 2 page v: "Applicants that seek ASC certification hire a CAB (Conformity Assessment Body)..... The independence of the ASC, AAB and the CABs ensures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All ASI's public documentation</u> • <u>ASC Website</u> <p>"To become ASC certified, a farm is assessed by an independent organisation against every single requirement in the relevant standard. If it passes the audit, seafood from the farm can be sold with the ASC logo, which allows consumers to reward these responsible farmers by purchasing their products."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASC-ASI Contract Extension • ASI-PRO-20-101-Accreditation-V5.1 • ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance & Sampling-V6.4 • ASI-PRO-20-111-Witness & Compliance Assessments-V2.3 • ASI-PRO-20-126-ASI Two-Tier Assurance Program-V2.0 • <u>CAR V 2.2 – Section 2, page v</u> • <u>Information on accredited CABs</u> 	

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.02 Impartiality

that high quality, objective audits and certification decisions are performed without bias for all clients around the world."

A.1.03 Operating Procedures

GSSI Component		Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner operates to a documented set of governance policies and procedures specifying at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Board or governance body election or appointment process, - Process to facilitate participation of stakeholders - Board or governance body representation and Terms of Reference, - Member categories (where applicable), - Income generation or funding processes, - An organizational structure, - The decision making processes of each governance body, - Key personnel roles (responsibility and authority), - Managing conflict of interest, and - quality assurance program. 		<p>The Scheme Owner has policies/procedures available covering all aspects in this Essential Component except Member categories if not applicable.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - statutes and by-laws, organizational chart, internal procedures, job descriptions, conflict of interest statements, quality assurance procedures or manual. - online process document for submission of input, governance body selection process and stakeholder composition, review of previous stakeholder inputs and verify if/how this reached top governance.
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the ultimate decision making governance body is the Supervisory Board (SB) as per explained in the ASC Standard Setting Procedure: . The Supervisory Board regulations cover balance and interests for the group</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASC Technical Governance Structure Dec 2022 • <i>ASC Teams - Website</i> • <i>ASC Whistle-blower Policy V1.0</i> • <i>Governance - ASC Website</i> • <i>Deed-Stichting ASC-Foundation</i>

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.03 Operating Procedures

and has the ultimate decision-making authority. The Supervisory Board is guided by the Technical Advisory Group (TAG). However, each standard development/revision process has its own governance structure, which is included in ToRs. Stakeholder can apply to join TWGs who work to develop standards content. The ASC governance bodies have balance of industry and non-industry members. The ASC Board was recently updated and there was a call for applications by ASC through a variety of media. 2) There is also an ASC Whistle Blower Policy, Complaints Procedure and a Conflict of Issue Policy that are applicable to ASC's SB and TAG bodies. 3) ASC's quality assurance program is coordinated by the Policy and Programme Management Team.

- [*Partners and Supporters - ASC Website*](#)
- TAG Conflict of Issue Policy V1.0 Nov 2020
- [*TOR- Technical Advisory Group \(TAG\)*](#)
- [*ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2*](#)
- [*ASC Combined Accounts 2020*](#)
- [*ASC Complaints Procedure V1.0*](#)
- [*ASC Facts*](#)
- [*ASC Regulations for Executive Board*](#)
- [*ASC Regulations for Supervisory Board*](#)
- ASC Senior Management Structure
- [*ASC Standard Setting Procedure V2.0 - Page 5 -Section 7. Governance structure and responsibility*](#)

A.1.03.01 Operating Procedures

GSSI Component	Guidance
The top governance body of the Scheme Owner carries out a regular performance review of the scheme with results that	<p>Scheme owner ensures continuous improvement of its operations by undertaking an annual performance review by its governance body.</p> <p>Results are made publicly available to ensure transparency and accountability.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment on the Scheme owner website:</p>

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.03.01 Operating Procedures

are made publicly available.

- performance review findings and defined actions,
- annual report which includes summary of review.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because

1) within the ASC Combined Accounts 2020 report, there are several references to achievements and performance and also plans for the future where there are a number of initiatives for improvement and development. Key achievements noted in the Combined Accounts 2020 report include programme and logo usage growth, biological scope revision of the Shrimp Standard, RAS Module development, sea lice indicators under the Salmon Standard revision and general expansion of the organisation to deliver the strategic plan.

References

- [Page 6 - ASC Combined Accounts 2020](#)

A.1.04 Transparency

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner makes information freely available about the scheme's ownership, governance structure, the composition, operating procedures and responsibilities of its governance bodies, standard-setting procedures and standards.

Guidance

All applicable listed governance documents are easily accessible online, free or at cost of any printing and handling costs.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- applicable documents posted on website, easy to find and free to download.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because :

1) all governance documents, standards and

References

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2](#)
- [ASC Complaints Procedure V1.0](#)
- [ASC Regulations for Executive Board](#)
- [ASC Regulations for Supervisory Board](#)
- [ASC Standard Setting Procedure V2.0 - Page 5 -Section 7. Governance structure and responsibility](#)

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.04 Transparency

certification requirements are available on ASC's website (www.asc-aqua.org) free of cost.

- [ASC Website](#)
- [ASC Whistle-blower Policy V1.0](#)
- [Deed Stichting ASC Foundation_ English translation](#)
- [Document Resources - ASC Website](#)
- [Example of an approved CAB's Accreditation Details can be viewed here and this information is available for all approved CABs:](#)
- [Governance - ASC Website](#)
- Information on accredited CABs can be found [here](#)
- [Information regarding ASC's AAB](#)
- [TOR- Technical Advisory Group \(TAG\)](#)

A.1.05 Scheme Scope

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner has a defined scope for certification under its standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner clearly defines the scope that the standard covers, for example which species, production systems/gear type, geographical locations, company structures (single units, groupings of sites/boats, smallholder groups/small-scale fisheries, subcontractors, product categories, certifiable units in the chain of custody etc.).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explicit scope definition in standards, certification methodology/requirements, objectives. - contracts with accreditation bodies, certification bodies and/or certified operations

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.05 Scheme Scope

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) all ASC standards explicitly state a scope in which the standard applies in the introductory text of the document.
- 2) Additionally, scope is required under ASC's Standard Setting Procedure V2.0, Nov 2021, clause 9.5.2: The (new or revised) standard has the following structure, as the minimum:
 - a. Purpose and scope, including geographic scope;
- 3) ASC's publicly available Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR V2.2 Apr 2019) define the requirements under Annex E – Certification for Multi-site Organizations; and Annex F – Requirements for CABs Providing Certification Services for Producer Groups – together with the following publicly available documents: Requirements for the Certification of Producer Groups V1.0 Oct 2019

References

- [ASC CAR 2.2](#)
- [ASC Requirements for Certification of Producer Groups](#)
- [ASC Salmon Standard V1.3 – Scope, page 12](#)
- [ASC Standard Setting Procedure V2.0 Clause 9.5.2](#)

A.1.06 Scheme Objectives

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner has defined objectives for its scheme that aim for responsible use of the resource and has publicly available performance indicators related to scheme objectives.	<p>Objectives for the scheme are defined and documented. The defined objectives cover all environmental resources covered in the standards; this would normally be for example fish populations, habitats and ecosystems, water, possibly energy, endangered species and biodiversity within the impact zone. Indirect use of resources for e.g. feed production may also be addressed. For each objective and associated resources, performance indicators are defined, documented and publicly available.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - standard document with objectives and thresholds.

A . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.1.06 Scheme Objectives

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) rationale is defined in each Standard Principle and each applicable indicator lists required metrics to support that objective. Additionally, objective of the standard is required under ASC's Standard Setting Procedure under 9.5.2: The (new or revised) standard has the following structure, as the minimum:</p> <p>a. Purpose and scope, including geographic scope;</p> <p>i. Clearly and explicitly states all the defined social and environmental outcomes sought.</p> <p>b. For the defined sustainability outcome in the ASC Mission, there are:</p> <p>i. Principles: high-level guiding goals needed to contribute to the ASC Mission;</p> <p>ii. Criteria: impact areas of concern that together address the Principle;</p> <p>iii. Indicators: defined requirement to be assessed at audit;</p> <p>iv. Performance level (if applicable): Specific performance levels to be reached.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

A.1.06.01 Scheme Objectives

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner has a documented monitoring and evaluation system through which it collects data on its performance indicators, and uses this to inform the revision of its standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a documented system to monitor and assess its defined performance indicators. Monitoring information is shared with the standards committee.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - monitoring system including data collected - previous monitoring information has been assessed and documented inputs developed for the next standard revision process.
Conclusion	References

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.06.01 Scheme Objectives

ASC is in alignment because:

1) ASC has an M&E programme in place which has been independently assessed to be in full compliance with the ISEAL Impacts code.

- [ASC Impacts Dashboard](#)
- [M&E Programme](#)
- [Positive Impact Report](#)

A.1.06.02 Scheme Objectives

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner can demonstrate it has delivered against its scheme objectives through outcome and impact evaluations of its scheme.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a system to periodically conduct in-depth assessments of its performance. The number, regularity and extent of outcome or impact evaluations should be commensurate with the maturity, scale and intensity of the activities of the standards system.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - documented outcome or impact evaluations, - requirement for full ISEAL members.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC has an M&E programme in place which has been independently assessed to be in full compliance with the ISEAL Impacts code. Our M&E system is comprised of strategies, activities, resources and tools collectively employed to achieve the intended change, as communicated through the indicators established in our framework. The M&E system focuses on three major result areas:</p> <p>social and environmental performance of the farm,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC's ISEAL status on ISEAL website</u> • <u>M&E Framework V 2.0</u> • <u>M&E Framework V 2.0 Appendix A</u>

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.06.02 Scheme Objectives

certification system effectiveness and efficacy, and market performance.

As a code compliance ISEAL member and active player in the seafood commodity sustainability sector, we recognize the importance to deliver impacts at scale by aligning with common sustainability indicators and UN Sustainable Development Goals. ASC's M&E system and framework 2.0 provides a necessary refresh to deliver a more consistent and rigorous approach to data collection, use, and reporting. Expansion in scope and impact have required a review of the framework to ensure it accurately represents ASC's strategies and activities and effectively utilizes the information collected across our certification and chain of custody programs.

- [M&E Programme](#)
- [Positive Impact Report](#)
- Recent ISEAL Report for Impacts Code

A.1.07 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner ensures that all types of fishery/aquaculture operations within the scope of its scheme can apply for certification, regardless of their scale, size or management arrangements, and has not set an upper limit on the number of operations that can be certified.	<p>The Scheme Owner application process ensures equal access within the defined standard scope whether directly, sub-contractors or outsourcing (i.e. to certification body).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application process selection criteria do not discriminate on factors such as size, scale, management, minimum number of operators. - review declined applications are due to other non-discriminatory issues (i.e. incomplete, out of scope) 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the development of ASC's standards consider accessibility under its guiding principles.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Standard Setting Procedure V2.0 –</u>

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.07 Non-Discrimination

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 8 – Accessibility – The standards' requirements should strike the right balance between mitigating key impacts whilst not impeding the development of sustainable and responsible aquaculture operations.

The standards should not create obstacles to trade or exclude small-scale farms from market access. ASC strives to address all barriers to engagement in the standard-setting process, for instance by translating consultation materials and organising local workshops. Standards and guidance documents are translated into different languages as deemed necessary.

Section 8 – Accessibility

A.1.07.01 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner has procedures for taking into account the special circumstances of data deficient and/ or small-scale fishery/ aquaculture operations.	<p>The Scheme Owner processes and policies reduce barriers or promote access of small scale enterprises. This may include specific small scale standards or exemptions that do not lower the requirements of the standards themselves.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - separate specific standard for small scale enterprises or programs such as capacity building and access to finance targeted to small scale enterprises. Policies may include sliding scale fees or simplified reporting templates. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the development of ASC's standards consider accessibility under its guiding principles.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>ASC Standard Setting Procedure V2.0 – Section 8 – Accessibility</i></u>

A.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.1.07.01 Non-Discrimination

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 8 – Accessibility – The standards' requirements should strike the right balance between mitigating key impacts whilst not impeding the development of sustainable and responsible aquaculture operations.

The standards should not create obstacles to trade or exclude small-scale farms from market access. ASC strives to address all barriers to engagement in the standard-setting process, for instance by translating consultation materials and organising local workshops. Standards and guidance documents are translated into different languages as deemed necessary.

A.1.08 Non-Discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner does not have mandatory requirements that require a fishery / aquaculture operation to be certified in order to access any markets.	Application selection process and certification methodology/ requirements do not include mandatory requirements for access to markets. Absence of such requirements indicates alignment.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) there are no market requirements as a condition of certification. On ASC's website, the steps for a farm to get certified are listed and there are no steps in which a market commitment is required to continue in the programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>How to get certified – ASC Website</u> • Steps for farms to get certified does not mention market requirements 	

A . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.1.09 Internal Review		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner undertakes a fully documented annual management review of scheme performance, including its assurance program, and the performance of certification and accreditation bodies. The results of the review are used to revise its operating procedures and practices, where necessary.	System exists for an annual documented management review that covers scheme performance, assurance program, accreditation bodies and certification bodies as applicable. A documented system to use the results of the review to revise operating procedures and systems is available.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC Conducts an Annual Management Review in-line with their documented Management Review Procedure. ASC's Initial Assurance System Annual Management Review Meeting occurred on 28th September 2022. The meeting inputs include the review of performance of certification and accreditation bodies. The outputs of the meeting include documented process improvement action points , the progression of which is monitored through ASC's internal time bound task logs.</p> <p>Copies of the following are available for review</p> <p>Management Review Procedure</p> <p>2022 Meeting Agenda</p> <p>2022 Meeting Presentation</p> <p>2022 Meeting Minutes with associated agreed improvement Action Points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda - Management Review Meeting 28.09.22 • ASC ASI Annual CAB Report 2021 • ASC-ASI Contract Extension • ASI - ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 - Section 5.9 • Internal Procedure -Management Review Procedure V2.0 Aug 22 • MRM PPT 28.09.2022 	

A . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.2 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.2.01 Logo Use and Claims		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner has a publicly available policy governing use of symbols, logos and claims.</p> <p>This policy includes the provision of written authorizations or licenses to use the scheme's mark/claim/logo only when the facility and products have been certified to the relevant standard.</p> <p>Any misleading use or statement by the certified entity regarding the status or scope of its certification, shall be prohibited.</p>	<p>Scheme Owner has a policy that covers use of symbols, logos and claims if applicable to its system. The policy is public, easily accessible and available in languages appropriate to geographic scope.</p> <p>Contracts or formal agreements with the certified entity specify legal responsibility for the use of the scheme's mark/claim/logo only when the facility and/or product are certified.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - publicly available Logo Use and Claim statement which is explicitly referenced in formal arrangement with certified entity. - other examples include: direct logo agreements, licensing or membership agreements with the Scheme Owner or its commercial partner or indirect contracts/agreements through the certification body. - in the latter case the requirements to include this in contracts/ agreements should be outlined in certification requirements/ methodologies or similar contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC has a publicly available Logo User Guide that defines requirements for the use of the logo, as in media and on products. through the following links: https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-we-do/our-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Logo Rules for Different Group</i> • <i>ASC Logo User Guide</i> • <i>ASC's Logo Information on Website</i> 	

A . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.2.01 Logo Use and Claims

logo/logo-rules-for-different-user-groups/; <https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-we-do/our-logo/logo-user-guide/>; <https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-we-do/our-logo/about-our-logo/>

A.2.02 Logo Use and Claims

GSSI Component	Guidance
Through the claims policy, the Scheme Owner ensures copyright is protected and that symbols, logos and claims are only applied to activities that are within the scope of certification, do not overstate or mislead users relative to the defined scope, and are relevant to that scope.	<p>Claims policy (see A.2.01), contracts and MoUs ensure that logo use and claims are copyright protected and are restricted to activities within the scope of certification. This includes symbols, logos and claims on and off product, such as marketing materials, consumer brochures and the internet.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - legal registration of logos and seals with applicable agents. - claims policy covers clear scope for on and off product use, claims and statements including policy for misuse. - contractual relationships specify explicitly adherence to claims policy. - records of applications for use of claims, records of complaints or violations.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>all logo users must have a Logo License Agreement, which specifies rules of logo use and terms for suspension in case of breaches. ASCI exercises its right to suspend or terminate licenses. Additionally, ASC has a set of defined claims to accompany the logo; only these specific claims can be used on ASC products. Anyone can report a misuse of the ASC logo or lodge a complaint to the ASC. Reports of misuse are investigated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) Example logo use agreement • <i>ASC Claims - ASC Website</i> • <i>ASC Logo User Guide</i> • <i>Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 - Section 4.10</i> • <i>Report misuse of ASC logo</i>

A . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.2.02.01 Logo Use and Claims

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner has data to substantiate claims about meeting its scheme objectives, e.g. with impacts data or monitoring and evaluation results.	<p>The Scheme Owner ensures claims (e.g. in a publications or on a website) are accurate and supported by data such as through outcome or impacts reports. This could be through a system and/or assignment of responsibility to check claims or statements made by the scheme itself.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review claims by schemes of meeting its objectives (this may be in the form of an annual update, 10 year success booklets, internet news, presentation materials for fairs, or other advertising materials). - For such claims, a documented assessment of the publicly available in the form of outcome or impact reports supporting the claim/results. - ISEAL Improvement criteria
Conclusion	References
ASC is in alignment because 1) it has an M&E programme in place which has been independently assessed to be in full compliance with the ISEAL Impacts code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Impacts Dashboard</i> • <i>ASC's ISEAL status on ISEAL website</i> • <i>M&E Programme</i> • <i>Positive Impact Report</i> • Recent ISEAL Impacts Code Assessment

A . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.2.03 Logo Use and Claims		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner requires certificates to include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the identification of the Scheme Owner; - identification of the accreditation body; - the name and address of the certification body; - the name and address of the certification holder; - the effective date of issue of the certificate; - scope of certification - the term for which the certification is valid; - signature of the issuing officer. 	<p>The issuer of the certificate ensures that minimum information enables identification and contact information of assurance process parties (accreditation body, Scheme Owner and certification body), unique name and address of certified entity, date and validity, scope and signature of issuing officer.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mandatory normative documents such as certification requirements/methodologies with certification bodies that cover all points listed. - mandatory certificate template includes all points listed. - review examples of certificates. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the Certification and Accreditation Requirements detail the content required on each individual certificate including information listed in the Component.</p> <p>2) Currently ASC have appointed ASI, an independent organisation as its exclusive approval body, when the two tier process is effective and there is NAB involvement in the process, certificate content requirements will be updated with the identification of the accreditation body.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 Section 17.13 – Content of Certificates</i> 	

A.2.04 Logo Use and Claims	
GSSI Component	Guidance
Where a seafood ingredient can be certified, the Scheme Owner	The Scheme Owner specifies minimum percentages for use of logo and claims in mixed products. This states that at least 95% of the total seafood ingredient that can be certified, for unqualified claims and for

A . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.2.04 Logo Use and Claims

requires that at least 95% of the total seafood ingredient within a product is of certified origin in order for the scheme's logo or certification mark to be used. Where there is less than 95%, the scheme requires that the percentage must be stated and the logo or certification mark cannot be used.

lower percentages, a qualifying statement of the percentage must be used in conjunction with the logo or claim.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- normative documents such as scope definition, certification requirements/ methodologies or other agreements between the Scheme Owner and certification body that define these percentage claims.
- logo use and claims policy which is explicitly referenced in formal contracts and agreements with certification bodies and/or certified entities.
- review examples of issued certificates where these are public or product information in online databases of certified products where these are available.
- if the Scheme Owner does not allow mixed product, then this Essential Component is aligned.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because as stipulated in page 8 of the ASC Logo User Guide October 2019, to promote your product with the ASC logo, its seafood content must be at least 95 per cent ASC certified.

References

- [*ASC Logo User Guide - Section On-Menu and On-Product*](#)

A.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.3.01 Standard Setting Body	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner shall have a process and governance structure in place for standard setting, reviewing, revising, assessing, verifying and approving.</p> <p>The process shall be carried out with the participation of technically competent persons (e.g. independent experts, and open to suitably qualified representatives of all key stakeholders).</p> <p>The information about the process and organization for standard development and revision shall be made publicly available.</p> <p>It is the Scheme Owners responsibility to ensure a balanced participation by stakeholders.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner clearly identifies the responsible person for assigning the management of the standard setting process.</p> <p>In addition, the procedure, organizational chart or related TORs/contracts with external bodies identifies where each of the tasks (setting, reviewing, revising, assessing, verifying and approving standards) are assigned to. This documentation clearly indicates where the overall responsibility for the standard setting process lies.</p> <p>Procedures defining the process of standard development and revision are easily available for the public, such as online, in appropriate languages.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because: 1) the ASC has a clearly defined organisation structure and procedures regarding the setting of standards and the involvement of stakeholders and technical experts 2) all information is publicly available. Example provided for the recent Salmon Standard Revision. Governance documents and standard setting information all publicly available and updated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASC Senior Management • <i>ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0</i> • <i>ASC's governance structure</i> • <i>Deed Stichting ASC Foundation English translation</i> • <i>Salmon Standard Revision Project Sea Lice Indicators</i>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.02 Standard Setting Body

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner identifies a central point of contact for standards-related enquiries and for submission of comments. The Scheme Owner makes contact information for this contact point readily available on its website.	<p>Contact details for standard related enquiries and comments are easily available for the public, including online. This can be the same as a general contact point, but should explicitly identify standard related scope.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review website and verify that point of contact responds to enquiries. - review past enquiries and submitted comments 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) on each page of the ASC website, there is an option to Contact ASC with the option to select "ASC Standards". 2) Additionally, ASC's general e-mail standards@asc-aqua.org is on the Farm Standards website and within ASC's Standard Setting Procedure - Section 13</p> <p>3) ASC has internal forwarding guidance for all staff managing general ASC inboxes. This guidance document is used to forward emails to appropriate personnel based on the topic.</p> <p>Feedback from stakeholders will be entered into an Issue Log and evaluated for priority and urgency where required changes to standards are identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Contact Form</u> • ASC General Inbox Guidance • <u>ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0 - Section 13 - Contact Information</u> • <u>ASC's Farm Standard website with contact</u> • Issue Log entries - closed items from Salmon and Shrimp previous standards • Issue Log Management Procedure V 1.2 	

A.3.03 Decision Making Process

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.03 Decision Making Process

The Scheme Owner strives for consensus decisions on the content of the standard.

Where consensus cannot be achieved, the Scheme Owner defines criteria in advance to determine when alternative decision-making procedures should come into effect and what the decision-making thresholds will be.

A mechanism is in place to assure a consensus decision is found where possible. In addition, the mechanism describes how decisions shall be made when a consensus is not possible. The mechanism assures that stakeholders are informed about this mechanism.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- internal procedures and/or quality handbook for standard setting and maintenance outlines decision making.
- meeting minutes/email correspondence.

Standard setting archives and draft standards and meeting minutes could verify that this mechanism was implemented during previous decision-making.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

1) ASC's Standard Setting Procedure strives for consensus and not unanimous decision. Additionally, decisions by consensus is in the Terms of Reference of the Technical Advisory Group, which is a governing structure for ASC's standard development: Decisions by the TAG should be made by consensus. If no consensus can be reached, agreement on advice by the TAG is made by simple majority of the present members. In such circumstances, the Executive should prepare a report to the Boards which clearly indicates a summary of the minority and majority positions. Recommendations made to the Board at key stages of the standard setting process require Board approval from at least 50% of voting members (TAG ToR Section 6.13)

References

- [ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0 – Section 6 – Terms and Definitions](#)
- [ASC Technical Advisory Group Terms of Reference – Section 6.13](#)

A.3.03.01 Decision Making Process

GSSI Component

Guidance

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.03.01 Decision Making Process

<p>The Scheme Owner's decision-making process for standards development or revision ensures that no category of stakeholders has a majority vote in decision-making.</p>	<p>Standard owner voting procedure process ensures balance in decision making where no single category of stakeholder has a majority in decision making.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedures and/or quality handbook, - previous voting from minutes if available.
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the Supervisory Board has a diverse membership from industry, NGO's, and other organisations. ASC also diverse membership in its Technical Advisory Group from industry, NGO's, academia and CABs. The Supervisory Group is the ultimate decision-making body of the ASC.</p>	<p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Website - Governance</u>

A.3.03.02 Decision Making Process

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has procedures in place to ensure that directly affected stakeholders have the opportunity to be represented in decision-making.</p>	<p>The standard owner defines directly affected stakeholders, including certified entities and any active technical and/or stakeholder working groups. A procedure is in place, assuring and describing how directly affected stakeholders can be represented in decision-making. A mechanism is in place to inform directly affected stakeholders of this opportunity.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stakeholder mapping, meeting minutes and email correspondence to verify if stakeholders have been informed.
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>References</p>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.03.02 Decision Making Process

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) There is diversity in membership in its Supervisory Board, Technical Advisory Group and Technical Working Groups
- 2) ASC's Standard Setting Procedure details how stakeholders can submit comments during public consultation as well as in between document revisions. It also details all opportunities in which stakeholder engagement will be sought.

- [ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0, Section 9.1.2, 9.3.2e, 9.6.2](#)
- [ASC Website - Governance](#)

A.3.03.03 Decision Making Process

GSSI Component	Guidance
Where the Scheme Owner limits decision-making to members, it ensures that membership criteria and application procedures are transparent and non-discriminatory.	<p>For membership organization where decision making is limited to members, the application process and selection criteria are easily available and ensure balanced participation of stakeholders. These criteria could be "Not Applicable" if the Scheme Owner is not a member based organization.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application procedure, forms, completed applications and any reasons for declining.
Conclusion	References
ASC is not a membership organisation	N/a

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.03.04 Decision Making Process			
GSSI Component	Guidance		
The Scheme Owner makes public any decisions on the content of the standard as well as a summary of deliberations in arriving at the decision.	<p>The standard owner has a process in place to document decisions made on standard content, as well as a summary of deliberations in arriving at the decision. Records are made public, such as online.</p> <p>Example of evidence of alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - standards development or revision process description, - template for comments and response, - review of past development or revision documents. 		
Conclusion			References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) synopses of public comments are published on ASC's website in accordance with ASC's Standard Setting Procedure 2) Full feedback from the Shrimp operational review 2020 that lead to Shrimp V1.2 revision available online. 3) Full feedback from the aligned standard public consultation 2022 that lead to the Salmon V1.4 Sea Lice criterion revision available online. <p>From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.7.3: The Secretariat will discuss consultation feedback comments with the relevant governance bodies and prepare a written synopsis of the first round of public consultation, which will be made public on the website along with original comments. Those stakeholders who have submitted comments will receive notification of the public synopsis or report of public consultation</p> <p>9.7.4: The original comments (including the name of the company/organisation) will be published together with the synopsis. The Secretariat will arrange them per subject matter. Personal names of stakeholders may not be public for anonymity purposes.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0, Section 9.7.3, 9.7.4</u> • <u>Feedback summary - farm standard Spring 2022</u> • <u>Shrimp Operational Review Spring 2020 Consultation</u>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.04 Complaints

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has a transparent process to assess and handle complaints based on a publicly available procedure for resolving complaints related to governance, scheme management, executive functions and standard setting. Decisions taken on complaints are disclosed at least to the affected parties.</p>	<p>Complaints procedure is documented and clearly outlines steps, timelines and responsibilities to address and resolve complaints.</p> <p>The process for submitting a complaint – how and to whom – is public and easily understood. A process is in place to identify when and if the complaint is addressed and resolved.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - easily found complaint process and submission form online. - documentation of existing complaints and their resolution. - possibly request accreditation and certification bodies for previous submissions of complaints and resolution. - request and cross check with any complaints from stakeholders.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC's complaint procedure is publicly available on its website. ASC's Contact form lists complaints as an option to direct the query. ASC's complaints procedure V 2.0 has been approved and is undergoing finalisation</p> <p>2) ASC's general email standards@asc-aqua.org is on the Farm Standards website for all standards-related queries and contact information is within ASC's Standard-setting Procedure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Complaint Procedure V1.0</u> • ASC Complaints Procedure V 2.0 • <u>ASC Contact Form</u> • <u>ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0 – Section 13 – Contact Information</u> • <u>ASC's Farm Standard website with contact</u>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.04.01 Complaints

GSSI Component	Guidance	
Decisions taken on complaints and justifications for those decisions are made publicly available.	Decisions on complaints related to standard setting and justification for decision are publicly available (e.g. online on website).	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the decisions made by the Supervisory Board regarding complaints are posted on the ASC website within 10 working days of the decision and available publicly for a minimum of 12 months (ASC Complaints Procedure V 1.0 Section 7.1.4).</p> <p>2) In relation to 'justification', detailed documentation relating to the complaint will be held and only released to stakeholders at the discretion of the ASC.</p> <p>3) ASC Complaints Procedure V 2.0 (which is undergoing finalisation) has clarified this requirement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Complaint Procedure V 1.0 – Section 7.1.4</i> • <i>Provide Input – Complaints and Objections Procedures</i> 	

A.3.05 Standards Review and Revision

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner reviews standards at least every five years for continued relevance and for effectiveness in meeting their stated objectives and, if necessary, revises them in a timely manner.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a process in place for reviewing all standards to ensure continued relevance and meeting stated objectives. Relevance can include market uptake, stakeholder scope and support. Outcome and assessment reports can identify progress towards objectives. Review should be at least every five years after the publication of the current version.</p> <p>Example of evidence of alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure, quality handbook, public work program. - monitoring and evaluation system.

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.05 Standards Review and Revision

- public comments and consideration of reports for standard revisions.	
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) improvements is listed as a guiding principle and as an objective for a standard revision in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure.</p> <p>2) Additionally, the Programme Improvements section of the ASC website details current revisions and development work to the ASC programme.</p> <p>From Standard-setting Procedure Section 8: Improvement – The ASC standards are reviewed and revised as deemed needed or at a minimum every five years. This allows the ASC to incorporate learning from stakeholders' feedback and from the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) programme; and to evaluate if Criterion/Indicator design and performance levels need to be adjusted to reflect new data/science, improved practices, or new technology. ASC may use indicators to gather information and/or data when the latter is absent or inadequate to define specific (best practice or performance-based) requirements, or when needed for impact monitoring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Programme Improvements</u> • <u>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 – Section 8 – Improvements and Section 9.1.1</u>

A.3.06 Standards Review and Revision

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner allows for comments on the standard to be submitted by any interested party at	<p>The Scheme Owner has a permanent publicly available point of contact defined online for the submission of comments on the standard. This is not just during the development or revision process.</p> <p>A general point of contact online is acceptable for small schemes, as long as it explicitly states that all stakeholders can submit comments on the standard at any time. All comments on standards are considered in subsequent revision process.</p>

A.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

A.3.06 Standards Review and Revision

any time and considers them during the subsequent standards revision process.	<p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - scheme's website with form for submitting comments on standards. - internal procedure, quality handbook describing the receiving, filing and incorporation of submissions during the subsequent revision process. <p>Review ongoing submissions by interested parties on file.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) stakeholders are able to submit comments at anytime as listed on ASC's Provide Input page and ASC Standards page (via ASC's general email standards@asc-aqua.org) This feedback is centrally logged via ASC's internal Issue Log Procedure and it is considered in future development in accordance with ASC's Standard-setting procedure</p> <p>From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.1.3: Stakeholders are encouraged to share their feedback, concerns, or proposals to develop a new standard, review/revise an existing one or comment on processes and procedures. The ASC Website provides information on how to submit these.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) ASC Issue Log Procedure V1.1 • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V 2.0 – Section 9.1.3</i> • <i>ASC's Farm Standard website with contact</i> • <i>ASC's Provide Input website</i>

A.3.07 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner keeps on file for a period of at least one full standards revision the following records related to each standard development or revision process:	The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to assure all records outlined remain on file for at least one full standards revision period.

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.07 Record Keeping

- policies and procedures guiding the standard setting activity;
- lists of stakeholders contacted;
- interested parties involved at each stage of the process;
- comments received and a synopsis of how those comments were taken into account; and
- all drafts and final versions of the standard.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- internal procedure, quality handbook describing records to be kept, document and retention policy.

Review the full range of records for the most previous standard development and revision process.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) record keeping requirements for standard revision development activities are well defined in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure.
- 2) Additionally, previous public consultations and standard development work for various projects are available on ASC's website.

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 10.2: Records will be available on the ASC website for five years after the standard (or revised standard) has come into effect.

References

- [*ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0 – Section 10 – Records*](#)
- [*Aug 2022 Public Consultation Report*](#)
 - Includes the feedback from the sea lice revision work that went into Salmon Standard V 1.4
- [*Example of record keeping for previous standard development activities for Shrimp V 1.2*](#)
- [*Public Consultation for Shrimp V 1.2*](#)

A.3.07.01 Record Keeping

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner makes records in A.3.07 available to interested parties upon request.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner has a mechanism to ensure records described in A.3.07 are provided to stakeholders on request for the last revision process.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.07.01 Record Keeping

- policy/procedure describing system and process to provide information,
- online form for request, past actual requests and action taken,
- possibly request records through online contact.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

1) record keeping requirements for standard revision development activities and requests for hard copies are well defined in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure as well as on the ASC website. All documents are available online free of cost. ASC does reserve the right to print materials at its cost of printing and shipping if hard copies are requested.

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.11.4: If reasonably requested, the Secretariat will provide hard copies of the standard and related documents at cost.

References

- [*ASC Standard Setting Procedure V 2.0 - Section 9.11.4*](#)
- [*Hard copies available - ASC Website*](#)
- Spring 2022 Public Consultation announcement

A.3.08 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component

At the outset of a standard development or revision process, the Scheme Owner makes publicly available a summary of the process that includes:

- contact information and information on how to contribute to the consultation;
- summary of the terms of reference for the standard, including the proposed scope, objectives and justification of the need for the standard;
- steps in the standard-setting process, including timelines and clearly identified

Guidance

The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place assuring that a summary of the process is made easily available for the public online at the outset of the process. This includes Who and How to contribute, timeline, summary ToR and decision making (who and how).

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.08 Participation and Consultation

opportunities for contributing; and – decision-making procedures, including how decisions are made and who makes them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook describing elements and process of public summary. - examples of availability of past or current information.
Conclusion ASC is in alignment because: 1) Notifications regarding public consultation are posted online on ASC's website, newsletters, press releases and via social media. All media used to notify stakeholders includes direct links to the public consultation website page for that particular document.	References <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Aligned Farm Standard Website, including previous consultations</u>

A.3.09 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner or delegated authority ensures participation by independent technical experts and enables balanced participation by stakeholders in the standard development,	<p>The Scheme Owner, or delegated authority, has mechanism to ensure participation of necessary technical experts and balance of different stakeholder perspectives in standard development and maintenance. A balanced participation of stakeholders would include: fisheries/aquaculture management authorities, the fishing/aquaculture industry, fish workers organizations, fishing/aquaculture communities, the scientific community, environmental interest groups, fish processors/traders/retailers, aquaculture input providers such as feed providers, hatcheries/nurseries and possibly treatment providers, as well as consumer associations.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook for standard development

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.09 Participation and Consultation

revision and approval process.	<p>- revision and approval processes that describe how balance is achieved, such as through stakeholder mapping, announcements and invitation.</p> <p>Draft documents and meeting minutes/email correspondence indicate that during standard development, revision and approval processes of the past, independent technical experts participated, and a balanced participation by stakeholders was encouraged.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ASC's Standard setting procedure explicitly states that the public consultation shall aim to elicit balanced feedback consistent with the issues addressed (the subject matter) within the standard and its geographic scope 2) ASC develops extensive global stakeholder lists for its public consultations and also targets under-represented and small scale producers 3) ASC widely publicises its public consultations through a variety of media including social media, newsletters, magazine ads, and on its website. Its newsletter in particular has extensive outreach to many stakeholders <p>ASC also translates relevant public consultation documents to further enable a balanced response. For example, ASC's recent Spring 2022 public consultation documents was translated into French, German, Japanese, Mandarin, Vietnamese and Spanish, giving more non-English speaking stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) Public Consultation stakeholder list • (Confidential) Spring 2022 Public Consultation newsletter recipients • (Confidential) Spring 2022 Public Consultation Stakeholder List • <i>ASC Farm Standard website with public consultation documents in multiple languages</i> • <i>ASC's standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.6.2</i>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.09 Participation and Consultation

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.6.2: Public consultation shall be open to all stakeholders and shall aim to elicit balanced feedback consistent with the issues addressed (the subject matter) within the standard and its geographical scope.

A.3.10 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner allows a period of at least 60 days for the submission of comments on the draft standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to assure a minimum of 60 days for comments on major changes of the draft standard.</p> <p>A Standard is considered to be a set of documents that provide rules and guidelines to achieve results and that include all normative documents used for the certification process. The Scheme owner shall define which documents are part of the standard.</p> <p>This may include standard governance and setting procedures, requirements for certification bodies and certified entities</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook defining public comment period, what are considered major changes and what constitutes the standard - ToR <p>Review previous comments and dates for submission on draft standards.</p>
Conclusion	References
ASC is in alignment because the consultation period lengths are clearly defined in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure as 60 days with the opportunity to reduce the second public consultation to 30 days if justification is approved by the TAG.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.3.2g, 9.8.1, 9.8.3</u>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.10 Participation and Consultation

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.3.2g: For new standard developments, two rounds of public consultation on draft versions (the first round must be 60 days, the second round may be reduced to 30 days with appropriate rationale included in the TOR);

- For standard revisions a minimum of one 60-day consultation

- *Example of public consultation period length - Aligned Standard Spring 2022 consultation was from March 1 - April 30, 2022*

A.3.10.01 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires at least two rounds for comment submissions on the draft standard by stakeholders, with one round of at least 60 days and the other of at least 30 days.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to ensure comment periods as per Supplementary Component.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – internal procedure/quality handbook defining public comment periods in line with Supplementary Component. – terms of reference review previous comments and dates for submission on draft standards.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the consultation period lengths are clearly defined in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure.</p> <p>From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.8.1: The second round may be shortened from 60 days to at least 30 days if:</p> <p>a. There are no objections or substantial comments in the first round;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.8.1</i></u> • <u><i>Example of multiple public consultation periods - Aligned Standard Spring 2022 consultation was #5</i></u>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.10.01 Participation and Consultation

b. There is sufficiently balanced participation by key stakeholder groups (participation goals achieved).

A.3.11 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance	
No later than the start of the comment period, the Scheme Owner publishes a notice announcing the period for commenting in a national or, as may be, regional or international publication of standardization activities and/or on the internet.	<p>Timely announcements are made regarding the public comment period in appropriate channels so that they are easily available to relevant stakeholders. This can be online and/or in an appropriate publications. Dates should be clearly stated.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure defining process. - previous announcements are dated and were published before the beginning of the comment period. - newsletters - record of publication on SO's website 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC promptly publishes notices of a public consultation using a variety of media including website posts, social media posts, newsletters and print media.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Examples of notification of most recent public consultation for the Aligned Standard March 2022</u>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.12 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner identifies all impacted stakeholders and ensures proactively that all can participate in the standard-setting process through a consultation forum or are made aware of alternative mechanisms by which they can participate.</p> <p>This includes stakeholders that are not well represented in consultations and disadvantaged stakeholders (small-scale operations and vulnerable groups).</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to identify all impacted stakeholders. It makes sure that, when needed, alternative tools are in place to leverage potential barriers to participate.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder mapping including past participation - internal procedure/quality handbook defining public consultation process. - ToR. Review participation, communication and mechanisms/tools of past or current consultation. - meeting minutes, announcements, publications and or email communication indicate that the Scheme Owner is proactively seeking the input of specific stakeholder groups.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ASC's Standard-setting procedure explicitly states that participation goals for each key stakeholder groups should be set and monitored over the development or revision process 2) ASC's Standard-setting procedure states that the draft standards may be translated into relevant languages to enable a wider participation of the most affected stakeholder groups <p>ASC develops extensive global stakeholder lists for its public consultations and also targets under-represented and small scale producers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) ASC also translates relevant public consultation documents to further enable a balanced response. For example, ASC's recent Spring 2022 public consultation documents was translated into French, German, Japanese, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) Consultation Engagement Record • <i>ASC Farm Standard website with public consultation documents in multiple languages</i> • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.3.2, 9.6.5, Annex I</i>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.12 Participation and Consultation

Mandarin, Vietnamese and Spanish, giving more non-English speaking stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback.

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.6.5: Depending on the proposed geographic application of the standard and available resources, the draft standard may be translated into relevant language(s) to enable wider participation of the most affected stakeholder groups.

A.3.13 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner makes publicly available all comments received in the consultation respecting personal data protection.	<p>All comments received during the public comment period are made publicly available without attribution or identifier.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure/quality handbook describing policy, current or past public comment comments posted online. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC posts public comments attributed to the organization and makes this known in their public consultation surveys. This is also stated in ASC's Standard setting procedure under Section 9.7.4: The original comments (including the name of the company/organisation) will be published together with the synopsis. The Secretariat will arrange them per subject matter. Personal names of stakeholders may not be public for anonymity purposes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V 2.0 Section 9.7.4</i> • <i>Shrimp V 1.2 Revision Public Consultation Records</i> 	

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.14 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The Scheme Owner takes into account in further processing of the standard, comments received during the period for commenting.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a process for considering all comments received during the public consultation on the standard. Comments which are integrated into the standard should be clearly identified.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - some sort of system (e.g. excel) for organizing, categorizing and responding to comments. - review past consultation system, comments and response taken. 	
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the details regarding the processing of public comments are explicit in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure under Section 9.7.2: The Secretariat will objectively analyse the received comments and prepare written responses to stakeholders. These responses will include (but not be limited to) details as to how issues are intended to be addressed in the next draft; as well as providing justification when issues raised are deemed not applicable and/or will not be incorporated in the next draft.</p> <p>2) ASC has developed extensive public consultation management documents that detail public consultation planning, execution and feedback processing</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V 2.0 Section 9.7.1 – 9.7.4</i> • Public Consultation Manual V 1.0 • <i>Shrimp V 1.2 Public Consultation Record</i>

A.3.14.01 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.14.01 Participation and Consultation

The Scheme Owner makes publicly available a synopsis of how these comments were addressed and sends the synopsis to all parties that submitted comments.	<p>The Scheme Owner develops a summary of how comments were addressed, makes publicly available as well as sends to everyone who submitted comments.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - system, internal procedure/quality handbook that describes how comments are summarized and made available publicly and to commenters, - review of current and past standard public consultation information flow including synopsis.
--	--

Conclusion

ASC is in compliance because

- 1) the details regarding ASC's responses to public comments are explicit in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.7.2: The Secretariat will objectively analyse the received comments and prepare written responses to stakeholders. These responses will include (but not be limited to) details as to how issues are intended to be addressed in the next draft; as well as providing justification when issues raised are deemed not applicable and/or will not be incorporated in the next draft.
- 2) synopsis of comments are sent via e-mail to parties who submitted comments as well as made available on the ASC website

References

- [*ASC Standard-setting Procedure V 2.0 Section 9.7.2*](#)
- [*Shrimp V 1.2 Public Consultation Record*](#)

A.3.15 Standards Content

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that the standard is consistent with the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only includes language that is clear, specific, objective and verifiable; 	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to review standards in respect to the listed requirements.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.15 Standards Content

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – is expressed in terms of process, management and / or performance criteria, rather than design or descriptive characteristics; (ISO 59) – does not favor a particular technology, patented item or service provider; and (ISO 59) – attributes or cites all original intellectual sources of content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – internal procedure/quality handbook defining all list requirements. Some standards state these in their preamble as principles or references. – review that this list was checked for the current standards – review standards and if available mandatory checklists/audit manuals in respect to the listed requirements. – review any available complaints relating to this requirement.
---	--

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

1) ASC's Standard-setting Procedure clearly defines all requirements including clear language that is objective and verifiable, with measurable metrics where needed, do not favour specific technology or service provider and all original work is cited.

From Standard-setting Procedure 9.5.4: All original intellectual sources of content must be cited or attributed in the respective sections of the standard.

9.5.5: No particular technology, methodology or patented item is favoured

9.5.6: Language use in the standard must be clear, specific, objective, and verifiable.

References

- *ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.5.3, 9.5.4, 9.5.5, 9.5.6*

A.3.16 Standards Content

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.16 Standards Content

As part of the standard development process, the Scheme Owner assesses the feasibility and auditability of requirements in the draft standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to test the feasibility (cost, time) and auditability (interpretation, consistency) of requirements prior to finalization of the standards.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedure, quality handbook, standard setting work plan. - review assessment outcomes of past processes including revisions based on findings.
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC's Standard-setting Procedure clearly defines requirements related to feasibility testing. An example is ASC's current standard under development – the Aligned Farm Standard – will be undergoing feasibility testing in Winter 2023</p> <p>From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.6.4: The main objectives of feasibility assessments, if conducted, are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Validating if the presumed outcomes of the standard can be achieved; Testing the standard's feasibility and auditability. 	<p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aligned Standard Timeline – Pilot Audits</i> • <i>ASC's Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 – Section 9.6.4</i> • Project plan for pilot audits

A.3.17 Standards Content

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner demonstrates that all criteria in the standard contribute to the	<p>Criteria are related to how the Scheme Owner's objectives are met by identifying the acceptable performance. Often they are logically grouped around principles and objectives.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.17 Standards Content

standard's defined objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comparison of the Scheme Owner performance indicators with the standard's criteria. - monitoring and evaluation system of the performance indicators. - criteria that are not monitored and not evaluated may be surplus to the objective of the standards.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC's standard-setting Procedure clearly states how the structure of the Standards into Principles, Criteria, Indicators and Requirements contribute to the standards objectives. The logical framework behind the standard format itself shows how requirements contribute to the intent of the Criterion and Principle.</p> <p>From Standard-setting Procedure Section 8 – Rigour – Page 7: Rigour – The standards are structured with a logical framework comprised of high-level guiding Principles which directly address the ASC Mission. Criteria within each Principle address issue-areas of concern, and Indicators within each Criterion which define the actual performance requirements to be met for the entity to be certified. The ASC strives to define global Indicators that include metrics, based on scientific evidence, written to assess the performance of certificate holders or applicants. These indicators are objectively verifiable and formulated in a way that facilitates consistent understanding. Rarely does a single indicator address an impact in its totality. To address an impact thoroughly, several criteria, indicators and requirements need to be defined.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V1.3 – page 11</i> • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V 2.0– Section – Rigour, page 7</i>

A.3.18 Standards Content

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that the standard is locally applicable. Where the Scheme Owner adapts the standard	The Scheme Owner has mechanisms in place to ensure local applicability and relevance. For national or regional standards, the Scheme Owner has a process to take into account local environmental and regulatory conditions through guidance and policies.

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.18 Standards Content

for direct application at the national or regional level, the Scheme Owner develops interpretive guidance or related policies and procedures for how to take into account local environmental and regulatory conditions.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- policies, internal procedures and quality handbook documenting process to consider environmental and regulatory aspects.
- compare geographical scope of standard and implementation (certificates) with available documented interpretation guidance.
- assessment or monitoring reporting indicating where locally specific guidance is required.

Conclusion

ASC is alignment because:

1) adaptation of a standard to a local context is stated in ASC's Standard-setting Procedure stating that the Standards-related Variance Request Procedure will be used. Additionally, any stakeholder can request an interpretation of an ASC standard using the the Question for Interpretation Procedure.

From Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.5.8: If, after its release, a standard requires adaptation to local context, the standards-related Variance Request procedure will be used.

References

- [ASC Question for Interpretation Procedure](#)
- [ASC Standard-setting Procedure V 2.0-Section 9.5.8, 9.10.4, 9.10.5](#)
- [ASC Standards-related Variance Request Procedure](#)

A.3.19 Standards Accessibility

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner promptly publishes adopted standards, and makes them

Guidance

Standards are published in a timely fashion and are freely available online and on request. Validity dates coincide with publication dates of standards (taking transition periods into account) and the public

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.19 Standards Accessibility

available for free on its website, and on request, to anyone expressing interest.

work program on standard setting and maintenance.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) the prompt publication of approved standards is addressed in ASC's Standard-setting procedure.
- 2) Additionally, all Standards have a minimum 6-month period for an effective date that is dependent on its publication date, not approval date.
- 3) All ASC's standards are freely available on its website and ASC's website and Standard-setting Procedure also states that will distribute hard copies upon request. All documents are available online free of cost. ASC does reserve the right to print materials at its cost of printing and shipping if hard copies are requested.

From ASC Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.11.3: Once approved, the new/revised standard is promptly made available on the website. An announcement is made communicating the standard's release to stakeholders, in particular certification accreditation bodies (CABs) and certified enterprises (UoCs).

9.11.4: If reasonably requested, the Secretariat will provide hard copies of the standard and related documents at cost.

References

- *All ASC's standards published on website*
- *ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.11.3 and 9.11.4*

A.3.20 Standards Accessibility

GSSI Component

Guidance

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.20 Standards Accessibility

The Scheme Owner shall makes translations of the standard into English and in the most relevant/appropriate languages, to ensure access and transparency, freely available and authorizes translations into other languages where necessary for credible implementation of the standard.

The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place to identify the applicability and need for translations based on geographical scope of certification, as well as the geographical range of certified entities and products. The process includes an assessment in order to ensure accurate translation.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- internal procedure, quality handbook, current language availability, work plan of translations, process for ensuring accuracy of translations.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) All documents in English and all translations are available freely on its website
- 2) Translations are centrally managed by ASC as per ASC's Standard Setting Procedure

From ASC Standard-setting Procedure Section 8 – Accessibility: The standards' requirements should strike the right balance between mitigating key impacts whilst not impeding the development of sustainable and responsible aquaculture operations.

The standards should not create obstacles to trade or exclude small-scale farms from market access. ASC strives to address all barriers to engagement in the standard-setting process, for instance by translating consultation materials and organising local workshops. Standards and guidance documents are translated into different languages as deemed necessary.

References

- *All ASC's standards, including translations published on website*
- *ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 – Section 8 Accessibility*

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.21 Transition Period		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner ensures that certified entities are informed of the revised standard and transition period, either directly or through their certification bodies.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a mechanism in place assuring that certified entities are informed of standard revision and transition periods. This can be done directly or through other assurance bodies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal procedures, quality handbook, contracts/agreements or formal arrangements with certification bodies. - review process of previous revisions if applicable. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establishing transition periods are a part of the standard revision or development process as explicitly stated in the Standard-setting procedure 2) Standards explicitly state a release date and an effective date 3) Notifications to certification bodies of a newly released standard include effective dates 4) The length of the transition period depends on the extent of changes introduced and time needed for adaption with a guidance of 12 months following approval. 5) Conformity Assessment Bodies and Stakeholders are notified of standard releases <p>From ASC Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.11.3: Once approved, the new/revised standard is promptly made available on the website. An announcement is made communicating the standard's release to stakeholders, in particular certification accreditation bodies (CABs) and certified enterprises (UoCs)</p> <p>Section 9.10.6: The length of the transition period depends on the extent of changes introduced and time needed for adaption.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) Notification to CABs regarding Shrimp V1.2 and RAS V 1.0 • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V1.3 - page 6 - release date and effective date</i> • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 - Section 9.11.3</i> • Stakeholders - Shrimp V 1.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All stakeholders who received notification from ASC regarding the release of Shrimp V 1.2 	

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.21 Transition Period

Section 9.10.3: When proposing the effective date of a new standard, the time needed to operationalise the standard (e.g., guidance documents, training, translation etc.) needs to be considered to offer a realistic timeframe. The standard (or new version of) should become effective not more than 12 months following approval.

A.3.22 Transition Period

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that the certified entities are given a period of at least three years to come into compliance with revised fishery standards and at least one year for revised aquaculture standards	<p>Certified entities are given sufficient time to come into compliance with revised standards, for fisheries – minimum three years and at least one year for revised aquaculture standards.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - standards, certification requirements/methodologies which state minimum transition period for revised standards 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the outcome of the current process detailed in the Standard-setting procedure is deemed equivalent.</p> <p>2) With respect to the transition period, some standards have a 6 month duration, however it was stated this is where there have been 'minor' changes and one must appreciate that the review process itself has taken over 12 months with significant stakeholder consultation. A good example of this approach is the ASC standard revision process. The approach by ASC is to make improvements sooner rather than later, without jeopardising any certification status, based on risk assessed within the review process. This is believed to be a reasonable and proportionate</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V1.3 – page 6 – release date and effective date</i> • <i>ASC Standard-setting Procedure V2.0 – Section 9.10.3</i>

A . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

A.3.22 Transition Period

approach. When proposing the effective date of a new standard, the time needed for setting up the implementation scheme (e.g. audit manual, training, etc.) needs to be taken into account to have a realistic timeframe.

3) CABs are notified by ASC via newsletter of all new releases and effective dates. This process is intended to be further documented in the Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 3.0

From ASC Standard-setting Procedure Section 9.10.3: When proposing the effective date of a new standard, the time needed to operationalise the standard (e.g., guidance documents, training, translation etc.) needs to be considered to offer a realistic timeframe. The standard (or new version of) should become effective not more than 12 months following approval.

- Example CABs newsletter with newly released documents

A.3.23 Transition Period

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner notes in the standard the date of a revision or reaffirmation of the standard along with a transition period after which the revised standard will come into effect.	Standards include date of version and any transition period for the certified entity to come into compliance. If there are normative documents other than the standard and certification requirements/ methodologies which affect compliance of fisheries/aquaculture, these similarly should contain the described validity dates.	
Conclusion	References	
ASC is in alignment because: 1) Standards explicitly state a release date and an effective date. Standards becoming mandatory for use on the effective date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>ASC Salmon Standard V1.3 - page 6 - release date and effective date</i></u> 	

**SECTION B.
OPERATIONAL
MANAGEMENT OF
SEAFOOD
CERTIFICATION
SCHEMES**



B.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.1.01 ISO-17011 compliance		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner has a contractual, enforceable arrangement or formal understanding that requires accreditation bodies to be compliant with the requirements of ISO/IEC 17011 in its applicable version.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable arrangement with a certification body or accreditation body that require the accreditation bodies to be compliant to ISO/ IEC 17011.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts, - memorandums of understanding and/or memorandum of agreements between scheme and accreditation bodies or certification bodies that specify accreditation bodies to be compliant with ISO/IEC 17011. - accreditation bodies' certificate of accreditation (on website). - rules for accreditation bodies in standard. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>the Copy of Renewed (31 Aug 2022) ASI-ASC SLA states</p> <p>1) under definitions the latest version of 17011</p> <p>1.1 Definitions</p> <p>1.1.1 'Accreditation Body': Authoritative body that performs Accreditation (Source: ISO/IEC 17011:2017); and under</p> <p>2) Section 7.4 Principal Obligations of ASI</p> <p>provide an ASC Accreditation Program and complementary Assurance Services that is/are consistent with ISO 17011 requirements; and</p> <p>3) in Annex 2, ASI shall</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) ASI - ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 - Annex 2 Section 1.1.6, 7.2.1 • ASC-ASI Contract Extension • ASC-ASI Contract Nov 2022 	

B . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.1.01 ISO-17011 compliance

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1.1.6 be in conformance with ISO 17011 with periodic peer review by a competent third party body (e.g. ISEAL);</p> <p>1.1.7 be in conformance with applicable requirements of the ISEAL Assurance Code;</p> <p>2. Competence Management</p> <p>2.2.3 All assessors must have proven competence in Assessment against ISO 17065</p> | |
|---|--|

B.1.02 Non-discrimination

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner ensures that accreditation services are available to certifying bodies irrespective of their country of residence, size, and of the existing number of already accredited bodies, within the scope of the scheme.	<p>The Scheme Owner ensures that access to accreditation is open to qualified certification bodies without consideration of size, country or number of existing accredited certification bodies. This could be through contracts/agreements, in referenced policies or certification requirements/methodologies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application process/forms, - review list of accredited certification bodies 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) in accordance with ISO 17011 section 4.3.3 'The accreditation body's policies and procedures shall be non-discriminatory and shall be administered in a non-discriminatory way. The accreditation body shall make its services accessible to all applicants whose requests for accreditation fall within the activities (see 4.6.1) and the limitations as defined within its policies and rules. Access shall not be conditional upon the size of the applicant CAB or membership of any association or group, nor shall accreditation be conditional upon the number of CABs already accredited.'</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) ASI - ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 - Annex 2 Section 1.1.6, 7.2.1 • ASI-POL-20-109-ASI-Impartiality Policy-V1.3

B . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.1.02 Non-discrimination

2) Within the ASI Policy statements is the following 'ASI is non-discriminatory and accepts applications from CABs operating anywhere in the world. CABs are invoiced based on cost in accordance with a publicly available fee schedule.'

The listed ASC CAB are highly diverse.

- B 1.02 ASI-POL-20-109-ASI-Impartiality Policy-V1.3.pdf

B.1.03 Specified requirements

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner specifies the requirements for certification bodies that the accreditation body is required to verify, including the respect of the scope of the scheme	<p>The Scheme Owner defines requirements for certification bodies to ensure accurate and consistent implementation. These are verified as part of the accreditation process by the accreditation body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requirements are specified in certification requirements/ methodologies or a separate certification body and/or accreditation manual. - reference to requirements in contracts or formal agreements with certification bodies or accreditation bodies.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC Is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC requires that CABs) must be accredited to ISO 17065 & ASC requirements as stipulated in the Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR) V2.2, Part A General Requirements Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and Annex F.</p> <p>CAR V.2.2, Part A_4.2.1 specifically states that "The CAB shall conform to ISO 17065 and the ASC requirements".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements - Section 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and Annex F</i> • ASC-ASI Contract Extension • ASI-PRO-20-101-Accreditation-V5.1

B.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.1.03 Specified requirements

2) ASC contracts the Oversight Body, Assurance Services International (ASI) to provide independent oversight and evaluation of the (CAB's) conformance against ISO 17065, ASCs Certification and Accreditation Requirements and ASI's Accreditation Procedures.

The oversight process that ASI follows for CABs is detailed in the ASI Accreditation Requirements – main procedures related to this clause can be found under ASI's public documentation at:
<https://www.asi-assurance.org/s/quality>

Example of an approved CAB's Accreditation Details can be viewed here, and this information is available for all approved CABs:
<https://www.asi-assurance.org/s/cab/a105c00000779azEAA/scs-asc-20212026>

3) In the ASI_ASCI_Service Agreement it states:

ASI Shall

1.1.6 be in conformance with ISO 17011 with periodic peer review by a competent third party body (e.g. ISEAL);

The last ISEAL Peer Review took place in Nov 2021

- ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance & Sampling-V6.4
- ASI-PRO-20-111-Witness & Compliance Assessments-V2.3

B.1.04 Transition period

GSSI Component	Guidance
Subsequent to any changes in the requirements for assessing certification	The Scheme Owner specifies transition periods for any changes to certification requirements (B.1.03) for certification bodies to come

B . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.1.04 Transition period

bodies, the Scheme Owner ensures certification bodies are given a defined time period within which to conform to the changes. Special considerations should be given to certification bodies in developing countries and countries in transition.	into compliance with changes. For certification bodies in developing countries consideration is given that may include a longer transition period, capacity building or other measures. Examples of evidence for scheme alignment: - see B.1.03 reference to transition period and/or special consideration for developing country certification bodies.
--	--

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the document governing requirements is the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 where clearly on the front cover where there is a defined effective from date of 9 October 2019 and a release date of 9 April 2019, a 6 month transition period to effectiveness.</p> <p>2) The ASC CAR Development and Revision Procedure V1.0, sections 7.8, Implementation and Communication; and 7.9, Transition, also explicitly state that effective dates must be set 6-12 months after document release and that CAR revisions will not take place more than annually, to allow stakeholders , such as CABs and producers, time to adjust and adapt to changes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) Internal Procedure - ASC CAR Development and Revision Procedure V1.0: Section 7.8 and 7.9 • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2</u>

B.1.05 Competencies

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner only works with accreditation bodies that have personnel	The Scheme Owner ensures personnel competency through contracts or enforceable arrangements with accreditation bodies. Personnel competency includes education, training on the standard,

B.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.1.05 Competencies

with the necessary education, training, technical knowledge and experience for performing accreditation functions in fisheries and aquaculture operations.	<p>technical knowledge and experience and can be defined by the Scheme Owner.</p> <p>Examples of objective evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065. - Contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body if applicable, certification/accreditation manuals. - Requirements for Accreditation Bodies and personnel mentioned in the standard
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the ASI-ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 – Annex 2 Section 2, defines the required competencies for ASI assessors. Additionally, brief CV's of all ASI assessors are on the ASI website</p> <p>2) ASI and its assessors undergo peer review as detailed in subsequent sections (e.g. B106)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) 1) ASI – ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 – Annex 2 Section 2 • <u>SI website with brief staff CV's</u>

B.1.06 External Review

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that external audits are carried out on the accreditation body to assess performance.	<p>The Scheme Owner ensures accreditation bodies undergo external/ independent performance assessments.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - assessment process and requirements of IAF, ISEAL or other membership organization. - Scheme Owner accreditation manual or requirements, contracts or agreements, assessment reports.

B . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.1.06 External Review

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the ASI-ASCI Service Agreement 2019, Annex 2 Terms of Reference, stipulate the following clauses</p> <p>1.1.4.2 ASI shall carry out accreditation assessments and audits as required by ASI accreditation requirements and all applicable scheme related documents e.g. sampling policy; and produces reports accordingly per oversight process of CABs as detailed in the ASI Accreditation Requirements</p> <p>1.1.5 ASI shall have an effective and efficiently functioning quality assurance methodology</p> <p>1.1.6. ASI shall be in conformance with ISO 17011 and periodic peer review by a competent third party body</p> <p>1.1.7 ASI shall be in conformance to applicable requirements of the ISEAL Assurance Code</p> <p>1.1.10 ASI shall conduct a yearly review of oversight performance and identify areas of improvement together with ASC</p> <p>1.1.11 ASI shall provide ASC in the first quarter of a calendar year with the ASI Annual Activity Report for the past year</p> <p>2) ASC has appointed ASI, an independent organization as its exclusive accreditation body. ASI is a member of ISEAL, so has been subject to peer review on the above points with the last peer assessment taking place in November 2021.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) ASI - ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 - Annex 2 Section 1.1.6 • ASI/ISEAL • ASI-PRO-20-101-Accreditation-V5.1 • ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance & Sampling-V6.4 • ASI-PRO-20-111-Witness & Compliance Assessments-V2.3

B.1.07 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that the accreditation body is	<p>Scheme owner ensures accreditation body transparency regarding organizational structure and financial support.</p> <p>The Scheme Owner requires disclosure of this information directly from the accreditation body.</p>

B.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.1.07 Transparency

transparent about its organizational structure and the financial and other kinds of support it receives from public or private entities.	<p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation body website with information, certification/ accreditation manuals, contracts and/or agreements. - agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065; - annual or periodic reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASI has sufficient transparency through the publication of its Annual Report regarding finances and corporate/management structure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASI's Annual Report 2021</i>

B.1.08 Office Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that the accreditation process includes an on-site audit of the certification body.	<p>The Scheme Owner specifies that accreditation includes an on-site audit of the certification body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies, accreditation body office audit reports, audit schedule. - specified in accreditation body or certification body contracts/ agreements. - agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065.
Conclusion	References

B.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.1.08 Office Audit

ASC is in alignment because

1) under the Service Contract ASI-ASCI Service Agreement September 2019, ASI has obligations defined in section 7 (7.2.1, 7.2.2) and under Annex 2 Terms of Reference, related to ISO 17011 requirements, whereby ASI is expected to conduct assessments at the premises of the CAB where key activities are performed; and where relevant, to perform witness audits at other selected locations

2) Both ASI-PRO-20-101-Accreditation_V5.1 Dec 2020 (sections 13 and 14) ; and ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance and Sampling_V6.4 Jan 2019, refer to office and affiliated office assessments, basal sampling rates and assessment durations for representative witness audits of CAB auditors and/or on-site assessments of a CAB's conformity assessment activity. " Add the following from the current conclusions to align with evidence provided: 3) ASC requires that CABs must conform to ISO 17065 & and be accredited to ASC requirements as stipulated in the Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR 2.2), sections 4.1.5 and 4.9.4 of which require witness audits and observation of CAB on-site audit. ; 4) A sample of ASI's CAB Head Office Assessments, Witness Assessments and Compliance Assessments can be reviewed through the ASI Portal.

- (Confidential) ASI - ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 -Section 7
- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2](#)
- ASC-ASI Contract Extension
- ASI-PRO-20-101-Accreditation-V5.1
- ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance & Sampling-V6.4

B.1.09 Field Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that the accreditation process includes a review of the performance of	<p>The Scheme Owner specifies that accreditation includes a performance review of certification bodies and auditors, that may include desktop reviews, office visits, witness audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

B . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.1.09 Field Audit

certification bodies and auditors, using witness audits.

- accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies, accreditation body audit reports, audit schedule, specified in accreditation body or certification body contracts/agreements.
- agreement/contract between the Scheme Owner and certification body to use national accreditation bodies which are IAF members and signatories to the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 17065.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because

1) the ASI-ASCI Service Agreement Sep 2019 details the obligations of ASI. This includes the obligation of ASI to evaluate and monitor CABs to ensure that all accredited CABs have fully implemented ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements, including those pertinent to witness audits.

2) There are also specific references within the ASI normative documents (ASI-PRO-20-1-1- ASI Accreditation V5.1 Dec 2020 ; ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance and Sampling_v6.4 Jan 2019, regarding the review of CAB performance and sampling of auditors. 3) All ASI assessments of CABs are scheduled and managed through the Assurance Portal; 4) ASC requires that Assurance Providers (CABs) must conform to ISO 17065 & and be accredited to ASC requirements as stipulated in the Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR 2.2) and Section 4.2 Conformity to ISO 17065 and the ASC requirements; 5) ASI's Witness and Compliance Assessments outlines the process for conducting ASI Witness and Compliance Assessments of a Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) at certificate holder (CH) level. 6) A sample of ASI's , Witness Assessments and Compliance Assessments can be reviewed through the ASI Portal. An overview of all completed, scheduled and planned assessments is also available for review

References

- (Confidential) ASI - ASCI Service Agreement Sept 2019 - Annex 2 Section 1.1.4
- ASI-PRO-20-101-ASI-Accreditation-V5.1 - Section 14 Initial Assessment and Initial Accreditation Decision sections 15.1, 15.2, 15.3
- ASI-PRO-20-105-Surveillance & Sampling-V6.4 Sections 5.2 Assessment Plan and 5.3 Basal Sampling Rate, 5.3.2
- ASI-PRO-20-111-Witness-Compliance-Assessments-V2.3
- CRM overview of Finalised Oversight Assessment
- Example HO Assessment

B.2 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B.2.01 ISO-17065 compliance		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies operating in the scheme are accredited to conduct certifications for the scope of their respective standards in conformance with ISO/IEC 17065 in its applicable version.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable arrangement with certification body that require to follow the principles of ISO/ IEC 17065 for the scope of the respective standard of the scheme.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts, memorandums of understanding and/or memorandum of agreements between Scheme and accreditation bodies or certification bodies that specify certification bodies be accredited with ISO 17065 - accreditation manual or certification requirements/methodologies; certification bodies certificate of accreditation. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC have appointed the Oversight Body, Assurance Services International (ASI), to provide exclusive independent oversight and evaluation of the CABs conformance against ISO 17065, and ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR 2.2)</p> <p>2) ASC requires that Assurance Providers (CABs) must conform to ISO 17065 & and be accredited to ASC requirements as stipulated in the Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR 2.2), Section 4.2 Conformity to ISO 17065 and the ASC requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements - Section 4.2</u> • <u>Example of an approved CAB's Accreditation Details can be viewed here and this information is available for all approved CABs:</u> 	

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.01 ISO-17065 compliance

3) The latest edition of ISO documents apply as stipulated in the ASI-ASCI Service Agreement of September 2019, Section 1.1.16.3

B.2.02 Fee Structure

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to maintain a written fee structure that is available on request and is adequate to support accurate and truthful assessments commensurate with the scale, size and complexity of the fishery, fish farm or chain of custody. The fee structure is non-discriminatory and takes into account the special circumstances and requirements of developing countries and countries in transition.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement in the contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement with the accreditation body and/or certification body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation manual/certification requirements/methodologies. - possibly also review accreditation body audit reports that this requirement is verified, and for compliance of certification bodies on this requirement. - policy or procedure which outlines how fee structures of certification bodies could address special requirements of developing and in transition countries in a non-discriminatory manner; certification body fee structure and policy (online or request). 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) Although ASC does not charge fees, there is a defined requirement within ISO 17065 to have specified information publicly available which include 'general information on fees charged to applicants and clients' (Ref ISO 17065 4.6 [b]). The CAB must also meet the non-discriminatory conditions (Ref ISO 17065 4.4 .3.)</p> <p>2) ASC requires that CABs) must be accredited to ISO 17065 & ASC requires in its Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR) V.2.2_Part A_4.2.1 that the CAB shall conform to ISO 17065 and the ASC requirements</p>		N/a

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.02 Fee Structure

3) ASC contracts the Oversight Body, Assurance Services International (ASI) to provide independent oversight and evaluation of the (CAB's) conformance against ISO 17065, ASCs Certification and Accreditation Requirements and ASI's Accreditation Procedures.

ISO17065 under Clause 4.6 b requires Assurance providers (CABs) to maintain (through publications, electronic media or other means), and make available upon request, a description of the means by which the certification body obtains financial support and general information on the fees charged to applicants and to clients.

B.2.03 Certification Cycle

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner defines that the validity of a certification cycle does not exceed 5 years in the case of fishery or 3 years in the case of aquaculture certification and 3 years in the case of chain of custody certification.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement in the contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement with the accreditation body and/or certification body.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation manual/certification requirements/methodologies. Issued certificates with validity (online database or on request) 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) The maximum period of a certificate validity that a CAB can issue for aquaculture certification is defined as three years in ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 Section 17.11.5.</p> <p>2) The MSC COC Certification Requirements V3.1 August 2019, under Section 11.1.6, states "overall certificate validity of maximum 3 years"</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.11.5</u>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.03 Certification Cycle

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>3) The minimum requirements for surveillance audit is defined in ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 as at least annually and be planned in such a way that all aspects of the production cycle are audited throughout the 3-year validity of the certificate.</p> <p>4) ASC also monitor CAB's performance to this requirement through their CRM for CABs – MyASC.</p> | |
|---|--|

B.2.04 Surveillance

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies carry out periodic surveillance and monitoring at sufficiently close intervals to verify that certified operations continue to comply with the certification requirements. For aquaculture operations, this shall be on an annual basis.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement in the contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement with accreditation body and/or certification body. Scheme owner risk assessment system should identify “sufficient close intervals”.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accreditation manual/certification requirements/methodologies. - Scheme Owner internal risk assessment system with assessment reports. - Audit reports, schedules and issued certificates. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the minimum requirements for surveillance audit is defined in ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 as at least annually and be planned in such a way that all aspects of the production cycle are audited throughout the 3-year validity of the certificate.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.15</i>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.05 Assessment Methodology

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies apply a consistent methodology to assess compliance with the standard.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the methodology to assess compliance with the standard. An internal assessment (updated regularly) with clear outcomes, identifies if the methodology is consistent between certification bodies or if the methodology needs revising.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/methodologies, - contracts and agreements with the certification body, - guidance interpretation documents, - Scheme Owner internal assessment system with assessment reports, - training and calibration records.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) within the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V.2.2 there are specific requirements in relation to the maintenance of competence to audit against ASC standards as well as specific requirement for ASC CAB calibration workshops.</p> <p>2) Within ISO 17065 there are again specific requirements for personnel management and competence.</p> <p>3) ASC also has a procedure regarding a request for interpretation or variance which results are published and where required the requirements/standards are reviewed.</p> <p>4) ASC also provides auditor training courses to support their standards.</p> <p>5) There are additional checks undertaken by ASC on audit reports and feedback is sent to CABs.</p> <p>6) ASC publish specific document templates to facilitate standardisation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Auditor Training</u> • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.8 and 6.1</u> • <u>ASC VR Platform</u>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.05 Assessment Methodology

Examples given are relevant and include recent work on Group Certification (<https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-we-do/programme-improvements/group-certification/>)

B.2.05.01 Assessment Methodology

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner has a publicly available methodology for calculating minimum audit duration.	<p>A methodology for calculating minimum audit duration is publicly available. Certification bodies implement this methodology.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - online methodology, audit schedules, audit reports defined in certification requirements/ methodologies. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1)ASC has released an interpretation providing baseline guidance on audit duration and factors the CABs shall consider to calculate audit duration - QA0253. 2) Interpretation when approved will provide temporary additional guidance and information between revision to programme documents. ASI will evaluate CABs against these interpretations.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.4 and 17.5</i> • <i>QA 253</i>

B.2.05.02 Assessment Methodology

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.05.02 Assessment Methodology

<p>The Scheme Owner has defined requirements for sampling methodology and frequency that certification bodies are required to follow during the audit.</p>	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirements for certification bodies for sampling methodology and frequency of audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body. - accreditation manual, certification requirements/ methodologies - audit reports - guidance specifying sampling methodology (including what issues to focus on) and sampling frequency, in order to support consistency between certification bodies.
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) there is a significant amount of guidance provided within the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 under sections: 7.2 Audit Planning, 7.3 Decision on Certification, 17.3 Audit Methodology – issued Audit Manuals, 17.4 Audit Timing, 17.5 Audit Duration, 17.9 Audit Evidence, 17.10 Audit Findings, 17.11 Certification Decisions, 17.12 Audit Report Requirements, 17.15 Surveillance, 17.16 Recertification Audits, Annex C Audit Report Review. In addition ASC has published procedures for multisite certification and group certification.</p>	<p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 7.2, 7.3, 17.3, 17.4, 17.5, 17.9, 17.10, 17.11, 17.12, 17.15, Annex C</i> • <i>Certification process – ASC website</i>

B.2.06 Termination, Suspension, Withdrawal

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.06 Termination, Suspension, Withdrawal

The Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies have consistent documented procedure(s) that specify the conditions under which certification may be suspended or withdrawn, partially or in total, for all or part of the scope of certification.

For accurate and consistent implementation of the standard, the Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies have documented procedures that specify the conditions under which certification may be suspended or withdrawn, partially or in total, for all or part of the scope of certification.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body; accreditation manual, certification requirements/methodologies,
- audit reports,
- guidance documents specifying the conditions under which certification may be suspended or withdrawn.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) It complies with the ISO 17065 requirement under section 7.11 which lays out the requirements for Termination, reduction, suspension or withdrawal of certification.
- 2) These are also defined in CAR 2.2 Section 7.6 relating to suspension, cancellation or withdrawal of certification and procedures that must be followed. For suspension post audit, there is reference to suspension in the event that major conformities are not closed out after a six month period. 3)

Suspended farms are named on the ASC website.

Weblink: <https://www.asc-aqua.org/find-a-farm/>

If farms cannot address reasons of suspension, the certificate will be withdrawn.

References

- [*Accredited CABs - ASI Website*](#)
- [*ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 7.6, 17.10.1.2.f*](#)
- [*Suspended certificates and logo licensees on ASC's website*](#)

B.2.07 Multi-Site Certification

GSSI Component

Guidance

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.07 Multi-Site Certification

The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies follow procedures and guidance for multi-site certifications as written in the standard or other scheme documents, if allowed under the scheme.	<p>If the Scheme Owner explicitly does not allow multi-site certification (prohibits, not that it is not yet developed or exists) requirement is “Not applicable”. Otherwise, the Scheme Owner requires certification body to follow have documented procedures and guidance for multi-site certification, detailed in the agreement or in the standards</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body; - requirements and guidance for multi-site certification - audit reports.
---	--

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) there are documented processes and CAB requirements for multi-site certification under the Certification and Accreditation Requirements Section 17.1.3.2 and 17.1.3.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.1.3.2, 17.1.3.3</i>

B.2.08 Audit Reports

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to ensure consistency in audit report formats and in how the reports are completed.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies and has some system for quality control.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies; - guidance specifying formats for audit reports and reporting, mandatory audit templates;

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.08 Audit Reports

	- review online audit reports for consistency of report format and reporting, Scheme Owner quality management system for review of audit reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) the use of ASC's audit templates are mandatory for CABs to use at all ASC audits under the Certification and Accreditation Requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex C</i> • B 2.08 Audit Report Template

B.2.09 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies have in place consistent procedures for stakeholders to provide input during the certification process.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to have a documented procedure to enable input from all stakeholders during the certification process.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirements for mechanism for stakeholder input during certification process. - guidance specifying procedures. - review certification body process for input: - publicly available information for stakeholder input, public announcements, audit work plans, requests for input. - audit reports with stakeholder input.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation</i>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.09 Participation and Consultation

- 1) the Certification and Accreditation Requirements detail the CABs obligation to notify stakeholders of upcoming auditing activities. Additionally, all audit notices are posted on ASC's website at least 30 working days prior to an audit. These notices are publicly available to any interested stakeholder.
- 2) CABs are also required to maintain stakeholder lists, acknowledge and address all stakeholder input and have a process for stakeholders to submit comments outside of the audit period.

From CAR V2.2 Section 17.2.4: The CAB shall notify potential stakeholders and interested parties of the planned audit and invite their participation.

17.8.4: Prior to the publication of the draft audit report, the CAB shall respond in writing to each stakeholder and interested party to explain how their comments were addressed by the audit team

*Requirements V 2.2
Section 17.2.4, 17.8,
17.11.2.2, and 17.15.5*

B.2.09.01 Participation and Consultation

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that the certification body solicits stakeholder input during the audit process.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to solicit input from all stakeholders during the certification process.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement for mechanism for stakeholder input during certification process, - guidance specifying procedures, - review certification body process for input: publicly available information for stakeholder input, public announcements, audit work plans, requests for input,

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.09.01 Participation and Consultation

- audit reports with documented stakeholder input.

Conclusion

The ASC is in alignment because:

1) there is evidence within Surveillance Reports confirming this has been undertaken.

2) Also there is reference with ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 section 17.8

From CAR V2.2 Section 17.8.1: The CAB shall maintain an up-to-date list of all stakeholders that are relevant to be contacted for their input per species.

Section 17.8.2: The CAB shall keep a list of all stakeholders and interested parties that indicate an interest in making a submission to the audit team.

References

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.8](#)

B.2.10 Non-Compliances

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies follow its requirements for determining non-compliances, verifying	<p>For accurate and consistent implementation of the standard, the Scheme Owner ensures that certification bodies follow non-compliances, verifying corrective actions arising from non-compliances, and allowing for appeals of non-compliances.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.10 Non-Compliances

corrective actions arising from non-compliances and allowing for appeals of non-compliances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body. - accreditation manual, certification requirements/methodologies. - guidance documents, determining non-compliances, verifying corrective actions arising from non-compliances and allowing for appeals of non-compliances, in order to support consistency between certification bodies. - audit reports. - standards.
--	---

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because

- 1) the general requirements under ISO 17065 relating to evaluation of audit findings, complaints and appeals (7.4.4, 7.4.6, 7.4.7, 7.4.8 and 7.13) are required by the SO in documented procedures and guidance for CBs in the ASC CAR V2.2 Part A Section 7.7 (Complaints and Appeals) and Part A Section 17.10 Audit Findings.
- 2) ASC CAR V2.2 Part A Section 17.10 clearly defines major non-conformity and minor non-conformity handling, and provides guidance on clear actions to be taken in relation to corrective actions, timelines and verification. These are supplemented by auditor training.
- 3) ASI's Assessment Finding Procedure ASI-PRO-106-ASI Findings V6.1, also details the requirements by ASI of CABs on handling and reporting NCs to ASI procedures.
- 4) ASC CAR V2.2 Part A Section 7.7.1.4 requires that "CABs shall send all logged issues using Form 4 no less than 30 days prior to the annual surveillance of the AAB with copies to ASC and the AAB."

References

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 Section 7.7, 17.10](#)
- ASI-PRO-20-106-ASI Findings V6.1

B.2.11 Site Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.11 Site Audit

The Scheme Owner requires that the scope of the (re-)certification audit includes a visit to locations pertinent to the scope of the certification.

The Scheme Owner requires that the scope of the audit (initial, annual or re-assessment) includes on-site assessment of premises covered by the scope of the standards and within which one or more key activities are performed.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract, memorandum of understanding or enforceable agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body,
- accreditation manual, certification requirements/methodologies,
- guidance documents specifying procedures for determining site visits including sampling,
- review audit reports.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) the ASC CAR V2.2 Part B, Operational Certification Requirements, state under Section 17.15.4. to consider "all aspects of the production cycle" ; under Section 17.15.6 that the CAB must undertake "no fewer than 2 surveillance audits during a certificate validity" and under Section 17.15.10.6 "sample of sites and records to verify that management systems are effective and consistent".
- 2) Under ASC CAR V2.2 Part B Section 17.4 Audit Timing, it is required that the audit take place during the time of harvesting (17.4.2) or when processing operations are taking place (17.4.4) .
- 3) ASC CAR V2.2 Annex F, Requirements for Certification for Producer Groups, under Section 4.7 require on-site audits and sampling of sites.

ASC's recently released CAR V2.3_July 2022 further clarifies Audit Timing under sections:

8.2. The CAB shall conduct an initial on-site audit only when the site(s) has completed one of the following periods, whichever is less:

- a) Been in operation no less than twelve (12) months, or
- b) Completed one harvest cycle, with similar operational conditions or
- c) Reached 75% of the peak biomass for long cycle species.

References

- [ASC CAR 2.3 Section 8](#)
- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.15.6](#)

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.11 Site Audit

8.3. The CAB shall schedule audits only when the facilities are in normal production or the species in the scope of the UoC is present on site and:
a) Fifty percent (50 %) of the production units are under operation for single-site UoC.

B.2.11.01 Site Audit

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that CBs conduct unscheduled audits.	<p>‘Unscheduled’ means without significant advance warning.</p> <p>The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to conduct unscheduled (without significant advance warning) or surprise audits. The Scheme Owner defines process for determining audits and methodologies to ensure consistent implementation.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, - certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement and conditions for unscheduled audits (e.g. risk, context, complaints received), - guidance specifying procedures and process to ensure consistency, - audit reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) there is a requirement under ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 section 17.15.14 for the CAB to specify criteria and conditions for unannounced surveillance audits in their documented procedures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.15.14</u>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.11.01 Site Audit

17.15.14 The CAB shall specify criteria and conditions for unannounced surveillance audits in their documented procedures.

B.2.12 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that a list of certified entities is made publicly available.	<p>The Scheme Owner makes publicly available a list of certified entities either directly or requires of certification bodies/accreditation bodies.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - system to show the certification status of entities is publicly available online (e.g. database or online certificate list). If this system is outsourced to the accreditation bodies or certification bodies, this is required and the system described in the contract/ agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, in a separate accreditation manual or certification requirements/methodologies. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment:</p> <p>1) because all certified farms, products and suppliers are publicly available on its website at https://www.asc-aqua.org/find-a-farm/; https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-you-can-do/take-action/find-a-product/; https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-you-can-do/take-action/find-a-supplier/</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC's listings for certified farms:</i> • <i>ASC's listings for certified products:</i> • <i>ASC's listings for certified suppliers:</i>

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.13 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance	
For fisheries, the Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to make full audit reports available on request after certification has been granted, while excluding commercially sensitive information.	<p>Applicable only to fisheries, for Aquaculture “Not Applicable”. The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make full audit reports, after certification has been granted, available online or upon request. Commercially sensitive information is excluded. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with certification body and certified entity with this requirement, - certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement, - guidance specifying that making reports available to stakeholders happens in a timely manner, - review certification body website for posted reports or process for responding to requests. 	
Conclusion	References	
This component is not applicable because ASC is not a fisheries scheme	N/a	

B.2.14 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance	
For aquaculture, the Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to make summary audit reports publicly available (excluding commercially	<p>Applicable only to Aquaculture. For Fisheries “Not Applicable”. The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make summary audit reports, after certification has been granted, publicly available. Commercially sensitive information is excluded. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p>	

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.14 Transparency

sensitive material information) after certification has been granted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with certification body and certified entity with this requirement. - certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement. - guidance specifying that making reports available to stakeholders happens in a timely manner. - certification body website for posted reports.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) all audit reports, excluding confidential information, is made publicly available on its website at https://www.asc-aqua.org/find-a-farm/ in compliance with the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex C</i> • <i>Audit Reports – ASC website</i>

B.2.14.01 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>For aquaculture, the Scheme Owner requires Certification Bodies to make summary audit reports available (excluding commercially sensitive information) on request after certification has been granted, that include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the date of the inspection/audit; - the name(s) of the person(s) responsible for the audit and report; - the names and addresses of the sites inspected/audited; - the scope of the inspection/audit; 	<p>Applicable only to Aquaculture. For Fisheries “Not Applicable”. The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make summary audit reports, after certification has been granted, available upon request that include all of the information defined in the Supplementary Component. If the scheme does not allow mass balance, then that information requirement is considered aligned. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with the certification body and certified entity with this requirement,

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.14.01 Transparency

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the non-conformities identified; - the result of at least one mass balance assessment for each product covered by the Chain of Custody audit; and - a conclusion on the conformity of the client with the chain of custody requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement - guidance specifying the information to be included in summary audit reports - certification body website for posted reports.
--	---

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because: 1) the use of ASC's audit templates are mandatory for CABs to use at all ASC audits under the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2;</p> <p>2) the information in the template meets GSSI requirements.</p> <p>3) A copy of the audit report is available for review. Completed audit reports using this audit report template can be found on the ASC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B 2.08 Audit Report Template • <i>Find a Farm - ASC Website</i>

B.2.14.02 Transparency

GSSI Component	Guidance
For aquaculture, the Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to make full audit reports publicly available on request after certification has been granted, while excluding	<p>Applicable only to Aquaculture. For Fisheries "Not Applicable". The Scheme Owner defines this requirement for certification bodies to make full audit reports, after certification has been granted, publicly available or upon request. Commercially sensitive information is excluded. Contracts with certified entities should clearly give notice of this requirement.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, contract with the certification body and certified entity with this requirement,

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.14.02 Transparency

commercially sensitive information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement – guidance specifying that making reports available to stakeholders happens in a timely manner - certification body website for posted reports.
-------------------------------------	---

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) all audit reports, excluding confidential information, is made publicly available on ASC's website at https://www.asc-aqua.org/find-a-farm/ in compliance with the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>ASC's listings for for farms includes audit reports</i></u>

B.2.15 Notification of Changes

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner notifies accreditation bodies, certification bodies and certified entities of any change in management procedures which affects scheme rules and procedures for accreditation or certification.	<p>The Scheme Owner has a system to ensure that accreditation bodies, certification bodies and certified entities are notified in a timely manner of any substantive change in management procedures. This is defined as changes which affect scheme rules and procedures for accreditation and/or certification. Where the scheme outsources responsibility of notification to accreditation bodies or certification bodies, there is a requirement for certification bodies to have a procedure for this notification and guidance on how this should take place (timeframe, manner, channel, etc.).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts/agreements with accreditation bodies and certification bodies regarding notification of changes, internal procedure/qualityhandbook for change management, ring information flow.
Conclusion	References

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.15 Notification of Changes

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) ASI, CABs and certified enterprises are notified of relevant changes to ASC's certification programme. Under the ASI – ASC Service Agreement, both parties are obligated to notify each other and the CABs of any significant changes with a minimum of two months' notice.
- 2) ASC distributes a monthly newsletter to CABs and to ASI with relevant programme updates.
- 3) ASC also has a public newsletter in which any stakeholders can sign up to receive

- (Confidential) ASC – ASI Service Agreement Section 4.3 and 6.2
- (Confidential) Email to CABs re: new standards releases
- Stakeholder notification – new standards releases

B.2.16 Corrective Action

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner clearly defines the criteria relating to the classification of non-conformities. Where the Scheme Owner allows for certification of an entity with non-compliances, the Scheme Owner requires that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only non-conformities on minor, non-critical issues are allowed; - a timeline for closing out corrective actions must be defined; - a system to verify that corrective actions have been closed out is in place. 	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the criteria related to rating the severity of non-conformities for certification bodies. If Scheme allows for certified entities with non-compliances, these can only be (All must be met): minor/non-critical, with a defined timeline for closing out and a mechanism defined to verify resolution.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, certification requirements/methodologies specifying classifications of non-conformities and conditions for allowing certification with non-compliances. - guidance specifying procedures and process for classifying nonconformities and conditions for issuing certification, audit reports.

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.16 Corrective Action

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR2.2) Section 17.10 and 17.11 clearly define the classifications of non-conformities and the corrective action process.</p> <p>2) A sample of CAB audit reports of ASC Certified Farms can be reviewed through ASC's CRM to demonstrate the CAB grading, assessment, verification and closure of non-conformities.</p> <p>3) Audit reports are also publicly available on the ASC website through the Find-a-Farm search tool</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Section 17.10 and 17.11</u> • <u>Find a Farm - ASC Website</u>

B.2.17 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner has defined the qualifications and competence criteria required by auditors and audit teams, employed by certification bodies, and it makes this information publicly available.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditor and audit teams qualifications and competency and these requirements are publicly available. Competencies and qualifications include knowledge in the standard, education, experience and personal attributes.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for each function, - auditor assessment and training records, - auditor CVs. 	
Conclusion		References

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.17 Auditor Competence

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR2.2,) Annex B define the competency requirements for CAB auditors.
- 2) ASC's Agreement with ASI also defines the requirements for competence of CABs and their auditors (TOR, Section 2)
- 3) Competence criteria required by auditors and audit teams are publicly available on the ASC website
- 4) Accredited CABs are listed on ASI's website

- (Confidential) ASC – ASI Service Agreement Section 4
- [Accredited CABs – ASI Website](#)
- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex B](#)

B.2.18 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires certification body auditors to have successfully completed training in the scheme to the satisfaction of the Scheme Owner.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditor training in the standard including initial and ongoing development.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for each function. - auditor assessment and training records. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) within Annex B of the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 there is a requirement for auditor training B21.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Confidential) ASC – ASI Service Agreement –

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.18 Auditor Competence

2) ASC requires that Assurance Providers (CABs) must conform to ISO 17065 & ASC requirements as stipulated in the Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR).

3) ASC have appointed the Oversight Body, Assurance Services International (ASI) to provide exclusive independent oversight and evaluation of the Assurance Provider's (CAB's) conformance against ISO17065, ASCs Certification and Accreditation Requirements and ASI's Accreditation Procedures. – An overview of the agreed services that ASI will provide can be reviewed in Section 7 (Obligations of the ASI) together with Annex 2 TOR of the ASI_ASCI_Service Agreement 2019

Section 7 and
Annex 2

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex B:](#)

B.2.19 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires that certification body auditors successfully complete auditor training based on ISO 19011. This does not include technical experts seconded to audit teams.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditors to have successfully completed (passed) training based on ISO 19011 Guidelines for auditing management systems) and that the audit team includes at least one auditor. Technical experts can supplement auditor expertise, but are not formally auditors and do not count as an auditor.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for each function. - auditor assessment and training records. - auditor CVs. - audit Reports. 	
Conclusion		References

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.19 Auditor Competence

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) Assurance Services International (ASI) provides to ASC exclusive independent oversight and evaluation of the CAB's conformance against ISO17065, ASC's Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR 2.2) and ASI's Accreditation Procedures. Section 7 and Annex 2 TOR of the ASI-ASCI Service Agreement 2019 define the Obligations of ASI regarding competency management.
- 2) ASC's CAR V2.2 explicitly states under Annex B , Part B20 Auditor Competencies and Training. There are various levels for example, to qualify as a lead auditor, individuals shall have successfully completed a Lead Assessor training course based on ISO19011 principles that have a minimum duration of thirty-seven (37) hours

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex B](#)

B.2.20 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies include the following in their competence assessment of auditors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an assessment of knowledge and skills for each fundamental area the auditor will be expected to be working, - an assessment of knowledge of pertinent fishery and /or aquaculture Programs and the ability to access and be able to apply relevant laws and regulations, - an assessment of the personal attributes of the auditor, to ensure they conduct themselves in a professional manner, 	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification bodies to include all of the elements in the Essential Component in the management of personnel competence (ISO 17065 clause 6.1.2).</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement, - guidance outlining the system and criteria for competencies, training, etc. (see B.2.17-B2.19, 21-22),

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.20 Auditor Competence

- a period of supervision to cover the assessment fishery and/or aquaculture principles, specific audit techniques and specific category knowledge,
- a documented sign off by the certification body of the satisfactory completion of assessment requirements.

- auditor assessment and training records,
- auditor CVs,
- accreditation body reports.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) within CAR V2.2 Part A General Requirements under Section 6.1 Resource Requirements, there are requirements for knowledge of ASC programmes and pertinent legislation and knowledge (6.1.1.1), registration as approved ASC Auditor (6.1.2.1), performance supervision. monitoring and assessment (6.1.2.2); maintenance of competency (6.1.3) which further requires that the CAB has a procedure to confirm auditor competencies annually (6.1.3.1) and that such assessments include regular performance evaluation and and calibration (6.1.3.1.a) which will be recorded and kept on file (6.1.3.1.b)
- 2) Annex B of the ASC CAR V.2.2 requirements for Auditor Qualifications and Competencies in detail.
- 3) There is a requirement under section 6.1.2 and more specifically 6.1.2.2 of ISO 17065 to meet specific requirements for recording performance and meeting of the scheme requirements generally.
- 4) ASC requires that Assurance Providers (CABs) must conform to ISO 17065 & ASC requirements as stipulated in the ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements (CAR).
- 5) ASC have appointed the Oversight Body, Assurance Services International (ASI) to provide exclusive independent oversight and evaluation of CABs

References

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 Annex B](#)

B.2.21 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2.21 Auditor Competence

The Scheme Owner requires that certification body lead auditors maintain category and scheme knowledge.	<p>The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body lead auditors to have and maintain the necessary training, technical knowledge and experience to ensure consistent and accurate audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/ methodologies specifying requirement, - guidance outlining the system and criteria for lead auditors, - lead auditor assessment and training records, - lead auditor CVs, - accreditation body reports.
---	--

Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) there is specific reference to the requirement for a lead auditor to undertake no less than 2 ASC audits per year to maintain this status. 2) There is also a requirement for the CAB to maintain scheme knowledge by the attendance of ASC workshops (4.8.1) and the need to undertake change when standards are revised (4.9.4.3) 3) There are general requirements under ISO17065 for key personnel (6.1.1.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 Annex B 21</u>

B.2.22 Auditor Competence

GSSI Component	Guidance
The Scheme Owner requires that certification bodies have a continuing professional	The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification body auditor ongoing professional development to maintain current best practice in sector.

B . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.2..22 Auditor Competence

development program in place that provides auditors with current best practice for fishery and/or aquaculture.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/methodologies specifying criteria for continuous professional development,
- auditor training, assessment and training records.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because even though there is no explicit requirement defined for continuing professional development, section 6.1.3 of ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 relates to monitoring of competence and Annex B B21 under Auditor Training refers to the completion of ASC training and additional training regarding changes in legislation, specific standards, codes or conventions.

References

- [ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2 Section 6.1.3 Annex B 21](#)

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

B3.01 Segregation

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The Scheme Owner requires that all certified products are identified and segregated from non-certified products at all stages of the supply chain.	<p>The Scheme Owner requires clear identification and separation of certified from non-certified product at all stages of the supply chain.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Chain of Custody standards, audit checklists, certification requirements/methodologies specifying requirement.- Chain of Custody audit reports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements page vi</i>• <i>MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1</i>• <i>MSC Default Standard V 5.0</i>
Conclusion		
ASC is in alignment because: 1) the MSC Chain of Custody Standard: Default Version 5.0_28 March 2019 (MSC COC Default 5.0) requires segregation under Principle 3 which is supported by the MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V3.1_23 August 2019 (MSC COC V3.1) sections 8.2.7 . 8.2.8, 8.3.6, 8.3.7, 8.4.3 and 8.4.4. 2) Overall reference is within the Introduction of ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements V2.2_April 2019 (ASC CAR V2.2) page vi		

B.3.02 Entities to be Audited

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.02 Entities to be Audited

The Scheme Owner requires all entities that are physically handling the certified product to undergo a Chain of Custody audit by an accredited certification body if the product can be destined for retail sale as a certified, labelled product.

Exceptions: No audit is required for storage and distribution of tamper-proof, packaged products.

The Scheme Owner requires all entities in a supply chain that physically handle the product and where there is the possibility of mixing undergo a Chain of Custody audit if the product will be claimed as certified or carry a label. Entities in the supply chain which do not take physical control or only handle storage and distribution in tamper proof packaging need to be identified, but do not require a Chain of Custody audit.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the accreditation body/certification body, certified entity, certification requirements/methodologies defining types of operations and activities that require auditing according to these requirements,
- Chain of Custody reports.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because there is a requirement within the introduction sections of the MSC Chain of Custody Default Standard V 5.0, MSC Group Standard V 2.0 and MSC CFO Standard V 2.0 to be audited by an accredited third party certification body throughout the supply chain with periodic surveillance over a three year period. MSC CoC Certification Requirements V 3.1 section 6.1 (Need for CoC certification) requires certification for all entities that take legal ownership of certified products. This is supported by the detailed procedures within MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1.

References

- [*MSC CFO Standard V 2.0*](#)
- [*MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1*](#)
- [*MSC Default Standard V 5.0*](#)
- [*MSC Group Standard V 2.0*](#)

B.3.03 Records for Traceability

GSSI Component

Guidance

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.03 Records for Traceability

The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to verify that all entities within the chain maintain accurate and accessible records that allow any certified product or batch of products to be traceable from the point of sale to the buyer.

The Scheme Owner defines the requirement for certification bodies that all entities within the supply chain, including those which may not undergo a Chain of Custody audit (see B.3.02), maintain up to date, complete and accessible records that allow for full traceability of the product along the entire supply chain.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- Chain of Custody standard.
- contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, accreditation/certification requirements/ methodologies specifying criteria for document control and maintenance.
- auditor checklists.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) there is a specific requirement within the MSC Chain of Custody Standard: Default Version V5.0 under Principle 4 for certified products to be traceable and volumes are recorded.
- 2) MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V3.1 defines the requirement for CAB to verify traceability records through the process /supply chain

References

- [*MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1*](#)
- [*MSC Default Standard V 5.0*](#)

B.3.04 Sub-Contractors

GSSI Component

The Scheme Owner requires that entities are able to demonstrate that these Chain of Custody requirements are met by the enterprise's subcontractors.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner ensures that certified entity takes full responsibility that all subcontractors fully meet Chain of Custody requirements and has a system to demonstrate this.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.04 Sub-Contractors

	- sub-contract agreements, internal audits. If the Scheme Owner does not allow sub-contracting then this is aligned (as opposed to Not Applicable)	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <p>1) there is a specific requirement within the MSC Chain of Custody Default Standard V 5.0, MSC Group Standard V 2.0 and MSC CFO Standard V 2.0 under Principle 5. The enterprise is required to have a management system, clause 5.3 (clause 5.4 in CFO Standard V 2.0). Subcontractors, transport and contract processing, for subcontractors must fully meet the requirements of the Default/Group/CFO Standard as applicable.</p> <p>2) The MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 clause 8.4 specifies the procedures required to demonstrate compliance by subcontractors.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MSC CFO Standard V 2.0</i> • <i>MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1</i> • <i>MSC Default Standard V 5.0</i> • <i>MSC Group Standard V 2.0</i>

B.3.05 Auditing Methods and Frequency

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner has or requires certification bodies to have documented procedures for auditing methods and frequency of audits that meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certificate validity does not exceed 3 years; - periodicity depends on risk factors - changes to an entity's traceability system that are deemed to affect the 	<p>The Scheme Owner has or ensures certification bodies have documented Chain of Custody audit methodologies including: validity of certificate cannot exceed 3 years, frequency of audits takes into consideration risk factors and an onsite audit is required when substantive changes to the certified entities traceability system take place. These are instances where the integrity of the Chain of Custody could be affected such as company mergers, major new markets.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requirements in the contract/agreement between the Scheme Owner and the certification body, in a separate accreditation manual or for example in certification requirements/methodologies. - guidance interpretation specifying frequency, auditing methods and risk factors, in order to support consistency between certification bodies.

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.05 Auditing Methods and Frequency

integrity of the Chain of Custody result in a re-audit (onsite).

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because

- 1) the MSC Chain of Custody Default Standard V 5.0, MSC Group Standard V 2.0 and MSC CFO Standard V 2.0 under each introduction section require chain of custody certification and periodic surveillance over a three year period. The MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 clause 11.4 specifies a 3 year maximum for certificate validity, clause 11.3.1 specifies risk factors related to determining audit frequency, 11.3.2 and 11.3.7 relate to risk factors to determine unannounced and expedited audits, respectively.
- 2) Changes to the certificate must be reported to the CAB within 10 days (MSC CoC Default Standard V 5.0 and Group Standard V 2.0 section 5.2 Reporting changes, CFO Standard V 2.0 section 5.3 Reporting changes), and the CAB must respond per MSC CoC Certification Requirements V 3.1 clause section 11.2 Changes to the certificate.
- 3) For Consumer-Facing Organisations, follow-up on-site audits are required within 90 days where non-conformities have been detected, per MSC CoC Certification Requirements V 3.1 clause 9.3.2.
- 4) Furthermore, companies that have an ASC Logo License Agreement are subject to on-site visits by ASC or its representatives for assurance and integrity purposes, such as in investigation of a suspected integrity breach (clauses 4.1(v) and Annex 3 clause 1(i)).
- 5) ASI also performs follow-up compliance audits as part of CAB oversight in ASC's assurance program (ASI Accreditation Procedure V 5.1 section 17 Maintaining Accreditation, ASI Witness & Compliance Assessments Procedure V 2.5, ASC-ASI Service Agreement 2022). Link to ASI documents: <https://www.asi-assurance.org/s/quality>. If the integrity of CoC has been affected to the extent the certificate holder is suspended as 'intentional or systemic', on-site follow-up verification audits are required per MSC General Certification Requirements v2.4.1 clause 7.4.13.1c.

References

- ASI_ASC_Service Agreement 2022 - Final ASC Signed
- ASI-PRO-20-101 Accreditation V5.1
- ASI-PRO-20-111-Witness & Compliance Assessments-V2.3
- [MSC CFO Standard V 2.0](#)
- [MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1:](#)
- [MSC Default Standard V 5.0](#)
- [MSC General Certification Requirements](#)
- [MSC Group Standard V 2.0,](#)

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.06 Non-Conformity/Corrective Actions

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires the certification body to record all identified breaches of the chain of custody, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an explanation of the factors that allowed the breach to occur; - an explanation of the corrective actions required to ensure that a similar breach does not re-occur; - the time frames for the corrective actions to be completed; and - the date of closing out of the corrective actions and how the problem was solved. 	<p>The Scheme Owner requires of certification bodies to document all breaches of Chain of Custody with explanation of contextual factors, corrective actions, and timeframes for corrective actions, date of closing and resolution.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/methodologies defining requirements of reports, contract or agreement specifying requirements, mandatory template reports. - Chain of Custody audit report.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <p>1) the MSC Chain of Custody Default Standard V 5.0 and, MSC Group Standard V 2.0 clause 5.4, and MSC CFO Standard V 2.0 clause 5.5, require certificate holders to have a process to manage non-conforming products (products that do not meet ASC requirements), including notifying the CAB in 2 days and affected customers in 4 days; recording and identifying why the breach occurred; and implementing measures to prevent re-occurrence.</p> <p>2) In cases of certificate holder non-conformity, audit findings at single, multi-site, Group and CFO audits are graded; corrective action plans are required to correct or downgrade, including root cause analysis, corrective actions needed and defined timeframes for closing out; per MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 sections 9.2-9.4</p> <p>3) The MSC General Certification Requirements V 2.4.1 section 7.4.9 define reasons for CoC certificate suspension and follow-up actions for the CAB to verify closure of corrective action are in clauses 7.4.16-7.4.17.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MSC CFO Standard V 2.0</i> • <i>MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 Section 9.4</i> • <i>MSC Default Standard V 5.0</i> • <i>MSC General Certification Requirements V 2.4.1</i> • <i>MSC Group Standard V 2.0</i>

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.07 Audit Reports

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that certification body audit reports include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the date of the inspection/audit; - the name(s) of the person(s) responsible for the audit and report; - the names and addresses of the sites inspected/audited; - the scope of the inspection/audit; - the non-conformities identified; - the result of at least one mass balance assessment for each product covered by the Chain of Custody audit; and - a conclusion on the conformity of the client with the Chain of Custody requirements. 	<p>The Scheme Owner requires of certification bodies that all Chain of Custody audit reports include all of the elements in the Essential Component.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certification requirements/methodologies defining requirements of reports, mandatory template reports. - Chain of Custody audit report.
Conclusion	References
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ASC uses the MSC Chain of Custody certification scheme for chain of custody requirements, which has tools such as the mandatory audit checklist and reporting templates that capture all required information under this essential component. 2) MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 requires use of the audit checklist and reporting templates in clause 8.1.1. 3) Mandatory checklist and reporting templates f on Single and Multi-Site, CFO, COC Group Certification were reviewed during the Office Visit and found to be adequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MSC CoC Consumer-Facing Organisation (CFO) Checklist and Reporting Template v2.2.1</i> • <i>MSC CoC Group Checklist and Reporting Template v4.2.1</i> • <i>MSC CoC Single and Multi-Site Checklist and Reporting Template v4.2.1</i>

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.08 Audit Reports		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The Scheme Owner requires certification bodies to file reports at their office and to make these reports available to relevant parties upon request.	<p>Certification bodies are required to maintain files of Chain of Custody audit reports (paper or electronic) and make these available upon request to relevant parties, within contractual arrangements with certified entities.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contracts, agreements, certification requirements specify Chain of Custody reports are filed and process for making them available. 	
Conclusion	References	
<p>ASC is in alignment because</p> <p>1) CoC audit reports are required to be filed with ASC by upload to the CoC scheme database within 10 days of the audit per MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 section 11.1.5. The reports are confidential and not public.</p> <p>2) The reports, however, are made available to limited relevant parties (within contractual arrangements) including the relevant client (certificate holder) via the CAB and ASC assurance staff by retrieval from the CoC database.</p> <p>3) The reports are also made available to ASI for CAB oversight purposes via ASC's database (ASI Accreditation Procedure V 5.1 section 17 Maintaining Accreditation, ASC-ASI Service Agreement 2022). ASC CoC certificate holder details and status is always available on ASC's Find-A-Supplier webpage, including reason for suspension (if applicable). https://www.asc-aqua.org/what-you-can-do/take-action/find-a-supplier/</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASC-ASI Service Agreement 2022 • ASI Accreditation Procedure V 5.1 • <u><i>MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 Section 11.1.5</i></u> 	

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.09 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The Scheme Owner requires that an enterprise certified entity keeps records that demonstrate conformity with the Chain of Custody requirements for a period that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exceeds the shelf life of the certified product; and - exceeds the periodicity between audits 	<p>Certified entity must keep records documenting compliance with Chain of Custody standard requirements at a minimum time that is longer than a. the shelf life of the product and b. time between audits.</p> <p>Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chain of Custody standard, guidance interpretation and audit checklist that specify document retention policy. 	
Conclusion		References
<p>ASC is in alignment because:</p> <p>the MSC Chain of Custody Standard: Default Version V5.0 under section 5.1.3 specifies that "The organisation shall maintain records that demonstrate conformity with this standard for a minimum of 3 years, or for the full duration of the certified products' shelf life if longer than 3 years".</p> <p>The surveillance audit frequency is within the specified duration of record storage.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MSC Default Standard V 5.0 Section 5.1.3</i>

B.3.10 Multi-Site CoC

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>Where a scheme allows for Chain of Custody certification of multiple sites managed under the control of a single entity, the Scheme Owner defines specific audit procedures that ensure all sites</p>	<p>If the Scheme Owner does not allow Chain of Custody of multi-sites (prohibits not that it is not yet developed or exists) - requirement is "Not applicable". Otherwise, the Scheme Owner defines audit procedure for multi-sites (under control of one entity) and requirements for internal control management system.</p>

B . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

B.3.10 Multi-Site CoC

comply with the Chain of Custody certification requirements. Control can include direct ownership, franchises, or where the entity has a signed agreement or contract with each site.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- Chain of Custody standard, guidance or checklist specifying procedure and internal control system.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because:

- 1) they use the MSC Chain of Custody Standard Group Version V2.0_28 March 2019 which defines procedures for multiple site certification and for internal control management system.
- 2) Options relating to the type of certification are defined in the MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V3.1 section 6.2.

References

- [*MSC Chain of Custody Certification Requirements V 3.1 Section 6.2;*](#)
- [*MSC Chain of Custody Standard: Group Version 2.0;*](#)

B.3.11 Multi-Site CoC

GSSI Component

Where the Scheme Owner allows for multisite certification, they require that all sites are assessed as part of the internal audit during the period of validity of the certificate.

Guidance

The Scheme Owner does not allow Chain of Custody of multi-site requirement is "Not applicable". Otherwise, the Chain of custody standard requires all sites are assessed as part of the internal audit during the validity period of the certificate.

Examples of evidence for scheme alignment:

- standard, guidance interpretation and audit checklist.

Conclusion

ASC is in alignment because it uses the MSC Chain of Custody Standard Group Version V2.0 which requires under Section 6.4 internal audits to be conducted by the group's central office of all sites prior to initial certification and then annually thereafter.

References

- [*MSC Chain of Custody Standard: Group Version 2.0*](#)

**SECTION C.
AQUACULTURE
CERTIFICATION
STANDARDS**



C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.01 Antimicrobial Usage		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that the decision to treat with antimicrobial agents, and their subsequent application, is consistent with the Principles for Responsible & Prudent Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Aquatic Animals and other guidance of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code i.e., by the aquatic animal health professional or other relevant competent authority and in response to a diagnosed disease; see Articles 6.2.7 and 6.2.8 of the 2015 Aquatic Animal Health Code).	<p>The standard is expected to prohibit prophylactic usage for growth promotion and require that all antimicrobials are used in response to a diagnosed disease (i.e., by the aquatic animal health professional or other relevant competent authority) and the audit is expected to include a review of suitable evidence (e.g., records of disease testing etc. prescriptions for treatments).</p> <p>The audit is expected to include a review of evidence (such as written records or through interviews) to ensure consistency with OIE guidelines (2015) Article 6.2.7 “The veterinarian or other aquatic animal health professional authorized to prescribe veterinary medicines should indicate precisely to the aquatic animal producer the treatment regime, including the dose, the treatment intervals, the duration of the treatment, the withdrawal period and the amount of antimicrobial agents to be delivered, depending on the dosage and the number of aquatic animals to be treated. The use of antimicrobial agents extra-label/off-label may be permitted in appropriate circumstances in conformity with the relevant legislation” and Article 6.2.8 “Aquatic animal producers should use antimicrobial agents only on the prescription of a veterinarian or other aquatic animal health professional authorized to prescribe veterinary medicines, and follow directions on the dosage, method of application, and withdrawal period.”</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <p>Criterion 5.2:</p> <p>1) prohibits prophylactic use of antibiotics,</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 5.2, Indicators 8.17 and 8.18</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.01 Antimicrobial Usage

- 2) requires all medication events to be prescribed by a veterinarian, and,
- 3) requires on-farm documentation of all chemicals and therapeutants used in the most recent production cycle, the amounts used, date of usage, which groups of fish were treated, against which disease, proof of proper dosing and all disease/pathogens detected on the site.

- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 5.2, Indicators 8.17 and 8.18](#)

C.1.01.01 Antimicrobial Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard prohibits the use of antimicrobials listed by the World Health Organization (WHO) as highly and critically important to human health.	<p>The audit is expected to include a review of evidence that supports a claim of no listed antimicrobial usage, this could include independent laboratory testing results, reviews of financial records, inspections of offices and chemical storage facilities.</p> <p>The most recent version of the WHO list is the 3rd edition, which can be found at www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/antimicrobials-third/en/.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that prohibits the use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO. Fish treated with critically important antibiotics are no longer eligible to be sold as "ASC". During the audit, records of used antibiotics are cross-checked with the WHO-list. In case the farm has used critically important antibiotics, the auditor will verify if proper traceability systems are in place and applied to assure that treated fish are not sold as "ASC".</p> <p>ASC released Salmon Standard V1.4 in Sept 2022 with updated WHO references.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.2.1, 5.2.12 and 8.17:</u> ▪ <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.4,</u> • Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.2.1, 5.2.12 and 8.17

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.02 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that workers with responsibilities in aquatic animal husbandry have been adequately trained and are aware of their responsibilities in aquatic animal health management practices.	The audit is expected to include a review of evidence that relevant workers have been appropriately trained and aware of their responsibilities. Examples of suitable evidence could include suitable training or appropriate qualifications, and interviews with staff. The training of workers may be a component in a broader management system e.g., a health management plan.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) farm will need to develop and implement a Fish Health Management Plan – which includes assurances of staff training, 2) farms have to be in full compliance with the entire OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code – which requires training, and 3) during an on-site audit, an auditor will verify if the most recent version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code is translated into management policies and procedures and that staff are trained to understand these procedures and policies and implements them correctly. <p>ASC released Salmon V1.4 in Sept 2022 with updated OIE references.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 5.1.1, 6.11.1 and 8.11</i> • <i>ASC Salmon v1.4</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 5.1.1, 6.11.1 and 8.11</i> 	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.03 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that aquatic animals are kept under farming conditions suitable for the species being raised.	The objective of this requirement is to verify that the species is being farmed in the proper environment to maintain its health. Due to the very broad nature of this Essential Component, specific guidance cannot be provided. Expected evidence could include requirements for farm siting (including permitting for the farm site and species), aquatic health plan maintenance, assurance or monitoring aquatic animal health, on-farm water quality and temperature monitoring, etc.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) water quality parameters are optimal (dissolved oxygen) , nitrogen and phosphorus levels are monitored and that farms are sited in areas classified as having "good" or "very good" water quality, 2) the development and implementation of a Fish Health Management Plan which takes into account the various factors that can influence the health and performance of the fish on site - ranging from disease control and diagnosis, feed, survival rates, biosecurity, net cleaning, etc. 3) that farms implement appropriate hygiene controls for good culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 2.2, 5.1 and Indicators 2.2.6 and 8.11</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 2.2, 5.1 and Indicators 2.2.6 and 8.11</i> 	

C.1.04 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures to respond to disease outbreaks, which	It is expected that disease response procedures would be a component of the aquatic animal health management system. Feasibility of quarantine depends on a combination of species, culture system and production environment. In cases where quarantine is applicable, a review of suitable evidence is expected to demonstrate and verify the ability to contain diseased aquatic animals.	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.04 Biosecurity

includes the ability to quarantine the aquatic animal where feasible.

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) a Fish Health Management Plan is developed and implemented. Part of this plan is disease monitoring, diagnoses and response protocols,
- 2) the farm is in compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code, which requires that once a OIE-notifiable disease is detected, a quarantine zone is implemented, and
- 3) in case an outbreak of an OIE-notifiable disease, four actions are required: 1) cull the pen(s) in which the disease is diagnosed, 2) immediately notify the other farms under the Area Based Management (ABM) scheme, 3) the farm and farms within the ABM scheme enhance monitoring and conduct rigorous testing for the disease, 4) the farm promptly makes the findings publicly available. These four actions are part of the overall quarantine zone requirement (see point 2 above).
- 4) in case of an unidentifiable transmissible agent, the farm has to: 1) report the issue to the ABM scheme and appropriate authority, 2) increase monitoring and surveillance on the farm and within the ABM scheme, 3) make findings public.

ASC released Salmon Standard V1.4 in Sept 2022 with updated OIE references

References

- [ASC Salmon Standard 1.4](#)
- [ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 8.17](#)
- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 8.17](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.05 Biosecurity		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures and/or systems for the early detection of aquatic animal health issues, which include routine monitoring of stocks and the environment.	<p>Appropriate procedures are expected to include general health/ behavioral inspections or testing for specific diseases with suitable monitoring (e.g., regular and including a suitable range of parameters, and of sufficient sample size to identify or anticipate disease outbreaks expediently, as well as increased surveillance when potential issues are identified.) Environmental monitoring is expected to include detection of unfavorable environmental quality factors that could adversely affect the health of the aquatic animal (e.g., water temperature and quality).</p> <p>Verification is expected and could include reviews of written records and monitoring results to ensure procedures and/or systems are operational is also expected. This could also be captured in an aquatic health management plan.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2) Frequent on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available within seven days of testing 3) 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 kilometres of the farm 4) 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. 5) In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish are set at 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish. 6) Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases, parasites and environmental conditions relevant for good fish health, including implementing corrective action when required 7) Site visits by a designated veterinarian at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager at least once a month 8) Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.4 5.1.7, 5.2.1, 5.4.3, 8.11, 8.12, 8.13, 8.14, 8.18</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 5.1.1, 5.1.2,</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.05 Biosecurity

9) A farm-specific mortalities reduction programme that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities	<u>5.1.4</u> <u>5.1.7</u> <u>5.2.1</u>
10) 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	<u>5.4.3</u> <u>8.11</u> <u>8.12</u>
11) Evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code	<u>8.13</u> <u>8.14</u> <u>8.18</u>
12) Evidence of a fish health management plan for smolt suppliers, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites	
13) 100% vaccination of fish for selected diseases that are known to present significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists	
14) 100% of smolt groups tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm	
15) 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	
16) Evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code at the smolt supplier	

C.1.06 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires that mortalities and moribund aquatic animals are routinely collected, where collection is a feasible practice.	GSSI expects this Essential Component to be applied where collection is a feasible function of good management practice (e.g., finfish grow out). Examples where this is not suitable could include where aquatic animals may be too small to effectively collect (e.g., shrimp farming). Record keeping on the numbers of, and reason for, mortalities is expected.	
Conclusion		

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.06 Biosecurity

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) dead fish are removed and disposed of in a responsible manner, and
- 2) all removed mortalities are recorded, classified and received a post-mortem analysis.

ASC intends to clarify this requirement in its upcoming Salmon Standard V 1.4 Audit Manual

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 5.1, Indicators 8.11, 8.12, 8.13, 8.18:*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 5.1, Indicators 8.11, 8.12, 8.13, 8.18:*](#)

C.1.07 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires the aquaculture facility to have operational fish health management practices. Evidence must be shown that these address the following elements (where relevant to the species, scale, and production system covered by the Standard's scope):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective biosecurity 2. Identification and use of suitable available vaccines 3. Introductions and transfers of farmed animals (where relevant, which is overseen by an aquatic animal health professional. 	<p>It is expected that the standard will contain sufficient elements and/ or audit of culture practices for an operational program relative to the scale, species, and production systems covered by the standard's scope, including a focus on disease prevention (e.g. the use of vaccines). The content of the measures are expected to be overseen (but not necessarily full time employment) of an aquatic animal health professional.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a Fish Health Management Plan is developed and implemented – for both the grow-out site and the smolt site – that, among other items, covers this topic. The Farm Health Management Plan is developed in collaboration with, and signed-off by, a veterinarian, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 8.12, 8.18</i> 	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.07 Biosecurity

2) compliant smolts are 100% vaccinated for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists.

- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 8.12, 8.18](#)

C.1.07.02 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to determine the cause of death when losses are significantly greater than expected and the cause is unclear, and to use laboratory analysis where feasible.	Verification that policies or other systems are in place to respond to these situations is expected.	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires: 1) all mortalities are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis, and 2) If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive, the standard requires off-site laboratory diagnosis. A qualified professional must conduct the diagnosis. Once 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.4:</u> • <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.4:</u> 	

C.1.07.03 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.07.03 Biosecurity

The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement, and maintain a written Aquatic Animal Health Management Plan (AAHMP) which is overseen by an aquatic animal health professional, and at a minimum, is compliant with the following GSSI Components; C.1.01, C.1.02, C.1.03, C.1.04, C.1.05, C.1.06, C.1.07, C.1.08, C.1.09, C.1.10.	<p>Verification that the farm has a written AAHMP, and that the content covers the necessary content and that it is fully in operation and frequently reviewed is expected. Evidence of oversight could include an interview with the health professional or a signature on the documents.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.1.01, C.1.02, C.1.03, C.1.04, C.1.05, C.1.06, C.1.07, C.1.08, C.1.09, and C.1.10.</p>
---	---

Conclusion	References
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases, parasites and environmental conditions relevant for good fish health, including implementing corrective action when required. The standard requires site visits by a designated veterinarian at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager at least once a month. A designated veterinarian is defined as the professional responsible for health management on the farm who has the legal authority to diagnose disease and prescribe medication. In some countries such as Norway, a fish health biologist or other professional has equivalent professional qualifications and is equivalent to a veterinarian for purposes of these standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.1 and 5.1.2</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.1 and 5.1.2</i>

C.1.07.05 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquatic animals are vaccinated against all relevant/important diseases for which vaccines are both available and effective.	Relevant/important pathogens could include those identified by the aquatic animal health professional and sources such as the OIE/ transboundary disease lists. Verification, such as a review of justification by the aquatic animal health professional as to which vaccines could be used and records/receipts for vaccinations is expected.

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.07.05 Biosecurity

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because there is an indicator that requires that all smolt are vaccinated for selected diseases in a given area based on the availability and efficacy of vaccines

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 8.1.2*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 8.1.2*](#)

C.1.07.06 Biosecurity

GSSI Component

The standard requires suitable performance based metric limits on survival rate (or similar system that incorporates survival rates (e.g. recovery rate)) or similar criteria that demonstrate that the aquatic health management practices are effective.

Guidance

A suitable performance based metric limit could include those set on a species specific basis using industry average data (e.g., a minimal % relative to say industry average data) or based on farm monitoring records. Other possible criteria may include metric limits on veterinary drug usage. Verification that the metric limits have been met and set based on a suitable monitoring and record keeping system is expected.

Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.1.08.02

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because there is an indicator that requires that viral disease related mortality to be less than or equal to 10%. Additionally, unexplained mortality must be less than or equal to 40% of all mortalities and farms must develop and implement site specific mortality reduction plans with defined targets

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.5, 5.1.6 and 5.1.7*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.5, 5.1.6 and 5.1.7*](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.07.07 Biosecurity		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that a legally binding, appropriately defined, and operational area management system is in place that ensures that all participant aquaculture facilities use common and, where applicable, coordinated practices for the shared management of aquatic animal disease risk.	Not applicable where the aquaculture facility is physically or sufficiently isolated that disease transfer is highly unlikely.	
	Common practices for the shared management of aquatic animal disease risk are expected to include suitable requirements to prevent disease outbreaks, share disease status information, and, where appropriate, coordinate response actions in the presence of a disease, such as the use of veterinary drugs. Requirements are expected to be enforced through an agreement with the regulator or legally binding agreement of the producers in the area (e.g. an MOU or similar document).	
	An appropriately defined area is expected to have boundaries that are defined according to the ability to realistically manage aquatic disease risk within it.	
	Verification is expected to include a review evidence of the presence of the system and the common and coordinated practices applied (e.g., such as written records, meeting notes, contractual agreements and/or interviews).	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) an Area Based Management (ABM) Scheme is developed and implemented, that covers at least the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application and rotation of treatments - coordination of stocking - fallowing - monitoring schemes - setting and revising a maximum ABM lice load, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 3.1.1,, 3.1.3, 5.4.2, 5.4.4</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 3.1.1,, 3.1.3, 5.4.2, 5.4.4</i> 	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.07.07 Biosecurity

2) in addition to having an ABM, 4 indicators of the ASC Salmon Standard v1.3 explicitly refer to the ABM as well: 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 5.4.2 and 5.4.4.

C.1.08 Off-Farm Disease Transmissions

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish and implement procedures for the disposal of mortalities using appropriate methods that prevent the spread of disease.	Given the nature of this requirement, the standard may appear as a general requirement; however verification that practices are employed is expected. Relevant examples can be found in Articles 4.7.7 and 4.7.8 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code 2015 (see www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_aquatic_animal_waste.htm).	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 100% of dead fish are removed and disposed of in a responsible manner 2) 100% of mortalities recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis 3) evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code at the smolt site and grow-out site 4) 100% vaccination of fish for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.4.3, 8.12, 8.18</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.4.3, 8.12, 8.18</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.09 Off-Farm Disease Transmissions

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures and/or systems to reduce the likelihood of disease and parasite transmission within the aquaculture facility and between it and natural aquatic fauna.	<p>Appropriate procedures or systems are expected to address both on farm disease and parasite transfer (such as the ability to quarantine diseased stocks, separating equipment) as well as between the facility and natural fauna (such as disinfection of effluents for diseased stocks, fallowing). The approach taken would be expected to be relevant to the species, production system, scale of production, and legal requirements. Can be “not applicable” with suitable justification provided by the scheme.</p> <p>Where pathogens or parasites are a known concern (for example, sea lice on farmed salmon); Appropriate procedures or systems are expected to include specific requirements or actions defined in the standard or specified by the aquaculture facility through a suitable risk assessment or other evidence such as local or national regulations. Appropriate management measures in these cases could include treatment trigger levels of parasite numbers on the farm-facility or siting requirements that require that the aquaculture facility is located at suitable distances from wild populations.</p> <p>Verification that the management measures are suitable and employed is expected.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) all dead fish are removed and disposed of in a responsible manner, 2) all salmon on the site are a single year class, 3) if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, the farm has to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - report the issue to the Area Based Management (ABM) Scheme and to the appropriate regulatory authority - increase monitoring and surveillance on the farm and within the ABM Scheme - promptly made findings publicly available, 4) farms operate in compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code, 5) if an OIE-notifiable disease is confirmed on the farm, evidence that: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V1.3, Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 5.1.3, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 8.1.8:</u> • <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V1.3, Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6,</u>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.09 Off-Farm Disease Transmissions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the farm has, at minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected - the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM - the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease - the farm promptly made findings publicly available, <p>6) 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 II-1,</p> <p>7) establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM Scheme and for the individual farm</p> <p>8) frequent on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available within seven days of testing,</p> <p>9) 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,</p> <p>10) 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.</p> <p>11) in areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish</p>	<p><u>3.1.7, 5.1.3, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 8.1.8</u></p>
---	---

C.1.09.01 Off-Farm Disease Transmissions

GSSI Component	Guidance
Where the production system allows the discharge of parasites that are a known concern to	<p>Examples of pathogens or parasites that are a known concern include sea lice on farmed salmon; appropriate practices could be specified in the standard or a suitable risk assessment or other justification could be given to determine whether or not this Supplementary Component is applicable.</p> <p>The certification scheme or standard is expected to address the monitoring of pathogen or parasite numbers on wild fish or a similar system that is likely to be effective at finding evidence of impact if it's occurring (possibly performed by third</p>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.09.01 Off-Farm Disease Transmissions

local wildlife, the standard requires monitoring and adapting farming practices based on parasite prevalence on wild fish.

parties or government), and that appropriate trigger limits (e.g., expert opinions, scientific literature) and adaptive management plans exist and are employed to reduce the pressure on wild populations (such as by treating fish, fallowing, etc.).

Verification that the system is operational is also expected.

Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.1.09

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) a demonstrated commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks,
- 2) 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) 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,
- 4) 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,
- 5) in areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2. Requirement: 0.1 mature female sea lice
- 6) Frequent on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available within seven days of testing

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7 and 5.2.5*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7 and 5.2.5*](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.1.10 Record Keeping		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to maintain records on veterinary drug and chemical usage and the rationale for their use.	Verification that suitable records are maintained is expected. Suitable records are expected to include type, concentration, and dosage, method of administration and withdrawal times of chemicals and veterinary drugs and the rationale for their use.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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, 2) 100% of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian, and 3) compliance with all withholding periods after treatments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.2.1, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 8.14:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.2.1, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 8.14</i> 	

C.2 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.2 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.2.01 Chemical Usage		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the establishment, implementation and maintenance of an appropriate system for the application of chemicals and veterinary drugs.	An appropriate system could conform to the relevant sections of Article 6.2.7 and 6.2.8 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code (2015) (www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_antibio_resp_prudent_use.htm) or other suitable reference. The system is expected to ensure that the application of the product follows the instructions of the manufacturer or other competent authority. Verification that the system is operational is also expected.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases, parasites and environmental conditions relevant for good fish health, including implementing corrective action when required, 2) site visits by a designated veterinarian at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager at least once a month, 3) 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, 4) no allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.12 8.11, 8.14, 8.15</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.12, 8.11, 8.14, 8.15</i> 	

C.2 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.2.01 Chemical Usage

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>5) 100% of medication events to be prescribed by a veterinarian, and</p> <p>6) no allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO).</p> | |
|---|--|

C.2.02 Chemical Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires appropriate controls for all chemicals, incl. veterinary drugs, that enter the environment during or after use (whether already covered by GSSI Essential Components or not) in order to minimize adverse impacts on environmental quality. Manufacturer's guidance or equivalent directions should be followed, and where appropriate, relevant examples of chemicals that pose a high risk of adverse impacts to environmental quality should be specifically defined by the standard	It is expected that the standard will require all chemicals used by the aquaculture facility and that will enter the environment are at least used according to the manufacturer's guidance (such as on label requirements or Safety Data Sheets (SDS) or, in the case of veterinary drugs, the guidance of the aquatic animal health professional to prevent adverse impacts upon the environment. Chemicals that pose a high risk of adverse impacts to environmental quality, examples of which should be specifically defined by the standard (e.g., copper-based anti-foulant treatments in marine cage aquaculture or anti-parasite or anti-microbe bath treatments), accepting that perceptions regarding high risk and the chemicals involved are subject to rapid change, or identified through a risk based self-assessment by the farmer (e.g., an environmental risk assessment) --or through reference to a recognized relevant classification system (e.g. the UN Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)). It is expected that the standard or the risk-assessment will define any necessary additional requirements to minimize the impacts (e.g., EQS limits for copper residues in the benthic environment).	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) farms to publicly report the weighted number of medicinal treatments, parasticide loads and benthic parasiticide residue levels</p> <p>2) farms to be at or below country entry levels for weighted numbers of medicinal treatments</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.2.6, 5.2.5, 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.2.10,</i>

C . 2 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.2.02 Chemical Usage

- 3) no allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments,
- 4) no allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO),
- 5) if more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles.
- 6) evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code,
- 7) for farms that use copper-treated nets, evidence that nets are not cleaned or treated in situ in the marine environment,
- 8) for any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment,
- 9) 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,
- 10) 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,
- 11) 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, and
- 12) appropriate controls are in place that maintains good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs, thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised.
- 13) The farm to reduce the Weighted Number of Medicinal Treatments, after achieving indicator 5.2.6, with 25% per 2 years until the WNMT is at or below the Global Level
- 14) The farm to monitor parasiticide residue levels annually in the benthic sediment directly outside the AZE.
- 15) no more than 3 antibiotic treatments per production cycle

5.2.11, 5.2.12, 5.2.13, 5.2.14, 5.4.3, Criterion 4.7:

- Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.2.6, 5.2.5, 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.2.10, 5.2.11, 5.2.12, 5.2.13, 5.2.14, 5.4.3, Criterion 4.7:

C.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.3.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility and its daily operations ensure that good culture and hygienic conditions are maintained. Relevant aspects include proper management of all chemicals, fuels and feeds including their safe storage	<p>This is a general Essential Component that covers a range of potential issues depending on the type of production system, species being cultured, and the local environment, and as such there is a need for flexibility in how consistency is achieved. It is expected that the following issues would be addressed and the systems verified to be operational:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate storage of chemicals and fuel (e.g., stored in a lockable, labeled facility, limited access by personnel, leakage prevention – all based on Safety Data Sheets (SDS) (see figure 4.14 of the A Guide to The Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS), available at: www.osha.gov/dsg/hazcom/ghsguideoct05.pdf) - Appropriate storage of feed (e.g., stored separately from sources of contamination, accurately labeled, keeping medicated and nonmedicated feed separated.) - Appropriate pest control (e.g., prevent contamination of feed, chemicals by rodents or insects etc.) - Domestic sewage control/disposal to avoid local contamination - General farm waste (e.g., empty feed bags, household rubbish, food containers etc.). 	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) appropriate controls are in place that maintains good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs, thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised, 2) presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non- biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling), 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.2.6, 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.7.2, 5.1.3, 6.5.1, and 6.5.3:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3,</i>

C . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.3.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

- 3) evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled,
- 4) for any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment,
- 5) 100% of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner,
- 6) percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures and policies on a yearly basis, and
- 7) presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken.

Indicators 2.2.6, 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.7.2, 5.1.3, 6.5.1, and 6.5.3:

C.3.01.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the presence of an active and documented recycling program.	The system is expected to ensure the farm recycles to the maximum extent practicable.	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non- biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.5.1 and 8.8:</u> • <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.5.1 and 8.8:</u> 	

C.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.3.01.02 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain a general waste management system.	An appropriate system is expected to include a baseline of waste generation and actions aimed at reductions, and suitable monitoring. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for the purpose.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) appropriate controls are in place that maintains good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs, thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised, and 2) presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non- biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.2.6, 4.5.1 and 8.8:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.2.6, 4.5.1 and 8.8:</i> 	

C.3.02 General Environmental Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that aquaculture facility infrastructure is appropriately maintained in order to prevent negative environmental impacts, whether from construction, operation or decommissioning (e.g., including the requirement for derelict equipment and	Given the wide variety of production systems in aquaculture specific guidance cannot be provided and flexibility by the evaluator is required using a risk-based approach. Examples could include the requirement for derelict or damaged gear in shellfish or cage aquaculture to be collected and disposed of responsibly, or for that waste from pond construction is not placed in mangrove forests in shrimp farming. It is expected that specific requirements or risk based management systems would be required where appropriate, along with suitable

C.3 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.3.02 General Environmental Management

materials to be collected and disposed of responsibly.)	verification. These requirements may also be included in other Standards, such as sensitive habitat protection or escape prevention.
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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, 2) presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non- biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling), and 3) evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled. 4) 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. 5) For smolt production, 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.4.1, 3.4.4, 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 8.3</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.4.1, 3.4.4, 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 8.3</i>

C.3.02.01 General Environmental Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires energy use to be monitored and recorded (e.g. total fuels or energy).	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that energy use is being appropriately monitored and recorded using appropriate methods.
Conclusion	References

C . 3 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.3.02.01 General Environmental Management

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 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. Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle,
- 2) records of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1, and
- 3) documentation of GHG emissions of the feed used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2.
- 4) Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the smolt production facility
- 5) Records of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment

- [ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.3, 8.9 and 8.10](#)
- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.3, 8.9 and 8.10](#)

C.4 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.4.01 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that can trace aquatic feed ingredients including fish meal and fish oil (>1% inclusion) to the species and, at least, to the country of origin.	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed, 2) FishSource score (Appendix IV-3) for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived. <p>Requirement: All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 6,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) 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, and 4) feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from: none by-products or trimmings from Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.1.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Appendix IV-3</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.1.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4:</i> 	

C . 4 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C402 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer who produces feed that excludes fishmeal and fish oil from endangered species and is validated as such.	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.</p> <p>Endangered species are expected to be defined in the Standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cites.org for more information.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires: 1) that feed does not contain fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from: by-products or trimmings from Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed.</p> <p>2) Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.4, 4.3.5</i> • <i>Audit manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.4, 4.3.5</i>

C.4.03 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that prohibits the	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other

C . 4 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.4.03 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

use of fishmeal and fish oil from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (I.U.U.).	relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes</p> <p>1) an indicator that requires that feed does not contain fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from: by-products or trimmings from Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed.</p> <p>2) Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.4, 4.3.5</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.4, 4.3.5</i>

C.4.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that has a written policy which includes assessment of source fishery status and identification of improvement needs and work plan to deliver improvements. The policy must include a commitment and timeline to source aquaculture and fishery products from responsible/best practice sources, such as those certified a standard benchmarked at minimum consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines or by identified independent risk assessment.	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.
Conclusion	References

C.4 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.4.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil
- 2) presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries.

- [ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, and 4.3.5:](#)
- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3 and 4.3.5:](#)

C.4.04.01 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires independent verification that the feed manufacturer sources, in cases where whole fish ingredients are greater than 1% of content;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fishmeal and fish oil that are traceable back to the species, fishery and country of origin, and - fishmeal and fish oil with less risk of detrimental environmental impacts, such as those certified to a standard benchmarked at minimum consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines and that uncertified sources must be identified as low risk by independent risk assessment or must come from sources that are part of an effective Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) towards a suitable certification or that have been assessed to show limited impacts on stock status and 	<p>Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish.</p> <p>Effective FIPs could be those consistent with the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions (2015). Guidelines for Supporting Fishery Improvement Projects. www.solutionsforseafood.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/03/Alliance-FIP-Guidelines-3.7.15.pdf</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.4.01, C.4.02, C.4.03, and C.4.04</p>

C . 4 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.4.04.01 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

ecosystem impacts as defined in Principle 3 of the FAO (2011).

Aquaculture Development. 5. Use of Wild Fish as Feed in Aquaculture.

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed,
- 2) the FishSource score for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived. Requirement: All individual scores ≥ 6 , and biomass score ≥ 6 ,
- 3) demonstration of third- party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil
- 4) feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from: none by-products or trimmings from Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed,
- 5) presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries, and
- 6) the policy should be written and include an assessment of source fishery status and identification of improvement needs and work plan to deliver improvements. The policy must include a commitment and timeline to source aquaculture and fishery products from responsible/best practice sources, such as those certified a standard benchmarked at minimum consistent with relevant Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations' (FAO) eco-labelling guidelines or by identified independent risk assessment.

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4 and 4.3.5;*](#)
[*4.4.1*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4 and 4.3.5;*](#)
[*4.4.1*](#)

C . 4 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C40402 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires independent verification that the feed manufacturer only sources fishmeal and fish oil (greater than 1% content) from whole fish certified to a standard benchmarked to be, at minimum, consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines.	<p>Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.4.01, C.4.02, C.4.03, C.4.04, and C.4.04.01</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed, 2) prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived. Requirement: All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 6, 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) feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from: none by-products or trimmings from Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed, 5) presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries, and 6) the policy should be written and include an assessment of source fishery status and identification of improvement needs and work plan to deliver improvements. The policy must include a commitment and timeline to source aquaculture and fishery products from responsible/best practice sources, such as those certified a standard 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4 and 4.3.5:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4 and 4.3.5:</i>

C.4 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C40402 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

benchmarked at minimum consistent with relevant FAO's eco-labelling guidelines or by identified independent risk assessment.

C.4.04.03 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires independent verification that the feed manufacturer only sources terrestrial feed ingredients (where greater than 1% of content) that are certified to an ecolabel or risk assessed not to present significant environmental impacts.	<p>Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer.</p> <p>Examples of ecolabels in terrestrial feed ingredients include the Roundtable for sustainable soy and the Roundtable for sustainable palm oil. Accepted ecolabels are expected to have met credibility thresholds for content and process requirements relevant to the industry they represent (examples could include full ISEAL members, ISO Guidelines or other FAO Guidelines).</p> <p>Risk assessment may include, but is not limited to: (For plants) sensitive habitat protection, run-off (nutrients), chemicals, water use, predator/ pest controls, and legal compliance. (For Animals): Antimicrobials, disease prevention, feed efficiency and ingredients, waste.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) all soya or soya-derived ingredients in feed are certified to Roundtable for Responsible Soy or equivalent.</p> <p>2) All farms must show evidence of traceability of the feed producer for all ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.4.1, 4.4.2</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 4.4.1, 4.4.2</i>

C.4 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.4.04.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the efficient use of fishmeal and fish oil relative to the production system and the species being farmed.	<p>Suitable approaches are expected to include setting a suitable maximum Fish in: Fish Out Ratios, FFDRm (Forage Fish Dependency Ratio for Fish Meal) and FFDRo (Forage Fish Dependency Ratio for Fish Oil), or other calculations which reflect the importance of limited wild-harvested aquatic resources, this could include be species specific performance based metric limits. Consideration for extreme events (such as disease or escapes) is permissible. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as from squid and krill. Verification is expected to include compliance at the aquaculture facility level.</p> <p>Where fishmeal and fish oil are used in feed, aligned standards will also be considered in alignment C.4.07</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV-1). Requirement: < 1.2, and</p> <p>2) Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV-1), OR, maximum amount of Eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) and Docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) from direct marine sources (calculated according to Appendix IV-2). Requirement: FFDRo < 2.52, OR, (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and Appendix IV-1:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and Appendix IV-1:</i>

C.4 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.4.04.05 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility sources feed from a manufacturer that assures the fish meal and fish oil used in their production based upon aquaculture trimmings (if greater than 1% inclusion) can also be traceable back to the origin fishery and does not come from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (I.U.U.) and does not contain species on the IUCN red list. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as those from squid and krill.	<p>Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as from squid and krill.</p> <p>Verification of the use of compliant feed by the aquaculture facility is expected. Suitable evidence of compliance could include document evidence of sources supplying the feed mill, 3rd party certifications of source aquaculture facilities and/or rendering plants, legal permits or declarations etc.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed, 2) feed can not contain fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products or trimmings from Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed, and 3) 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1 and 4.3.4:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1 and 4.3.4:</i>

C . 4 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.4.05 Feed Biosecurity		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard prohibits the use of raw fish as a direct feed source in grow-out.	<p>0% of feed at any time during production (under the scope of certification) may contain “whole fish” or “wet fish”, which includes any form of uncooked wet fish (whole or chopped or frozen etc.), which includes direct feed, supplemental feeding, or on-farm made applications. Alternatives would be to require 100% use of commercial dry pelleted feeds.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a suitable review of evidence, such as feed use records, visual observation, and financial records in aquaculture industries where this is common practice.</p> <p>A non-applicable (N/A) designation is only acceptable where 100% of production under the scope of the standard (including species, production intensity and production systems covered) uses entirely commercial dry pelleted feeds (e.g., Atlantic salmon).</p>	
Conclusion		References
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because it has clarified via QA 26 that raw, whole fish or parts thereof are not permitted under the Salmon Standard.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QA 26
ASC intends to clarify this requirement in its upcoming Salmon Standard V 1.4 Audit Manual		

C.4 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.4.06 Feed Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standards prohibits aquatic feed protein from the same species and genus as the species being farmed.	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer).	
Conclusion The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires that feed does not contain 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, whole fish and fish meal from the same species and family as the species being farmed. ASC intends to clarify this requirement in its upcoming Salmon Standard V 1.4 Audit Manual		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.4</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.3.4</i>

C.4.07 Feeding Efficiency

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
Where applicable, the standard requires that the aquaculture facility has suitable measures in place to ensure that feed is used efficiently at the individual production unit level.	Suitable measures are expected to be part of a wider feed management system, such as the measurement of FCR (Feed Conversion Ratio) and FIFO (Fish In Fish Out ratio) as well as documented records of visual feed response and staff training. Verification that the measures are operational and fit for purpose is also expected.	
Conclusion The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 1) Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV-1). Requirement: < 1.2, 2) Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV-1). Requirement: FFDRo < 2.52, and		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 6.11.1</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 6.11.1</i>

C . 4 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.4.07 Feeding Efficiency

3) Evidence that the company regularly performs training of staff in fish husbandry, general farm and fish escape management and health and safety procedures.

C.4.08 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that appropriate records are kept on all feed use. At a minimum this must include: feed source, feed Batch/Lot/ID number, date of purchase, and feed conversion ratio (FCR) MT	Appropriate records are expected to include those stated in the component, and, where appropriate, feed inclusion percentages of fishmeal and fish oil or a fish in: fish out ratio. Appropriate records are expected to be kept for each individual production unit. Verification of appropriate record keeping and suitable documentation from feed manufacturers is also expected.
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Traceability of feed ingredients more than 1% of feed 2) All farms to maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 4.1.1</i>

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.01 Benthic Habitats

GSSI Component	Guidance
For cage production systems, the standard requires appropriate management measures for preventing excessive impacts of aquaculture facility waste on benthic environments, including impacts of a biological, chemical or physical nature.	Appropriate measures for marine cage production systems are expected to consider biological, chemical and physical impacts and additional chemical residues resulting from culture practices and should use appropriate sampling methods. Where relevant, they should conform to ISO 16665. The use of systems combining suitable allowable zones of effect and environmental quality standards (EQS) of effect are expected. Verification that the measures are operational and fit for purpose is expected. Evidence of the prevention of adverse impacts could include comparisons with baseline conditions, reference locations, or standardized limits with a suitable justification for their use. Where adverse impacts are detected it is expected that appropriate mitigation measures/ remedial action for the identified adverse impacts on the surrounding natural ecosystem are applied. Sanctions that address situations where EQS' are exceeded and there is no effective remediation within a suitable timeframe could include withholding certification. While generally recognized as a marine cage issue, benthic impacts can also occur in freshwater cage systems. The degree of management measures should reflect the degree of potential impacts relative to the environment, production system, species, and size of production.
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>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. Requirement: Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) OR Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l,</p> <p>2) faunal index score indicating good to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1. Requirement: AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI6) score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 2.1, Indicator 8.3</u> • <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard</u>

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.01 Benthic Habitats

3) number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1. Requirement: ≥ 2 highly abundant7 taxa that are not pollution indicator species, and	<u>V 1.3, Criterion 2.1, Indicator 8.3:</u>
4) definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible modeling system.	
5) biological impact assessments at smolt facilities	

C.5.02 Predator Control

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard prohibits the use of any lethal predator control techniques on endangered species. Exceptions for worker safety and where euthanization is an act of mercy are acceptable and expected.	Verification of the predator controls used, appropriate record keeping, and details of the endangered species in the region of the aquaculture facility are expected. Examples of supporting evidence of non-use could include interview, appropriate signage, and mortality records. Exceptions for worker safety and where euthanization is an act of mercy are acceptable and expected. Endangered species are expected to be defined in the standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix I), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 1) that the number of mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on the farm is 0. In addition, Appendix I-3 (Biodiversity-focused impact assessment) requires identification of endangered and sensitive species that could be impacted by farm operations. 2) Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action against a predator:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.2, 2.5.3, and 2.5.4 Appendix I-3</u> <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4 Appendix I-3:</u> 	

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.02 Predator Control

- A. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action
- B. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager
- C. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority
- 3) Evidence that information about any lethal incidents on the farm has been made easily publicly available

C.5.02.01 Predator Control

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility uses non-lethal predator control measures on birds, mammals, and where relevant, reptiles.	<p>Verification of the predator controls used is expected. Examples of supporting evidence could include interview, visual inspection, and appropriate signage. Exceptions for human health and welfare and where euthanization is an act of mercy are acceptable and expected. Exclusions for accidental mortalities are also acceptable. This does not apply to pests (e.g., rats).</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.5.02</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action against a predator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. all other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action, b. approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager, c. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.3 and 2.5.6:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V</i>

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.02.01 Predator Control

2) 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, and

[1.3, Indicator 2.5.3 and 2.5.6:](#)

C.5.02.02 Predator Control

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard excludes aquaculture facilities where a history of repeated accidental or deliberate mortality of endangered species has occurred.	<p>Accidental mortality can include those as a result of entanglement etc.</p> <p>Repeated mortality means on more than one occasion over a suitable period of time (expected to be over one production cycle). Verification is expected and examples of supporting evidence include employee and local community interviews, appropriate signage, and interaction records.</p> <p>Endangered species are expected to be defined in the standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.5.02 and C.5.02.01</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) no mortalities of endangered or red- listed marine mammals or birds on the farm,</p> <p>2) maximum number of lethal incidents on the farm over the prior two years of < 9, with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals, and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.6:</u>

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.02.02 Predator Control

3) 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.

- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.2, 2.5.5 and 2.5.6:*](#)

C.5.03 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that in areas where damage of sensitive habitats has occurred previously, and where restoration is possible and effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed.	It is expected that the standard will define sensitive habitat in context with its scope and an appropriate date to be used prior to which legal impacts can be "grandfathered in" and provide supporting evidence for the date. Verification at the aquaculture facility is expected to include whether restoration is necessary, to what degree (evidence could include maps, aerial photos, satellite images, government certification etc.) and whether that the active restoration is suitable (i.e., will it be successful and restore a suitable area of sensitive habitat).
Conclusion	References
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 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, and 2) Appendix I-3 Biodiversity Focussed impact assessment (under point 4) reads the exact same indicator as provided by GSSI: "Where damage of sensitive habitats has been caused by the farm (as defined in the impact assessment) previously and where restoration is possible and effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.4.1, Appendix I-3:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.4.1, Appendix I-3:</i>

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.03.01 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard ensures that no net loss of sensitive habitats on an area basis has occurred as a result of aquaculture facility construction, conversion and culture practices.	<p>It is expected that the Standard will define (with supporting evidence) sensitive habitat in context with its scope, the basis for a “no net loss” claim, and an appropriate date to be used prior to which legal impacts can be “grandfathered in” (the date must be before major period of significant historical habitat loss for the production system that the certification covers). Verification at the aquaculture facility is expected to include whether restoration is necessary, to what degree (evidence could include maps, aerial photos, satellite images, government certification etc.) and whether the active restoration is or is likely to be successful at restoring the sensitive habitat. Offsetting is allowed.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.5.03</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires no allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs).</p> <p>The following exceptions shall be made for siting in a protected area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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). -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. -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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.4.2:</u> • <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.4.2:</u>

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.03.04 Preventing Habitat Biodiversity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that a suitable process has been put in place to protect sensitive habitat and endangered species prior to expansions to the aquaculture facility that occur after initial certification.	<p>A suitable process could include an EIA that be required to show evidence of negligible impacts to sensitive habitats.</p> <p>Endangered species are expected to be defined in the Standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.</p> <p>Verification is also expected.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires:</p> <p>1) Evidence of the farms potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outline in Appendix I-3,</p> <p>2) the farm is not sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Area (HCVA).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.4.1, 2.4.2, Appendix I-3:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.4.1, 2.4.2, Appendix I-3:</i> 	

C.5.03.05 Preventing Habitat Impacts

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that environmental monitoring records are made available upon request because of the aquaculture facilities use of a public resource (e.g., water).	Relevant records could include water quality, veterinary drug and chemical use, diseases, escapees, predator incidents. Verification is expected.

C.5 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.5.03.05 Preventing Habitat Impacts

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) evidence that information about any lethal incidents on the farm has been made easily publicly available,
- 2) frequent on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available within seven days of testing,
- 3) 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,
- 4) estimated unexplained loss of farmed salmon is made publicly available,
- 5) presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production,
- 6) evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, the farm has:
 - a. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority,
 - b. Increased monitoring and surveillance on the farm and within the ABM,
 - c. Promptly made findings publicly available, and
- 7) If an OIE-notifiable disease is confirmed on the farm, evidence that:
 - a. the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected,
 - b. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM,
 - c. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease,
 - d. the farm promptly made findings publicly available.
- 8) that IPM-measures are implemented and publicly available.

References

- [ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.4, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.4.3, 5.2.9, 5.2.15, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, Appendix VI:](#)
- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.5.4, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.4.3, 5.2.9, 5.2.15, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, Appendix VI:](#)

C.6 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.6.01 Record Keeping		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the establishment, implementation and maintenance of an appropriate record keeping system for all seed that is intentionally stocked.	<p>An appropriate records system may include source of the seed, date of purchase, stocking density, vaccination record of the seed, and stocked seed batch identification.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires:</p> <p>1) accuracy of counting technology for record keeping and records of mortalities</p> <p>In Appendix II, point 2, Stocking: Records must demonstrate that all stocked fish within the ABM are of the same year class and that stocking dates were coordinated with other farms.</p> <p>2) records of mortalities, stocking count, harvest count and escapes</p> <p>3) Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single year class</p> <p>4) At least 98% accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish</p> <p>5) 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.1.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 5.4.1, 8.7</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.1.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 5.4.1, 8.7</i> 	

C . 6 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.6.01.01 Hatchery Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires that all intentionally stocked seed come from a source hatchery that has been independently-verified to be legally compliant and has an Aquatic Animal Health Management Plan (AAHMP) which is overseen by an aquatic animal health professional and is, at a minimum, consistent with the following GSSI Essential Components; C.1.01, C.1.02, C.1.06, C.1.08. Verification that an established, implemented and maintained appropriate system for recording the source, stocking and health status of broodstock (done either by the hatchery or through a traceability system back to the broodstock facility) is required.</p>	<p>Legal alignment is expected to include applicable local/international/ national laws/CITES laws and cover species introductions and transfers of live aquatic animals requirements (where relevant), including legal brood stock sourcing. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence of the independence and suitability of the hatchery source (e.g., audit report, certificate, benchmarking result). An appropriate records system is expected to include source of the seed, date of purchase, results of disease/health status tests, vaccination record of the seed, stocking density, and stocked brood stock batch identification. Verification that the system is operational and fit for purpose is expected.</p> <p>C.6.03 will not be applicable to aligned standards.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality, 2) compliance with labor laws and regulations, 3) evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites, 4) 100% 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, 5) 100% of smolt groups tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm, 6) 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, 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 8.1, 8.2, 8.11, 8.12, 8.13, 8.14, 8.15, 8.17, 8.18:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 8.1, 8.2, 8.11, 8.12,</i>

C . 6 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.6.01.01 Hatchery Seed

7) no allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, and	<u>8.13, 8.14, 8.15,</u>
8) evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	<u>8.17, 8.18:</u>
9) no allowance of use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO	

C.6.02 Wild Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that where the deliberate use of wild seed is justifiable, it is collected in a manner that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensures controls are in place so that the collection of seed is not detrimental to the status of the wild target and non-target populations, nor that of the wider ecosystem. This requires a documented management approach that ensures those wild populations are not overfished and not subject to recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, and avoids, minimizes or mitigates fishing impacts on essential habitats and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear; 	<p>Expected examples of “justifiable use” include where there is a lack of commercially-available hatchery-raised seed, inability/lack of technology to hatchery-raised the farmed species, or passive collection of mollusks. Justification could be offered at the standard or aquaculture facility level. Verification is expected to include the need to provide suitable evidence by the aquaculture facility (e.g., a summary report written by a credible 3rd party on the source fishery, a self-certification by the appropriate management authority, a 3rd party fishery certification that verifies suitable compliance).</p> <p>A documented management approach is expected to follow Component D.3.01 where the standard requires the existence of documented management approaches or other management framework covering the unit of certification and the stock under consideration, including management measures consistent with achieving management objectives for the stock under consideration. Expected outcomes of the management approach are described in the Guidance of D.6.01 Target Stock Status, D.6.05 Non-Target Catches, D.6.06 Endangered Species, and D.6.07 Habitat, respectively. Definitions of terms related to wild fisheries can be found in Section D terms of the Glossary.</p>

C.6 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.6.02 Wild Seed

- Avoids the use of environmentally damaging collection practices; And ensures that the source fishery is regulated by an appropriate authority.	Examples of environmentally damaging collection practices include blast, poison, and Muro-ami fishing practices.
Conclusion	References
This Component is not-applicable as the capture of wild seed is not practiced in salmon farming.	n/a

C6.03 Hatchery Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that hatchery-raised seed are free from relevant/important pathogens before stocking for grow-out.	Relevant/important pathogens are expected to include those identified by the aquatic health professional and sources such as the OIE/ transboundary disease lists (See Chapter 1.3 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code 2015 http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/aquatic-code/access-online/). Verification of suitable measures is expected to include reviews of disease-testing methods, the disease tested for, and the results (including ISO 23893-1:2007), and the vaccination record of the seed. This could form part of the aquatic animal health management plan.	
Conclusion		References
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 1) 100% of smolt groups tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm, 2) 100% 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,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 8.11., 8.12.,</u>

C . 6 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C6.03 Hatchery Seed

- 3) evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites,
- 4) 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,
- 5) no allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, and
- 6) evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.

8.13, 8.14, 8.15. and 8.18

- *Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 8.11, 8.12, 8.13, 8.14, 8.15. and 8.18*

C.7 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.7.01 Escapes	
GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires that the aquaculture facility establishes, implements, and maintains an appropriate system to minimize the unintentional release or escape of cultured species. This should include monitoring and management of the physical facilities and practices</p>	<p>An appropriate system is expected to be based on an evaluation of the likelihood of events and the magnitude of impacts on surrounding environment (where risk assessments are used they met use a suitable scientific method and taking into consideration, siting, culture practices, local environmental conditions, including extreme events, and other relevant uncertainties) according to the precautionary approach and possible impacts on surrounding natural ecosystems, including fauna, flora, and habitat. Specific requirements stated in the standard are acceptable.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence of an operational and fit for purpose system.</p> <p>The monitoring of the management practices could include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Measures for escape detection ii) Monitoring for and record keeping of escapes events iii) Suitable training of employees iv) Incident management and infrastructure, including response or recapture measures. v) Regular monitoring and maintenance of the culture system vi) Regular review and failure analysis vii) containment infrastructure <p>(Relative to the species being farmed and the production system individual elements can be “Not Applicable” with these considerations).</p>

C.7 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.7.01 Escapes

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) a maximum number of escapees in the most recent production cycle of 300,
- 2) accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers of $\geq 98\%$,
- 3) estimated unexplained loss of farmed salmon is made publicly available, and
- 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.

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 8.6*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmo Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 8.6*](#)

C.7.01.01 Escapes

GSSI Component

The standard excludes from certification (or decertifies) aquaculture facilities that have experienced repeated escape events over a representative number of production cycles.

Guidance

Repeated escape events is expected to be considered in terms of the numbers of aquatic animals stocked and the length of the production cycle. Escapes due to factors outside of the aquaculture facility's control can be exempt. Examples of representative number of production cycles include 3 or more for production cycles less than 1.5 years, 2 for production cycles over 1.5 years, 1 for production cycles over 3 years.

Verification is expected to include a review of evidence, such as monitoring records, interviews with employees and the local community.

Conclusion

REMOVED AFTER BC REVIEW The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2:*](#)

C.7 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.7.01.01 Escapes

- 1) a maximum number of escapees in the most recent production cycle of 300,
- 2) accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers of $\geq 98\%$, and
- 3) the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) should raise a major non-conformity where minor non-conformities are repeatedly raised against a particular requirement.

- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2:*](#)
- [*Certification and Accreditation Requirements V 2.2 - Section 17.10.1.1.b:*](#)

C.7.01.02 Escapes

GSSI Component	Guidance
Within detection limitations, the standard requires a stringent maximum cap on the total number of escaped fish that would lead to the loss of certification.	Escapes due to factors outside of the aquaculture facility's control can be exempt. Stringent escape limits are expected to be pragmatic and set to account for the detection limits of the counting system and relevant for the production system and species (e.g., if counting accuracy is $\pm 3\%$, then a stringent limit could be interpreted as 4-6% of the stocked population). Verification is expected to include a review of evidence, such as monitoring records, interviews with employees and the local community.
Conclusion	References
The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a maximum number of escapees in the most recent production cycle of 300, 2) accuracy of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers of $\geq 98\%$, and 3) the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) should raise a major non-conformity where minor non-conformities are repeatedly raised against a particular requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2:</i> • <i>ASC CAR 2.2</i>

C.7 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.7.01.04 Escapes

GSSI Component	Guidance
Where a non-established, non-native species has been shown to be or has potential to be a successful invasive species, the standard requires that they are controlled by strict effective escape impact prevention and mitigation measures.	Effective measures are expected to include sourcing only sterile, polyploidy, or mono-sex seed or physical isolation. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence of operational and fit for purpose measures (e.g., hatchery records, visual inspection (aquaculture facility and/or aquatic animal)).
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ASC Salmon Standard, 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) 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.2.1 and 3.2.2:</u> • <u>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.2.1 and 3.2.2:</u>

C.7 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.7.02 Genetically Modified Organisms

GSSI Component	Guidance
In the case where the culture of GMO organisms is permitted, the standard requires a suitable evaluation of the risk of environmental impacts.	A suitable evaluation is expected to have been performed using an appropriate scientific method that assesses the likelihood of events and the magnitude of impacts, and take into account relevant uncertainties according to the precautionary approach. The evaluation should consider the possible impacts on genetic diversity, aquatic communities and ecosystems. Where ICES Code of Practice on the Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms 2005 is relevant, consistency with these requirements on genetically modified organisms (GMO) is also expected. Verification is expected to include a review of supporting evidence.
Conclusion	References
Not applicable, ASC Standard prohibits the culture of transgenic salmon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.3:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 3.3:</i>

C . 8 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.8 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.8.01 Salinization	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility establishes, implements, and maintains an appropriate system that addresses the impact of salinization of freshwater resources and the surrounding environment by the aquaculture facility.	<p>An exemption for standards that do not cover land-based saline water systems is expected.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are expected to be based on risk assessments or standardized requirements. Controls could include relevant monitoring of freshwater resources (e.g., groundwater resources, local water bodies, local soils) for salinity changes and measures such as pond-linings, limiting groundwater use and other control techniques. The standard is expected to prohibit the aquaculture facility to contributing to changing freshwater resources and the surrounding environment to saline conditions. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose, such as a visual inspection of the site.</p>
Conclusion	References
Most salmon farms are marine cage culture systems. Any land-based salmon farms seeking ASC certification would be required to adhere to the RAS Module V 1.0.	n/a

C.8 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.8.02 Water Use		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
Where appropriate (e.g. land-based freshwater ponds supplied with groundwater and all culture systems where water resources are limiting) the standard requires that the aquaculture facility has appropriate management measures for efficient water use.	<p>This requirement is based on Paragraph 47 of the Technical Guidelines on Aquaculture Certification state “Measures should be adopted to promote efficient water management and use, as well as proper management of effluents to reduce impacts on surrounding land, and water resources should be adopted.” GSSI recognizes that standards for efficient water management and use are not common in many current aquaculture standards. Generally it is expected that this Essential Component will only apply to aquaculture facilities that use land-based freshwater ponds supplied with groundwater and all culture systems where water resources are limiting. An exemption for all other production systems is expected. This can also be “not applicable” for standards that do not cover relevant production systems.</p> <p>Management measures may include a general promotion or awareness of efficient water use or actions that may lead to more efficient use. Where groundwater is used the standard is expected to require that the aquaculture facility establish, implement and maintain an appropriate system to prevent aquifer drawdown and negative impacts on freshwater resources and the surrounding environment caused by the facilities operations. Verification that the system is operational and fit for purpose is expected.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
Most salmon farms are marine cage culture systems. Any land-based salmon farms seeking ASC certification would be required to adhere to the RAS Module V 1.0.	n/a	

C . 8 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.8.03 Water Quality	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires, where appropriate, management measures for effluents in order to reduce adverse impacts on the water quality of water bodies receiving effluents. Monitoring of the systems effluents against appropriate criteria is required.	<p>Appropriate measures are expected to include.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring and recording of effluent or receiving water quality, and which may including key parameters that need to be addressed include, where applicable: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Nutrients – Nitrate/Nitrogen (impacts on seawater) ii) Nutrients – Phosphate/Phosphorous (impacts on freshwater) iii) Dissolved oxygen iv) Salinity v) Suspended Solids vi) pH 2. Defined, aquaculture appropriate, maximum reference points (e.g., general concentration limits or aquaculture facility-specific limits) or mandatory systems (e.g., presence of a suitable filter) are defined to prevent pollution 3. Where reference points are exceeded, the scheme either refuses certification or that mitigation methods are employed and monitored to meet a time bound goal to come into compliance. <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose, including visual inspection of the site. Where effluent concentration limits are used for compliance, independent verification of conformance is also expected.</p> <p>“Where appropriate” is expected to include standards that cover production systems that release effluent that has the potential to impact water quality, e.g., fed/intensive aquaculture in ponds and raceways. An exception for marine cage aquaculture and on or offbottom shellfish culture is expected.</p>
Conclusion	References

C . 8 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.8.03 Water Quality

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) weekly average percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO) on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4 of $\geq 70\%$,
- 2) maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/liter DO of 5%,
- 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,
- 4) for jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I- 5, indicating consistency with reference site.
- 5) percentage of fines in the feed at point of entry to the farm (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) of $< 1\%$ by weight of the feed,
- 6) demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of the farm on a production cycle basis, and
- 7) appropriate controls are in place that maintains good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs, thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised.
- 8) Maximum 4kg total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric tonne (t) of fish produced over a 12-month period

- [ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 2.2 and Indicator 2.3.1, 8.4](#)
- [Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Criterion 2.2 and Indicator 2.3.1, 8.4](#)

C.8.03.01 Water Quality

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires suitable specific limits to the nutrient	Suitable specific limits are expected to be specific to the culture practices, and designed to ensure minimal pollution. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the specific limits are met.

C . 8 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.8.03.01 Water Quality

load released to the environment.

Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.8.03

Conclusion

The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) 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) for jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I- 5, indicating consistency with reference site.
- 3) percentage of fines in the feed at point of entry to the farm (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) of < 1% by weight of the feed
- 4) Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per mT over a 12-month period is 4kg/t or less
- 5) Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of the farm on a production cycle basis

References

- [*ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.1, 8.4*](#)
- [*Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicators 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.1, 8.4*](#)

C.9 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

C.9.01 Legal Compliance		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
<p>The standard requires (evidence of) compliance with all local and national laws and regulations relevant to aquaculture, especially concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application of chemicals and veterinary drugs - feed, feed ingredients and fertilizers - habitat and biodiversity (including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where required) - seed sourcing at both source and destination - Escapes and releases - water use, water quality and waste discharge 	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence provided by the aquaculture facility to support compliance with relevant laws. For feed, its ingredients & fertilizers, verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). For seed sourcing this could include international laws (e.g., CITES, OIE and ICES import guidelines) and laws governing introductions and transfers of live aquatic animals.</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Salmon Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use 2) Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws 3) Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labour laws and regulations 4) presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts. 5) Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 8.1, 8.2</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Salmon Standard V 1.3, Indicator 1.1.1</i> 	

C . 9 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

C.9.01 Legal Compliance

permits related to water quality at the smolt supplier level

6) Compliance with labour laws and regulations at the smolt supplier level.

1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 8.1,

8.2

**SECTION C.
AQUACULTURE
CERTIFICATION
STANDARDS - SHRIMP**



C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.01 Antimicrobial Usage		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that the decision to treat with antimicrobial agents, and their subsequent application, is consistent with the Principles for Responsible & Prudent Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Aquatic Animals and other guidance of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code i.e., by the aquatic animal health professional or other relevant competent authority and in response to a diagnosed disease; see Articles 6.2.7 and 6.2.8 of the 2015 Aquatic Animal Health Code).	<p>The standard is expected to prohibit prophylactic usage for growth promotion and require that all antimicrobials are used in response to a diagnosed disease (i.e., by the aquatic animal health professional or other relevant competent authority) and the audit is expected to include a review of suitable evidence (e.g., records of disease testing etc. prescriptions for treatments).</p> <p>The audit is expected to include a review of evidence (such as written records or through interviews) to ensure consistency with OIE guidelines (2015) Article 6.2.7 “The veterinarian or other aquatic animal health professional authorized to prescribe veterinary medicines should indicate precisely to the aquatic animal producer the treatment regime, including the dose, the treatment intervals, the duration of the treatment, the withdrawal period and the amount of antimicrobial agents to be delivered, depending on the dosage and the number of aquatic animals to be treated. The use of antimicrobial agents extra-label/off-label may be permitted in appropriate circumstances in conformity with the relevant legislation” and Article 6.2.8 “Aquatic animal producers should use antimicrobial agents only on the prescription of a veterinarian or other aquatic animal health professional authorized to prescribe veterinary medicines, and follow directions on the dosage, method of application, and withdrawal period.”</p>	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that: 1) prohibits use of antibiotics and medicated feed on ASC -labelled products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.1 and 5.3.2:</i> 	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.01 Antimicrobial Usage

2) prohibits the allowance of antibiotics categorised as critically important by the World Health Organisation, even if permitted by national authorities

- [*Audit Manual ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 5.3.1 and 5.3.2:*](#)

CC.1.01.01 Antimicrobial Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard prohibits the use of antimicrobials listed by the World Health Organization (WHO) as highly and critically important to human health.	<p>The audit is expected to include a review of evidence that supports a claim of no listed antimicrobial usage, this could include independent laboratory testing results, reviews of financial records, inspections of offices and chemical storage facilities.</p> <p>The most recent version of the WHO list is the 3rd edition, which can be found at www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/antimicrobials-third/en/.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <p>1) prohibits use of antibiotics and medicated feed on ASC -labelled products</p> <p>2) prohibits the allowance of antibiotics categorised as critically important by the World Health Organisation, even if permitted by national authorities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 5.3.1 and 5.3.2:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 5.3.1 and 5.3.2:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.01.02 Antimicrobial Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard prohibits aquatic animals treated with antimicrobials from being labeled with its standard; however, antimicrobial application deemed necessary by an aquatic health professional cannot be withheld from aquatic animals solely to preserve the certification status of the production.	<p>The audit is expected to include a review of evidence that supports a claim of no antimicrobial usage, this could include independent laboratory testing results, reviews of financial records, inspections of offices and chemical storage facilities. The standard is expected to ensure the need to treat aquatic animals is prioritized above the certification status.</p> <p>Where a standard complies with the prohibition on all antimicrobials then it will also be considered in alignment with C.1.01 (and the corresponding inclusion of these in Supplementary Component C.1.07.02). Unlabeled products produced by the certified aquaculture facility are still expected to meet the Essential Components C.1.01 (and the corresponding need for compliance with them in in Supplementary Component C.1.07.03).</p>	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) prohibits use of antibiotics and medicated feed on ASC -labelled products 2) prohibits the allowance of antibiotics categorised as critically important by the World Health Organisation, even if permitted by national authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.1 and 5.3.2:</i> • <i>Audit Manual ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.1 and 5.3.2:</i> 	

CC.1.02 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that workers with responsibilities in aquatic animal husbandry have been adequately trained and are aware of their	The audit is expected to include a review of evidence that relevant workers have been appropriately trained and aware of their responsibilities. Examples of suitable evidence could include suitable training or appropriate qualifications, and interviews with staff. The	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.02 Biosecurity

responsibilities in aquatic animal health management practices.

training of workers may be a component in a broader management system e.g., a health management plan.

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) The farm will need to develop and maintain an operational health plan addressing: i) Pathogens that can come from the surrounding environment into the farm (e.g., predator and vector control), ii) Pathogens that can spread from the farm to the surrounding environment (e.g., effluent filtration/sterilization, and waste such as dead-shrimp management) and iii) Spreading of pathogens within the farm. Critical to avoid cross contamination, detect and prevent emerging pathogen(s), and monitor external signs of pathologies and moribund animals.
- 2) Also Criterion 5.3 "Disease management and treatment" specifically, relating to farm workers training and awareness Indicator 5.3.4. Proper use of chemical products by farmworkers – Evidence of worker awareness/ training and instructions are available.
- 3) during an on-site audit an auditor will verify if the most recent version of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials.

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.2 and 5.3.4*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.2 and 5.3.4*](#)

CC.1.03 Biosecurity

GSSI Component

The standard requires that aquatic animals are kept under farming

Guidance

The objective of this requirement is to verify that the species is being farmed in the proper environment to maintain its health. Due to the very broad nature of this Essential Component, specific guidance cannot be provided. Expected evidence could include requirements for farm siting

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.03 Biosecurity

conditions suitable for the species being raised.	(including permitting for the farm site and species), aquatic health plan maintenance, assurance or monitoring aquatic animal health, on-farm water quality and temperature monitoring, etc.
Conclusion	References
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes a Criterion (5.1) for disease prevention. This Criterion includes an Indicator (5.1.1) that requires the development and maintenance of an operational health plan. The narrative guidance (Rationale) for this Criterion includes consideration of maintenance of suitable growing conditions in the following statement: "At the farm level, biosecurity measures include...taking action to reduce the stress levels of the farm animals(e.g., good pond condition and adequate feed)."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 Criterion 5.1:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 Criterion 5.1:</i>

CC.1.04 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures to respond to disease outbreaks, which includes the ability to quarantine the aquatic animal where feasible.	It is expected that disease response procedures would be a component of the aquatic animal health management system. Feasibility of quarantine depends on a combination of species, culture system and production environment. In cases where quarantine is applicable, a review of suitable evidence is expected to demonstrate and verify the ability to contain diseased aquatic animals.
Conclusion	References
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard has a indicators that require: 1)The development and maintenance of an operational health plan addressing: A) Pathogens that can come from the surrounding environment into the farm (e.g.,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.1.1,</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.04 Biosecurity

predator and vector control)

B) Pathogens that can spread from the farm to the surrounding environment (e.g., effluent filtration/sterilization, and waste such as dead-shrimp management)

C) Spreading of pathogens within the farm. Critical to avoid cross contamination, detect and prevent emerging pathogen(s), and monitor external signs of pathologies and moribund animals.

2) Filtration of inlet water for minimizing the entry of pathogens.

3) 100% if commercially available stocked post larvae (PLs) that are Specific Pathogen Free (SPF) or Specific Pathogen Resistant (SPR) for all important pathogens

The Instruction to Auditors (Guidance for Implementation) states that 'The auditor needs to be assured that the farm is not contaminating or spreading disease to the surrounding environment, has enacted good prevention measures adapted to the localized risks and has mechanisms to prevent the spread of infections from one pond to another.' The ASC Variance Request and Interpretation Platform includes the statement 'The health management plan... includes an appropriate procedure to prevent and respond to disease outbreaks, which includes informing veterinarian, inform neighbouring producers, aquaculture authorities, the Certification Body and the ability to quarantine the aquatic animal where feasible or even shut down the operation if it is needed.'

[5.1.4, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.6](#)

- [Audit Manual ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 5.1.1, 5.1.4, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.6](#)
- [QA 84](#)

CC.1.05 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures and/or	Appropriate procedures are expected to include general health/ behavioral inspections or testing for specific diseases with suitable monitoring (e.g., regular and including a suitable range of parameters, and of sufficient sample size to identify or anticipate disease outbreaks expediently, as well as increased surveillance when potential issues are identified.) Environmental monitoring is expected to include detection

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.05 Biosecurity

systems for the early detection of aquatic animal health issues, which include routine monitoring of stocks and the environment.	<p>of unfavorable environmental quality factors that could adversely affect the health of the aquatic animal (e.g., water temperature and quality).</p> <p>Verification is expected and could include reviews of written records and monitoring results to ensure procedures and/or systems are operational is also expected. This could also be captured in an aquatic health management plan.</p>
--	---

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard has an indicator that requires:

- 1) The development and maintenance of an operational health plan addressing:
- A) Pathogens that can come from the surrounding environment into the farm (e.g., predator and vector control)
 - B) Pathogens that can spread from the farm to the surrounding environment (e.g., effluent filtration/sterilization, and waste such as dead-shrimp management.
 - C) Spreading of pathogens within the farm. Critical to avoid cross contamination, detect and prevent emerging pathogen(s), and monitor external signs of pathologies and moribund animals.

The standard also includes an Indicator (5.1.3) that specifies a survival rate as a function of shrimp production intensity. These survival rates area a performance-based indicator of successful disease prevention; including that the species is being farmed in the proper environment to maintain its health, including water quality and feeding to meet the nutritional requirements of the shrimp crop.

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.1.1*](#)
- ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.1.1

CC.1.06 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.06 Biosecurity

The standard requires that mortalities and moribund aquatic animals are routinely collected, where collection is a feasible practice.	GSSI expects this Essential Component to be applied where collection is a feasible function of good management practice (e.g., finfish grow out). Examples where this is not suitable could include where aquatic animals may be too small to effectively collect (e.g., shrimp farming). Record keeping on the numbers of, and reason for, mortalities is expected.
Conclusion	References
This component is not applicable because collection of moribund or dead shrimp is not practical or feasible given their small size and greater stocking density relative to fish and mortality collection is not a standard practice	n/a

CC.1.07 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to have operational fish health management practices. Evidence must be shown that these address the following elements (where relevant to the species, scale, and production system covered by the Standard's scope): 1. Effective biosecurity 2. Identification and use of suitable available vaccines 3. Introductions and transfers of farmed animals (where relevant, which is overseen by an aquatic animal health professional.	It is expected that the standard will contain sufficient elements and/ or audit of culture practices for an operational program relative to the scale, species, and production systems covered by the standard's scope, including a focus on disease prevention (e.g. the use of vaccines). The content of the measures are expected to be overseen (but not necessarily full time employment) of an aquatic animal health professional.
Conclusion	References
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 1) The farm will need to develop and maintain an operational health plan addressing: A) Pathogens that can come from the surrounding environment into the farm (e.g., predator and vector control) B) Pathogens that can spread from the farm to the surrounding environment (e.g., effluent filtration/sterilization, and waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.1.1, 5.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.07 Biosecurity

such as dead-shrimp management) C) Spreading of pathogens within the farm. Critical to avoid cross contamination, detect and prevent emerging pathogen(s), and monitor external signs of pathologies and moribund animals).

2) 100% of stocked post larvae (PLs) that are Specific Pathogen Free (SPF) or Specific Pathogen Resistant (SPR) for all important pathogens.

3) PL and broodstock have appropriate disease-free status and sources meet regional, national and international importation guidelines (e.g., OIE and ICES).

4) 100% of total post larvae from closed loop hatchery

5) Origin of wild-caught broodstock sourced from locally fished broodstock only.

- [ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 5.1.1, 5.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3](#)

CC.1.07.06 Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires suitable performance based metric limits on survival rate (or similar system that incorporates survival rates (e.g. recovery rate)) or similar criteria that demonstrate that the aquatic health management practices are effective.	<p>A suitable performance based metric limit could include those set on a species specific basis using industry average data (e.g., a minimal % relative to say industry average data) or based on farm monitoring records. Other possible criteria may include metric limits on veterinary drug usage. Verification that the metric limits have been met and set based on a suitable monitoring and record keeping system is expected.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.1.08.02</p>	
Conclusion		

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.07.06 Biosecurity

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires:

- 1) calculation of survival rate from stocking to harvest. To obtain an accurate estimation of survival rate, records on seed stocking in individual ponds is needed.
- 2) documentation of disease-free status and compliance with regional, national and international importation guidelines
- 3) seed production in a hatchery .
- 4) The ASC Interpretations Platform QA 87 includes the following statement: "The UoC shall provide evidence that traceability per pond or batch from stocking to harvest (see % pond survival rate) is recorded for calculation of the survival rate (SR) Indicator 5.1.3 – Survival Rate (SR). These survival rates area a performance-based indicator of successful disease prevention; including that the species is being farmed in the proper environment to maintain its health, including water quality and feeding to meet the nutritional requirements of the shrimp crop. The annual farm survival rate for A) Unfed and non-permanently aerated pond systems is >25%. B) Fed but non-permanently aerated pond systems is >45%. C) Fed and permanently aerated pond systems is >60%.
- 5) Origin of wild-caught broodstock sourced from locally fished broodstock only.

The standard also includes an Indicator (5.1.3) that specifies a survival rate as a function of shrimp production intensity.

- [ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.1.3, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3:](#)
- [ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.1.3, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3:](#)
- [QA 87](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.08 Off-farm Disease Transmission		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish and implement procedures for the disposal of mortalities using appropriate methods that prevent the spread of disease.	Given the nature of this requirement, the standard may appear as a general requirement; however verification that practices are employed is expected. Relevant examples can be found in Articles 4.7.7 and 4.7.8 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code 2015 (see www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_aquatic_animal_waste.htm).	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 1) responsible handling and disposal of wastes based on risk assessment and possibilities of recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.7.2:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.7.2:</i> 	

CC.1.09 Off-farm Disease Transmission	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain appropriate procedures and/or systems to reduce the likelihood of disease and	Appropriate procedures or systems are expected to address both on farm disease and parasite transfer (such as the ability to quarantine diseased stocks, separating equipment) as well as between the facility and natural fauna (such as disinfection of effluents for diseased stocks, fallowing). The approach taken would be expected to be relevant to the species, production system, scale of production, and legal requirements. Can be “not applicable” with suitable justification provided by the scheme.

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.09 Off-farm Disease Transmission

parasite transmission within the aquaculture facility and between it and natural aquatic fauna.	Where pathogens or parasites are a known concern (for example, sea lice on farmed salmon); Appropriate procedures or systems are expected to include specific requirements or actions defined in the standard or specified by the aquaculture facility through a suitable risk assessment or other evidence such as local or national regulations. Appropriate management measures in these cases could include treatment trigger levels of parasite numbers on the farm-facility or siting requirements that require that the aquaculture facility is located at suitable distances from wild populations. Verification that the management measures are suitable and employed is expected.
---	---

Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require: 1) The farm will need to develop and maintain an operational health plan addressing: A) Pathogens that can come from the surrounding environment into the farm (e.g., predator and vector control); B) Pathogens that can spread from the farm to the surrounding environment (e.g., effluent filtration/sterilization, and waste such as dead-shrimp management); C) Spreading of pathogens within the farm. Critical to avoid cross contamination, detect and prevent emerging pathogen(s), and monitor external signs of pathologies and moribund animals; 2) 100% of stocked post larvae (PLs) that are Specific Pathogen Free (SPF) or Specific Pathogen Resistant (SPR) for all important pathogens 3) PL and broodstock have appropriate disease-free status and sources meet regional, national and international importation guidelines (e.g., OIE and ICES); 4) 100% of total post larvae from closed loop hatchery; 5) Origin of wild-caught broodstock sourced from locally fished broodstock only; 6) Filtration of inlet water for minimizing the entry of pathogens.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.1.10 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to maintain records on veterinary drug and chemical usage and the rationale for their use.	Verification that suitable records are maintained is expected. Suitable records are expected to include type, concentration, and dosage, method of administration and withdrawal times of chemicals and veterinary drugs and the rationale for their use.	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that: 1) require records of stocks and usage for all chemical stocks, their usage and storage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3:</i> 	

CC.2.01 Chemical Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires the establishment, implementation and maintenance of an appropriate system for the application of chemicals and veterinary drugs.	An appropriate system could conform to the relevant sections of Article 6.2.7 and 6.2.8 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code (2015) (www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_antibio_resp_prudent_use.htm) or other suitable reference. The system is expected to ensure that the application of the product follows the instructions of the manufacturer or other competent authority. Verification that the system is operational is also expected.	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that: 1) require information on chemical usage and storage. 2) Proper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.4 and 5.3.6</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.4.6 and 5.3.6</i> 	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.2.01 Chemical Usage

use of chemical products by farm workers 3) No allowance for discharge of any hazardous chemicals without previous neutralization

CC.2.02 Chemical Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires appropriate controls for all chemicals, incl. veterinary drugs, that enter the environment during or after use (whether already covered by GSSI Essential Components or not) in order to minimize adverse impacts on environmental quality. Manufacturer's guidance or equivalent directions should be followed, and where appropriate, relevant examples of chemicals that pose a high risk of adverse impacts to environmental quality should be specifically defined by the standard	It is expected that the standard will require all chemicals used by the aquaculture facility and that will enter the environment are at least used according to the manufacturer's guidance (such as on label requirements or Safety Data Sheets (SDS) or, in the case of veterinary drugs, the guidance of the aquatic animal health professional to prevent adverse impacts upon the environment. Chemicals that pose a high risk of adverse impacts to environmental quality, examples of which should be specifically defined by the standard (e.g., copper-based anti-foulant treatments in marine cage aquaculture or anti-parasite or anti-microbe bath treatments), accepting that perceptions regarding high risk and the chemicals involved are subject to rapid change, or identified through a risk based self-assessment by the farmer (e.g., an environmental risk assessment)--or through reference to a recognized relevant classification system (e.g. the UN Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)). It is expected that the standard or the risk-assessment will define any necessary additional requirements to minimize the impacts (e.g., EQS limits for copper residues in the benthic environment).	
Conclusion		References
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that: 1) records of stocks and usage for all chemical products are available 2) prohibit the treatment of water treated with pesticides that are banned or restricted		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 5.3.5 and 5.3.6:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.2.02 Chemical Usage

- 3) prohibit the discharge of any hazardous chemicals without previous neutralisation
- 4) workers are properly trained on chemical usage
- 5) Information on chemical storage and usage

- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 5.3.5 and 5.3.6:*](#)

CC.2.02.01 Chemical Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard prohibits use of chemicals within the aquaculture facility that may enter the local environment due to farming practices that are listed as highly polluting by relevant organizations or other justification.	<p>Relevant organizations could include the World Health Organization listed 1a and 1b pesticides (see www.who.int/ipcs/publications/pesticides_hazard_2009.pdf?ua=1) and the Rotterdam Convention Annex III listed chemicals (see www.pic.int/TheConvention/Chemicals/AnnexIIIChemicals/tabid/1132/language/en-US/Default.aspx).</p> <p>The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) (2001) and the Rotterdam Convention are also relevant organizations alongside WHO.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence supporting the claim of no use, such as inspection of the chemical storage, interviews etc.</p>	
Conclusion		References
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator (5.3.5) that does not allow the treatment of water with pesticides banned or restricted by the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent (PIC), the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) or classed as “extremely hazardous” or “highly hazardous” (classes 1a and 1b) by the World Health Organization (WHO).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.5</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.5:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.2.02.02 Chemical Usage

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires that chemicals used on the aquaculture facility, and that may enter the local environment, are restricted to identified environmentally benign products (e.g., rapidly denaturing chemicals), with a suitable justification for their listing as benign.	Suitable justification is expected to include scientific literature or product description. Verification, including a review of evidence supporting the claim, such as inspection of the chemical storage, interviews are also expected. Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.2.02.01	
Conclusion		
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator (5.3.6.) that: 1) prohibits the discharge of any hazardous chemical without previous neutralisation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.6</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.6:</i>

CC.3.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility and its daily operations ensure that good culture and hygienic conditions are maintained. Relevant aspects include proper	<p>This is a general Essential Component that covers a range of potential issues depending on the type of production system, species being cultured, and the local environment, and as such there is a need for flexibility in how consistency is achieved. It is expected that the following issues would be addressed and the systems verified to be operational:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate storage of chemicals and fuel (e.g., stored in a lockable, labeled facility, limited access by personnel, leakage prevention – all based on Safety Data Sheets (SDS) (see figure 4.14 of the A Guide to The Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS), available at: www.osha.gov/dsg/hazcom/ghsguideoct05.pdf)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.3.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

management of all chemicals, fuels and feeds including their safe storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate storage of feed (e.g., stored separately from sources of contamination, accurately labeled, keeping medicated and nonmedicated feed separated.) - Appropriate pest control (e.g., prevent contamination of feed, chemicals by rodents or insects etc.) - Domestic sewage control/disposal to avoid local contamination - General farm waste (e.g., empty feed bags, household rubbish, food containers etc.).
---	--

Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) require information on chemical usage and storage 2) workers are properly trained on chemical usage 3) safe storage and handling of chemicals and hazardous materials is implemented 4) responsible handling and disposal of wastes are in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 7.7.1 and 7.7.2:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 7.7.1 and 7.7.2:</i>

CC.3.01.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the presence of an active and documented recycling program.	The system is expected to ensure the farm recycles to the maximum extent practicable.	
Conclusion	References	
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator (7.7.2) that requires:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) responsible handling and disposal of wastes based on risk assessment and possibilities of recycling. The Guidance for Implementation of this indicator states that "Recyclable wastes need to be identified and separated at the point of generation. Some wastes (e.g., feed bags and plastic containers) can be reused, and their return to suppliers shall be encouraged. When selling recyclable wastes to a local collector, the final destination of wastes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.7.2:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.7.2:</i> 	

C . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

CC.3.01.01 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

shall be specified. The income generated by the sales of recyclable wastes should be used for providing incentives to employees for separating wastes and increasing the amount of recycling done on the farm."

CC.3.01.02 Maintaining Good Culture and Hygienic Conditions

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to establish, implement and maintain a general waste management system.	An appropriate system is expected to include a baseline of waste generation and actions aimed at reductions, and suitable monitoring. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for the purpose.	
Conclusion The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator (7.7.2) that requires: 1) responsible handling and disposal of wastes based on risk assessment and possibilities of recycling.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.7.2:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.7.2:</i>

CC.3.02 General Environmental Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that aquaculture facility infrastructure is appropriately maintained in order to prevent negative	Given the wide variety of production systems in aquaculture specific guidance cannot be provided and flexibility by the evaluator is required using a risk-based approach. Examples could include the requirement for derelict or damaged gear in shellfish or cage aquaculture to be collected and

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.3.02 General Environmental Management

environmental impacts, whether from construction, operation or decommissioning (e.g., including the requirement for derelict equipment and materials to be collected and disposed of responsibly.)	disposed of responsibly, or for that waste from pond construction is not placed in mangrove forests in shrimp farming. It is expected that specific requirements or risk based management systems would be required where appropriate, along with suitable verification. These requirements may also be included in other Standards, such as sensitive habitat protection or escape prevention.
--	---

Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) require information on chemical usage and storage 2) prohibit the discharge of water treated with pesticides that are banned or restricted 3) prohibit the discharge of any hazardous chemicals without previous neutralisation 4) safe storage and handling of chemicals and hazardous materials is implemented 5) Responsible handling and disposal of wastes based on risk assessment and recycling procedures are implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.5, 5.3.6, 6.1.2, 7.7.1 and 7.7.2</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.3.3, 5.3.5, 5.3.6, 6.1.2, 7.7.1 and 7.7.2</i>

CC.3.02.01 General Environmental Management

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires energy use to be monitored and recorded (e.g. total fuels or energy).	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that energy use is being appropriately monitored and recorded using appropriate methods.
Conclusion	References
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the Standard includes indicators that require:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.6.1 and 7.6.2:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.3.02.01 General Environmental Management

1) Records of energy consumption by energy source over a 12-month period 2) Calculations of an Annual Cumulative Energy Demand (CED) over a 12-month period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.6.1 and 7.6.2</i>
--	--

CC.4.01 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that can trace aquatic feed ingredients including fish meal and fish oil (>1% inclusion) to the species and, at least, to the country of origin.	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <p>1) require basic traceability of feed ingredients including source, species, country of origin and harvest method demonstrated by the feed producer</p> <p>2) require demonstration of chain of custody and traceability for fisheries products in feed through an International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling (ISEAL) member or ISO/IEC 17065:2012 compliant certification scheme that also incorporates the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.1.1 and 7.1.2:</i> <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.1.1 and 7.1.2:</i>

CC.4.02 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.02 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer who produces feed that excludes fishmeal and fish oil from endangered species and is validated as such.	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.</p> <p>Endangered species are expected to be defined in the Standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cites.org for more information.</p>
---	---

Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) requires the farm to use fish meal and fish oil from fisheries certified to a full ISEAL member that has guidelines specifically promoting ecological sustainability of forage fisheries or 2) requires the farm to use at least 80% of fish meal and fish oil derived from fisheries recognised by FishSource with a score of 8 or 6 with interim requirements or 3) requires a farm to use fish meal and fish oil from a Fishery Improvement Program with periodic public reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:</i>

CC.4.03 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that prohibits the use of fishmeal and fish oil from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (IUU).	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.

C . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

CC.4.03 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:

- 1) requires the farm to use fish meal and fish oil from fisheries certified to a full ISEAL ember that has guidelines specifically promoting ecological sustainability of forage fisheries or
- 2) requires the farm to use at least 80% of fish meal and fish oil derived from fisheries recognised by FishSource with a score of 8 or 6 with interim requirements or
- 3) requires a farm to use fish meal and fish oil from a Fishery Improvement Program with periodic public reporting

ASC has also stated in QA 85 that farms must be free from fish meal and fish oil derived from IUU fishing practices with demonstrated compliance requirements

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:*](#)
- [*QA 85*](#)

CC.4.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component

The standard requires that the aquaculture facility to source feed from a manufacturer that has a written policy which includes assessment of source fishery status and identification of improvement needs and work plan to deliver improvements. The policy must include a commitment and timeline to source aquaculture and fishery products from responsible/best practice sources, such as those certified a standard benchmarked at minimum consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines or by identified independent risk assessment.

Guidance

Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer). The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish and fishery byproducts.

Conclusion

References

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:

- 1) requires the farm to use fish meal and fish oil from fisheries certified to a full International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling (ISEAL) member that has guidelines specifically promoting ecological sustainability of forage fisheries or
- 2) requires the farm to use at least 80% of fish meal and fish oil derived from fisheries recognised by FishSource with a score of 8 or 6 with interim requirements or
- 3) requires a farm to use fish meal and fish oil from a Fishery Improvement Program with periodic public reporting

- [ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:](#)
- [ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:](#)

CC.4.04.02 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires independent verification that the feed manufacturer only sources fishmeal and fish oil (greater than 1% content) from whole fish certified to a standard benchmarked to be, at minimum, consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines.	<p>Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients (e.g., algae, krill, and squid) and to whole fish.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.4.01, C.4.02, C.4.03, C.4.04, and C.4.04.01</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because it includes sourcing of fishmeal and fish oil from whole fish from fisheries certified according to standards consistent with FAO ecolabelling guidelines if the whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption.</p> <p>1) ISEAL is a global association for social and environmental standards systems. More information can be found at http:// www.isealalliance.org . ASC Shrimp Standard strives to meet the ISEAL guidelines for standard</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:</u> • <u>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a, b c:</u>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.04.02 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

setting. Fisheries ingredients must be certified by a process that conforms to the ISEAL guidelines within five years of the publication date of the ASC Shrimp Standard. The farm's feed manufacturer may use the "mass balance approach" to demonstrate that it purchased the appropriate amount and kind of "certified" ingredients to supply feed to all of its customers making a similar request. These ingredients would get mixed into the general silos and production lines of the manufacturer, greatly reducing costs associated with special storage capacity and production lines. This could be done instead of requiring documentation for a single batch per farm. Fishmeal and fish oil used in shrimp feed (including those made from fisheries by-products) must not contain products from a) target fisheries that are on CITES Appendix I, on the IUCN's Red List in categories: Near Threatened, Vulnerable, Endangered and Critically Endangered, b) a target fishery that has bycatch with significant impact on species listed on CITES Appendix I, on the IUCN's Red Listed species (categories as above), upon landing, on an annual basis or c) bycatch with significant impact on CITES/IUCN listed species. (7.2.1.a)

2) Fishery status information may be accessed through FishSource (www.fishsource.org/indices_overview.pdf) and the IFFO Responsible Fisheries (<http://www.iffonet.net/iffors>) (7.2.1.b)

3) Lacking a FishSource assessment a fishery could be engaged in an Improvers Program. (transparent and public Fisheries Improvement Project (FIP) with periodic public reporting (refer to Appendix VII). (7.2.1.c)

4) 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 do 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 do not come from any species that are classified as critically endangered, endangered, or vulnerable in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/about/red-list-overview#introduction>). (footnote 152).

CC.4.04.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component

Guidance

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.04.04 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

The standard requires the efficient use of fishmeal and fish oil relative to the production system and the species being farmed.	<p>Suitable approaches are expected to include setting a suitable maximum Fish in: Fish Out Ratios, FFDRm (Forage Fish Dependency Ratio for Fish Meal) and FFDRo (Forage Fish Dependency Ratio for Fish Oil), or other calculations which reflect the importance of limited wild-harvested aquatic resources, this could include be species specific performance based metric limits. Consideration for extreme events (such as disease or escapes) is permissible. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as from squid and krill. Verification is expected to include compliance at the aquaculture facility level.</p> <p>Where fishmeal and fish oil are used in feed, aligned standards will also be considered in alignment C.4.07</p>
--	---

Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out. Requirement = $P. vannamei \leq 1.35:1$, $P. monodon \leq 1.8:1$ and the fish meal is the determining factor for the FFER, as fish oil use in shrimp feed is very low (7.4.1)</p> <p>2) Economic Feed Conversation Ratio (eFCR) = Records are available, and (7.4.2.a)</p> <p>3) Protein Retention Efficiency = Records are available (7.4.2.b)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.4.1, 7.4.2a and 7.4.2b:</i> <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.4.1, 7.4.2a and 7.4.2b:</i>

CC.4.04.05 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility sources feed from a manufacturer that assures the fish meal and fish oil used in their production based upon aquaculture	Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as from squid and krill.

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.04.05 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

trimmings (if greater than 1% inclusion) can also be traceable back to the origin fishery and does not come from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (I.U.U.) and does not contain species on the IUCN red list. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as those from squid and krill.

Verification of the use of compliant feed by the aquaculture facility is expected. Suitable evidence of compliance could include document evidence of sources supplying the feed mill, 3rd party certifications of source aquaculture facilities and/or rendering plants, legal permits or declarations etc.

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because it includes sourcing of fishmeal and fish oil from whole fish from fisheries certified according to standards consistent with FAO ecolabelling guidelines if the whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption.

1) ISEAL is a global association for social and environmental standards systems. More information can be found at <http://www.isealalliance.org>. ASC Shrimp Standard strives to meet the ISEAL guidelines for standard setting. Fisheries ingredients must be certified by a process that conforms to the ISEAL guidelines within five years of the publication date of the ASC Shrimp Standard. The farm's feed manufacturer may use the "mass balance approach" to demonstrate that it purchased the appropriate amount and kind of "certified" ingredients to supply feed to all of its customers making a similar request. These ingredients would get mixed into the general silos and production lines of the manufacturer, greatly reducing costs associated with special storage capacity and production lines. This could be done instead of requiring documentation for a single batch per farm. Fishmeal and fish oil used in shrimp feed (including those made from fisheries by-products) must not contain products from a) target fisheries that are on CITES Appendix I, on the IUCN's Red List in categories: Near Threatened, Vulnerable, Endangered and Critically Endangered, b) a target fishery that has bycatch with significant impact on species listed on CITES Appendix I, on the IUCN's Red Listed species (categories as above), upon landing, on an annual basis or c) bycatch with significant impact on CITES/IUCN listed species. (7.2.1.a)

References

- [ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a:](#)
- [ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a:](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.04.06 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility sources feed from a manufacturer that assures that the fishmeal and fish oil derived from byproducts (if greater than 1% inclusion) come originally from fishery and aquaculture sources that were certified to a standard benchmarked to be, at minimum, consistent with relevant FAO's ecolabelling guidelines.	<p>Verification is expected to include a 3rd party certification or audit of the feed manufacturer. The standard is expected to apply to other relevant marine feed ingredients, such as from squid and krill.</p> <p>Verification of the use of compliant feed by the aquaculture facility is expected. Suitable evidence is expected to include document evidence of sources 3rd party certification and the independent verification that these certifications are compliant with FAO Guidelines.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.4.04.05</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because it includes sourcing of fishmeal and fish oil from whole fish from fisheries certified according to standards consistent with FAO ecolabelling guidelines if the whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption.</p> <p>1) ISEAL is a global association for social and environmental standards systems. More information can be found at http:// www.isealalliance.org . ASC Shrimp Standard strives to meet the ISEAL guidelines for standard setting. Fisheries ingredients must be certified by a process that conforms to the ISEAL guidelines within five years of the publication date of the ASC Shrimp Standard. The farm's feed manufacturer may use the "mass balance approach" to demonstrate that it purchased the appropriate amount and kind of "certified" ingredients to supply feed to all of its customers making a similar request. These ingredients would get mixed into the general silos and production lines of the manufacturer, greatly reducing costs associated with special storage capacity and production lines. This could be done instead of requiring documentation for a single batch per farm. Fishmeal and fish oil used in shrimp feed (including those made from fisheries by-products) must not contain products from a) target fisheries that are on CITES Appendix I, on the IUCN's Red List in categories: Near Threatened, Vulnerable, Endangered and Critically Endangered, b) a target fishery that has bycatch with significant impact on species listed on CITES Appendix I, on the</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.2.1a:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.04.06 Environmental Considerations of Feed Ingredients

IUCN's Red Listed species (categories as above), upon landing, on an annual basis or c) bycatch with significant impact on CITES/IUCN listed species. (7.2.1.a)

CC.4.05 Feed Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard prohibits the use of raw fish as a direct feed source in grow-out.	<p>0% of feed at any time during production (under the scope of certification) may contain "whole fish" or "wet fish", which includes any form of uncooked wet fish (whole or chopped or frozen etc.), which includes direct feed, supplemental feeding, or on-farm made applications. Alternatives would be to require 100% use of commercial dry pelleted feeds.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a suitable review of evidence, such as feed use records, visual observation, and financial records in aquaculture industries where this is common practice.</p> <p>A non-applicable (N/A) designation is only acceptable where 100% of production under the scope of the standard (including species, production intensity and production systems covered) uses entirely commercial dry pelleted feeds (e.g., Atlantic salmon).</p>
Conclusion	References
Shrimp farms do not use whole fish as a direct feed source.	n/a

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.06 Feed Biosecurity

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standards prohibits aquatic feed protein from the same species and genus as the species being farmed.	Verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer).	
Conclusion		
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because:</p> <p>1) QA 86 on its interpretation platform clarifies that feed cannot contain the same species or genus.</p> <p>2) the standard requires evidence of basic traceability of feed ingredients, including source, species, country of origin and harvest method demonstrated by the feed producer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp Audit Manual V 1.1 Indicator 7.1.1</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V1.1 Indicator 7.1.1</i> • <i>QA 86</i> 	

CC.4.07 Feeding Efficiency

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
Where applicable, the standard requires that the aquaculture facility has suitable measures in place to ensure that feed is used efficiently at the individual production unit level.	Suitable measures are expected to be part of a wider feed management system, such as the measurement of FCR (Feed Conversion Ratio) and FIFO (Fish In Fish Out ratio) as well as documented records of visual feed response and staff training. Verification that the measures are operational and fit for purpose is also expected.	
Conclusion		
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that:</p> <p>1) requires the farm to have an Forage Fish Equivalency ratio of 1.35:1 for L. vannamei and 1.9:1 for P. monodon</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.4.1:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.4.1:</i> 	

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.4.08 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that appropriate records are kept on all feed use. At a minimum this must include: feed source, feed Batch/Lot/ID number, date of purchase, and feed conversion ratio (FCR) MT	Appropriate records are expected to include those stated in the component, and, where appropriate, feed inclusion percentages of fishmeal and fish oil or a fish in: fish out ratio. Appropriate records are expected to be kept for each individual production unit. Verification of appropriate record keeping and suitable documentation from feed manufacturers is also expected.	
Conclusion	References	
The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires the aquaculture facility sources feed from a manufacturer that assures the fish meal and fish oil used in the production of from aquaculture trimmings (if greater than 1% inclusion) can also be traceable back to the origin fishery and does not come from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (I.U.U.) and does not contain species on the IUCN red list.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 7.4.1:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 7.4.1:</i> 	

CC.5.01 Benthic Habitats

GSSI Component	Guidance
For cage production systems, the standard requires appropriate management measures for	Appropriate measures for marine cage production systems are expected to consider biological, chemical and physical impacts and additional chemical residues resulting from culture practices and should use appropriate sampling methods. Where relevant, they should conform to ISO 16665. The use of systems combining suitable allowable zones of effect and environmental quality standards (EQS) of effect are expected. Verification that the

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.5.01 Benthic Habitats

preventing excessive impacts of aquaculture facility waste on benthic environments, including impacts of a biological, chemical or physical nature.	measures are operational and fit for purpose is expected. Evidence of the prevention of adverse impacts could include comparisons with baseline conditions, reference locations, or standardized limits with a suitable justification for their use. Where adverse impacts are detected it is expected that appropriate mitigation measures/ remedial action for the identified adverse impacts on the surrounding natural ecosystem are applied. Sanctions that address situations where EQS' are exceeded and there is no effective remediation within a suitable timeframe could include withholding certification. While generally recognized as a marine cage issue, benthic impacts can also occur in freshwater cage systems. The degree of management measures should reflect the degree of potential impacts relative to the environment, production system, species, and size of production.
Conclusion	References
Shrimp farms are land-based operations, not marine cage production systems	N/a

CC.5.02 Predator Control

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard prohibits the use of any lethal predator control techniques on endangered species. Exceptions for worker safety and where euthanization is an act of mercy are acceptable and expected.	<p>Verification of the predator controls used, appropriate record keeping, and details of the endangered species in the region of the aquaculture facility are expected. Examples of supporting evidence of non-use could include interview, appropriate signage, and mortality records. Exceptions for worker safety and where euthanization is an act of mercy are acceptable and expected.</p> <p>Endangered species are expected to be defined in the standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List</p>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.5.02 Predator Control

(Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes
1) an indicator (5.2.1) with no allowance for intentional lethal predator control of any protected, threatened or endangered species as defined by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List, national listing processes, or other official lists.

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.2.1:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.2.1:*](#)

CC.5.02.02 Predator Control

GSSI Component

The standard excludes aquaculture facilities where a history of repeated accidental or deliberate mortality of endangered species has occurred.

Guidance

Accidental mortality can include those as a result of entanglement etc.
Repeated mortality means on more than one occasion over a suitable period of time (expected to be over one production cycle). Verification is expected and examples of supporting evidence include employee and local community interviews, appropriate signage, and interaction records.

Endangered species are expected to be defined in the standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix 1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information.

Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.5.02 and C.5.02.01

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.5.02.02 Predator Control

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes
1) an indicator (5.2.1) with no allowance for intentional lethal predator control of any protected, threatened or endangered species as defined by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List, national listing processes, or other official lists.

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.2.1:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.2.1:*](#)

CC.5.03 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

GSSI Component

The standard requires that in areas where damage of sensitive habitats has occurred previously, and where restoration is possible and effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed.

Guidance

It is expected that the standard will define sensitive habitat in context with its scope and an appropriate date to be used prior to which legal impacts can be “grandfathered in” and provide supporting evidence for the date. Verification at the aquaculture facility is expected to include whether restoration is necessary, to what degree (evidence could include maps, aerial photos, satellite images, government certification etc.) and whether that the active restoration is suitable (i.e., will it be successful and restore a suitable area of sensitive habitat).

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:
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, and
2) Appendix I, Biodiversity Focussed impact assessment (under point 4) reads: “Where damage of sensitive habitats has been caused by the farm (as defined in the impact assessment) previously and where restoration is possible and

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 Criterion 2.1 and Appendix I*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1*](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.5.03 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed."

3) Mitigation and offsetting – The BEIA must define appropriate mitigation and offsetting requirements given previous impacts. – Remedial action can take several forms, including avoidance or prevention, mitigation and compensation or offsetting (e.g., restoration and rehabilitation of sites). Apply the "positive planning approach," where avoidance has priority and compensation is used as a last resort measure. Avoid "excuse"-type compensation. Acknowledge that compensation will not always be possible and there will still be cases where it is appropriate to say "no" to new farms or expansion of existing farms on the grounds of irreversible damage to biodiversity.

*Criterion 2.1
and Appendix I*

CC.5.03.01 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard ensures that no net loss of sensitive habitats on an area basis has occurred as a result of aquaculture facility construction, conversion and culture practices.	It is expected that the Standard will define (with supporting evidence) sensitive habitat in context with its scope, the basis for a "no net loss" claim, and an appropriate date to be used prior to which legal impacts can be "grandfathered in" (the date must be before major period of significant historical habitat loss for the production system that the certification covers). Verification at the aquaculture facility is expected to include whether restoration is necessary, to what degree (evidence could include maps, aerial photos, satellite images, government certification etc.) and whether the active restoration is or is likely to be successful at restoring the sensitive habitat. Offsetting is allowed. Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.5.03	
Conclusion		References

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.5.03.01 Sensitive Habitat and Biodiversity

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 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, and
- 2) Appendix I, Biodiversity Focussed impact assessment (under point 4) reads: "Where damage of sensitive habitats has been caused by the farm (as defined in the impact assessment) previously and where restoration is possible and effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed."
- 3) Mitigation and offsetting – The BEIA must define appropriate mitigation and offsetting requirements given previous impacts. – Remedial action can take several forms, including avoidance or prevention, mitigation and compensation or offsetting (e.g., restoration and rehabilitation of sites). Apply the "positive planning approach," where avoidance has priority and compensation is used as a last resort measure. Avoid "excuse"-type compensation. Acknowledge that compensation will not always be possible and there will still be cases where it is appropriate to say "no" to new farms or expansion of existing farms on the grounds of irreversible damage to biodiversity.

- [ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 Criterion 2.1 and Appendix I](#)
- [ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 Criterion 2.1 and Appendix I](#)

CC.5.03.04 Preventing Habitat Impacts

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that a suitable process has been put in place to protect sensitive habitat and endangered species prior to expansions to the	<p>A suitable process could include an EIA that be required to show evidence of negligible impacts to sensitive habitats.</p> <p>Endangered species are expected to be defined in the Standard, with reference to relevant national listings (e.g., Vietnam's Red Data Book) and/or global listing organizations such as CITES (Appendix</p>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.5.03.04 Preventing Habitat Impacts

aquaculture facility that occur after initial certification.	1), IUCN Red List (Categories Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU)). See www.iucnredlist.org and www.cities.org for more information. Verification is also expected.
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>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, and</p> <p>2) Appendix I, Biodiversity Focussed impact assessment (under point 4) reads: "Where damage of sensitive habitats has been caused by the farm (as defined in the impact assessment) previously and where restoration is possible and effective; restoration efforts will or have resulted in a meaningful amount of restored habitat; either through direct on-farm restoration or by an off-farm offsetting approach. Grandfathering of historical losses is allowed."</p> <p>3) Mitigation and offsetting – The BEIA must define appropriate mitigation and offsetting requirements given previous impacts. – Remedial action can take several forms, including avoidance or prevention, mitigation and compensation or offsetting (e.g., restoration and rehabilitation of sites). Apply the "positive planning approach," where avoidance has priority and compensation is used as a last resort measure. Avoid "excuse"-type compensation. Acknowledge that compensation will not always be possible and there will still be cases where it is appropriate to say "no" to new farms or expansion of existing farms on the grounds of irreversible damage to biodiversity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 Criterion 2.1 and Appendix I</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 Criterion 2.1 and Appendix I</i>

CC.6.01 Record Keeping

GSSI Component	Guidance
----------------	----------

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.6.01 Record Keeping

The standard requires the establishment, implementation and maintenance of an appropriate record keeping system for all seed that is intentionally stocked.	<p>An appropriate records system may include source of the seed, date of purchase, stocking density, vaccination record of the seed, and stocked seed batch identification.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator that requires:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) calculation of survival rate from stocking to harvest. To obtain an accurate estimation of survival rate, records on seed stocking in individual ponds is needed. 2) documentation of disease-free status and compliance with regional, national and international importation guidelines 3) seed production in a hatchery. 4) The ASC Interpretations Platform QA 87 includes the following statement: "The UoC shall provide evidence that traceability per pond or batch from stocking to harvest (see % pond survival rate) is recorded for calculation of the survival rate (SR) Indicator 5.1.3 – Survival Rate (SR) 5) the origin of wild-caught broodstock to be sourced from locally fished broodstock only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.1.3, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.1.3, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3</i> • <i>QA 87</i>

CC.6.02 Wild Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that where the deliberate use of wild seed is justifiable, it is collected in a manner that:	Expected examples of "justifiable use" include where there is a lack of commercially-available hatchery-raised seed, inability/lack of technology to hatchery-raised the farmed species, or passive collection of mollusks. Justification could be offered at the standard or aquaculture facility level. Verification is expected to include the need to provide suitable

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.6.02 Wild Seed

- Ensures controls are in place so that the collection of seed is not detrimental to the status of the wild target and non-target populations, nor that of the wider ecosystem. This requires a documented management approach that ensures those wild populations are not overfished and not subject to recruitment overfishing or other impacts that are likely to be irreversible or very slowly reversible, and avoids, minimizes or mitigates fishing impacts on essential habitats and on habitats that are highly vulnerable to damage by the fishing gear;
 - Avoids the use of environmentally damaging collection practices;
- And ensures that the source fishery is regulated by an appropriate authority.

evidence by the aquaculture facility (e.g., a summary report written by a credible 3rd party on the source fishery, a self-certification by the appropriate management authority, a 3rd party fishery certification that verifies suitable compliance).

A documented management approach is expected to follow Component D.3.01 where the standard requires the existence of documented management approaches or other management framework covering the unit of certification and the stock under consideration, including management measures consistent with achieving management objectives for the stock under consideration. Expected outcomes of the management approach are described in the Guidance of D.6.01 Target Stock Status, D.6.05 Non-Target Catches, D.6.06 Endangered Species, and D.6.07 Habitat, respectively. Definitions of terms related to wild fisheries can be found in Section D terms of the Glossary.

Examples of environmentally damaging collection practices include blast, poison, and Muro-ami fishing practices.

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require the use of seed produced in hatcheries (6.2.2). The standard does not allow wild-caught PL other than natural tidal flow into ponds (6.2.4).

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 6.2.2 and 6.2.4.*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 6.2.2 and 6.2.4.*](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.6.03 Hatchery Seed

GSSI Component	Guidance	References
The standard requires that hatchery-raised seed are free from relevant/important pathogens before stocking for grow-out.	<p>Relevant/important pathogens are expected to include those identified by the aquatic health professional and sources such as the OIE/ transboundary disease lists (See Chapter 1.3 of the Aquatic Animal Health Code 2015 http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/aquatic-code/access-online/).</p> <p>Verification of suitable measures is expected to include reviews of disease-testing methods, the disease tested for, and the results (including ISO 23893-1:2007), and the vaccination record of the seed. This could form part of the aquatic animal health management plan.</p>	
Conclusion		
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <p>1) PL and broodstock have appropriate disease-free status and sources meet regional, national and international importation guidelines (e.g., OIE and ICES) (6.2.1).</p> <p>2) If commercially available, all stocked post larvae (PLs) are Specific Pathogen Free (SPF) or Specific Pathogen Resistant (SPR) for all important pathogens (5.1.4).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 5.1.4 and 6.2.1:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 5.1.4 and 6.2.1:</i>

CC.7.01 Escapes

GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility establishes, implements, and maintains an appropriate system	<p>An appropriate system is expected to be based on an evaluation of the likelihood of events and the magnitude of impacts on surrounding environment (where risk assessments are used they must use a suitable scientific method and taking into consideration, siting, culture practices, local environmental conditions, including extreme events, and other relevant uncertainties) according to the precautionary approach and possible impacts on surrounding natural ecosystems, including fauna, flora, and habitat. Specific requirements stated in the standard are acceptable.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence of an operational and fit for purpose system.</p>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.7.01 Escapes

to minimize the unintentional release or escape of cultured species. This should include monitoring and management of the physical facilities and practices

The monitoring of the management practices could include but are not limited to:

- i) Measures for escape detection
- ii) Monitoring for and record keeping of escapes events
- iii) Suitable training of employees
- iv) Incident management and infrastructure, including response or recapture measures.
- v) Regular monitoring and maintenance of the culture system
- vi) Regular review and failure analysis
- vii) containment infrastructure

(Relative to the species being farmed and the production system individual elements can be “Not Applicable” with these considerations).

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) Prevention measures in place to prevent escapes at harvest and during grow-out include: A). Effective screens or barriers of appropriate mesh size for the smallest animals present; double screened when non-indigenous species B). Perimeter pond banks or dykes are of adequate height and construction to prevent breaching in exceptional flood events, C). Regular, timely inspections are performed and recorded in a permanent register D). Timely repairs to the system are recorded E). Installation and management of trapping devices to sample for the existence of escapes; data is recorded F). Escape recovery protocols in place (6.1.2)
- 2) Escapes and actions taken to prevent reoccurrence must be recorded and records are available for inspection (6.1.3)

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V.1.1 indicator 6.1.2 and 6.1.3:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 6.1.2 and 6.1.3:*](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.7.01.01 Escapes

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard excludes from certification (or decertifies) aquaculture facilities that have experienced repeated escape events over a representative number of production cycles.	<p>Repeated escape events is expected to be considered in terms of the numbers of aquatic animals stocked and the length of the production cycle. Escapes due to factors outside of the aquaculture facility's control can be exempt. Examples of representative number of production cycles include 3 or more for production cycles less than 1.5 years, 2 for production cycles over 1.5 years, 1 for production cycles over 3 years.</p> <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence, such as monitoring records, interviews with employees and the local community.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Escape records and actions to prevent recurrence of escapes 2) Farms that continue to have recurrences can be given major non-conformities under the Certification and Accreditation Requirements and if a farm cannot close a major non-conformity, the farm will lose its certification or not be eligible to receive certification. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Certification and Accreditation Requirements - Section 7.3.2 and 17.10:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V.1.1 indicator 6.1.2 and 6.1.3:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 6.1.2 and 6.1.3:</i>

CC.7.01.04 Escapes

GSSI Component	Guidance
Where a non-established, non-native species has been shown to be or has potential to be a successful invasive species, the	Effective measures are expected to include sourcing only sterile, polyploidy, or mono-sex seed or physical isolation. Verification is expected to include a

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.7.01.04 Escapes

standard requires that they are controlled by strict effective escape impact prevention and mitigation measures.

review of evidence of operational and fit for purpose measures (e.g., hatchery records, visual inspection (aquaculture facility and/or aquatic animal)).

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) Prevention measures in place to prevent escapes at harvest and during grow-out include: A). Effective screens or barriers of appropriate mesh size for the smallest animals present; double screened when non-indigenous species B). Perimeter pond banks or dykes are of adequate height and construction to prevent breaching in exceptional flood events C). Regular, timely inspections are performed and recorded in a permanent register D). Timely repairs to the system are recorded E). Installation and management of trapping devices to sample for the existence of escapes; data is recorded F). Escape recovery protocols in place (6.1.2)
- 2) Escapes and actions taken to prevent reoccurrence must be recorded = Record are available for inspection (6.1.3)

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V.1.1 indicator 6.1.2 and 6.1.3:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicator 6.1.2 and 6.1.3:*](#)

CC.7.02 Genetically Modified Organisms

GSSI Component

In the case where the culture of GMO organisms is permitted, the standard requires a suitable evaluation of the risk of environmental impacts.

Guidance

A suitable evaluation is expected to have been performed using an appropriate scientific method that assesses the likelihood of events and the magnitude of impacts, and take into account relevant uncertainties according to the precautionary approach. The evaluation should consider the possible impacts on genetic diversity, aquatic communities and ecosystems. Where ICES Code of Practice on the Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms 2005 is relevant, consistency with these requirements on genetically modified organisms (GMO) is also expected. Verification is expected to include a review of supporting evidence.

Conclusion

References

C . 1 E V I D E N C E O F A L I G N M E N T

CC.7.02 Genetically Modified Organisms

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because it includes an indicator (6.3.1) that does not allow the culture of transgenic shrimp (including the offspring of genetically engineered shrimp).

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 6.3.1:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 6.3.1:*](#)

CC.8.01 Salinization

GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires that the aquaculture facility establishes, implements, and maintains an appropriate system that addresses the impact of salinization of freshwater resources and the surrounding environment by the aquaculture facility.	<p>An exemption for standards that do not cover land-based saline water systems is expected.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are expected to be based on risk assessments or standardized requirements. Controls could include relevant monitoring of freshwater resources (e.g., groundwater resources, local water bodies, local soils) for salinity changes and measures such as pond-linings, limiting groundwater use and other control techniques. The standard is expected to prohibit the aquaculture facility to contributing to changing freshwater resources and the surrounding environment to saline conditions. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose, such as a visual inspection of the site.</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No allowance for discharging saline water to natural freshwater bodies (2.5.1). 2) No allowance for the use of fresh groundwater in ponds (2.5.2). 3) For all freshwater wells used by the farm or located on adjacent properties (identified prior to full assessment), specific conductance may not exceed 1,500 mhos per centimeter and/or chloride concentration may not exceed 300 milligrams per liter (2.5.3). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4: and 2.5.5</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4: and 2.5.5</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.8.01 Salinization

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>4) No net increase of soil-specific conductance or chloride concentration in adjacent land ecosystems and agricultural fields when compared to the first year of monitoring (2.5.4).</p> <p>5) The Specific conductance or chloride concentration of sediment prior to disposal outside the farm must not exceed those of the soil in the disposal area (2.5.5).</p> | |
|---|--|

CC.8.02 Water Use

GSSI Component	Guidance
Where appropriate (e.g. land-based freshwater ponds supplied with groundwater and all culture systems where water resources are limiting) the standard requires that the aquaculture facility has appropriate management measures for efficient water use.	<p>This requirement is based on Paragraph 47 of the Technical Guidelines on Aquaculture Certification state “Measures should be adopted to promote efficient water management and use, as well as proper management of effluents to reduce impacts on surrounding land, and water resources should be adopted.” GSSI recognizes that standards for efficient water management and use are not common in many current aquaculture standards. Generally it is expected that this Essential Component will only apply to aquaculture facilities that use land-based freshwater ponds supplied with groundwater and all culture systems where water resources are limiting. An exemption for all other production systems is expected. This can also be “not applicable” for standards that do not cover relevant production systems.</p> <p>Management measures may include a general promotion or awareness of efficient water use or actions that may lead to more efficient use. Where groundwater is used the standard is expected to require that the aquaculture facility establish, implement and maintain an appropriate system to prevent aquifer drawdown and negative impacts on freshwater resources and the surrounding environment caused by the facilities operations. Verification that the system is operational and fit for purpose is expected.</p>
Conclusion	References

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.8.02 Water Use

Not applicable. The overwhelming majority of shrimp produced in the world are farmed in brackish water ponds, using surface water from estuaries. Thus, water efficiency considerations applicable to freshwater ponds filled with groundwater are not applicable to brackish water shrimp ponds. However, some inland shrimp farms use brackish groundwater or fresh surface water. The ASC Shrimp Standard includes an indicator (2.5.2) that prohibits the use of fresh groundwater in ponds.

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 2.5.2:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 2.5.2:*](#)

CC.8.02.01 Water Use

GSSI Component	Guidance	
Where appropriate (e.g., land-based pond and flow-through systems, particularly in water resource limited regions), the standard requires metric limits to be placed on fresh water consumption and prevention of aquifer drawdown.	<p>Metric limits are expected to be defined (by the facility or by the standard) and intended to prevent aquifer drawdown and minimize negative impacts on freshwater resources and the surrounding environment. Verification that these limits are not exceeded by the aquaculture facility is expected.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.8.02</p>	
Conclusion		References
The overwhelming majority of shrimp produced in the world are farmed in brackish water ponds, using surface water from estuaries. Thus, water efficiency considerations applicable to freshwater ponds filled with groundwater are not applicable to brackish water shrimp ponds. However, some inland shrimp farms use brackish groundwater or fresh surface water. The ASC Shrimp Standard includes an indicator (2.5.2) that prohibits the use of fresh groundwater in ponds.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 2.5.2:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 2.5.2:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.8.03 Water Quality	
GSSI Component	Guidance
The standard requires, where appropriate, management measures for effluents in order to reduce adverse impacts on the water quality of water bodies receiving effluents. Monitoring of the systems effluents against appropriate criteria is required.	<p>Appropriate measures are expected to include.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring and recording of effluent or receiving water quality, and which may including key parameters that need to be addressed include, where applicable: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Nutrients – Nitrate/Nitrogen (impacts on seawater) ii) Nutrients – Phosphate/Phosphorous (impacts on freshwater) iii) Dissolved oxygen iv) Salinity v) Suspended Solids vi) pH 2. Defined, aquaculture appropriate, maximum reference points (e.g., general concentration limits or aquaculture facility-specific limits) or mandatory systems (e.g., presence of a suitable filter) are defined to prevent pollution 3. Where reference points are exceeded, the scheme either refuses certification or that mitigation methods are employed and monitored to meet a time bound goal to come into compliance. <p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the system is operational and fit for purpose, including visual inspection of the site. Where effluent concentration limits are used for compliance, independent verification of conformance is also expected.</p> <p>“Where appropriate” is expected to include standards that cover production systems that release effluent that has the potential to impact water quality, e.g., fed/intensive aquaculture in ponds and raceways. An exception for marine cage aquaculture and on or offbottom shellfish culture is expected.</p>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.8.03 Water Quality

Conclusion

The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:

- 1) presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use, (1.1.1)
- 2) Nitrogen effluent load per ton of shrimp produced over a 12-month period = Less than 25.2 kg N per ton of shrimp for *L. vannamei*. Less than 32.4 kg N per ton of shrimp for *P. monodon*.
- 3) Phosphorous effluent load per ton of shrimp produced over a 12-month period = Less than 3.9 kg P per ton of shrimp for *L. vannamei*. Less than 5.4 kg P per ton of shrimp for *P. monodon*.
- 4) Responsible handling and disposal of sludge and sediments removed from ponds and canals = No discharge or disposal of sludge and sediments to public waterways and wetlands.
- 5) Treatment of effluent water from permanently aerated ponds = Evidence that all discharged water goes through a treatment system, and concentration of settleable solids in effluent water < 3.3 mL/L.
- 6) Percentage change in diurnal dissolved oxygen (DO) relative to DO at saturation in receiving water body for the water's specific salinity and temperature $\leq 65\%$
- 7) Water-specific conductance or chloride concentration monitoring in freshwater wells used by the farm or located on adjacent properties
- 8) No net increase in the soil-specific conductance or chloride concentration in adjacent land ecosystems and agricultural fields
- 9) Specific conductance or chloride concentration of sediment does not exceed those of the soil at disposal outside the farm.

References

- [*ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 1.1.1, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, 7.5.5:*](#)
- [*ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicators 1.1.1, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, 7.5.5:*](#)

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.8.03.01 Water Quality		
GSSI Component	Guidance	
The standard requires suitable specific limits to the nutrient load released to the environment.	<p>Suitable specific limits are expected to be specific to the culture practices, and designed to ensure minimal pollution. Verification is expected to include a review of evidence that the specific limits are met.</p> <p>Aligned standards will also be considered in alignment with C.8.03</p>	
Conclusion		References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes indicators that require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use, (1.1.1) 2) Nitrogen effluent load per ton of shrimp produced over a 12-month period = Less than 25.2 kg N per ton of shrimp for L. vannamei. Less than 32.4 kg N per ton of shrimp for P. monodon. 3) Phosphorous effluent load per ton of shrimp produced over a 12-month period = Less than 3.9 kg P per ton of shrimp for L. vannamei. Less than 5.4 kg P per ton of shrimp for P. monodon. 4) Responsible handling and disposal of sludge and sediments removed from ponds and canals = No discharge or disposal of sludge and sediments to public waterways and wetlands. 5) Treatment of effluent water from permanently aerated ponds = Evidence that all discharged water goes through a treatment system, and concentration of settleable solids in effluent water < 3.3 mL/L. 6) Percentage change in diurnal dissolved oxygen (DO) relative to DO at saturation in receiving water body for the water's specific salinity and temperature ≤ 65% 7) Water-specific conductance or chloride concentration monitoring in freshwater wells used by the farm or located on adjacent properties 8) No net increase in the soil-specific conductance or chloride concentration in adjacent land ecosystems and agricultural fields 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V.1.1 indicator 1.1.1, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, 7.5.5:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V.1.1 indicators 1.1.1, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, 7.5.5:</i>

C.1 EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT

CC.8.03.01 Water Quality

9) Specific conductance or chloride concentration of sediment does not exceed those of the soil at disposal outside the farm.

CC.9.01 Legal Compliance

GSSI Component	Guidance
<p>The standard requires (evidence of) compliance with all local and national laws and regulations relevant to aquaculture, especially concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - application of chemicals and veterinary drugs - feed, feed ingredients and fertilizers - habitat and biodiversity (including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where required) - seed sourcing at both source and destination - Escapes and releases - water use, water quality and waste discharge 	<p>Verification is expected to include a review of evidence provided by the aquaculture facility to support compliance with relevant laws. For feed, its ingredients & fertilizers, verification is expected to include a review of evidence (e.g., documentation, self-declaration by the feed manufacturer).</p> <p>For seed sourcing this could include international laws (e.g., CITES, OIE and ICES import guidelines) and laws governing introductions and transfers of live aquatic animals.</p>
Conclusion	References
<p>The ASC Shrimp Standard is in alignment because the standard includes an indicator (1.1.1) that requires compliance with local and national laws or regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ASC Shrimp audit manual V 1.1 indicator 1.1.1:</i> • <i>ASC Shrimp Standard V 1.1 indicator 1.1.1:</i>

