Form 3 - Public Disclosure Form

Public Disclosure Form

Name of CAB	SAI Global
Date of Submission	03rd August 2017

CAB Contact Person

Name of Contact Person	Linda McDonnell
Position in the CAB's-organisation	Programme Administrator
Mailing address	3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co.Louth, Ireland
Email address	Linda.McDonnell@saiglobal.com
Phone number	0035342 932 0912
Other	N/A

ASC Name of Client

Name of Company	Marine Harvest Canada Inc.
Name of Contact Person	Katherine Dolmage
Position in the client's organisation	Certification Manager
Mailing address	124-1334 Island Hwy, Campbell River, B, V9W 8C9, Canada
Email address	katherine.dolmage@marineharvest.com
Phone number	250-850-3276
Other	N/A

Unit of Certification

Single Site	X
Multi-site	
Group certification	

Sites to be audited

Site Name	GPS Coordinates	Other Location Information	Planned Site Audit(s)	Date of planned audit
Althorp (Initial)	N:50 28.500; W:125 48.410	N/A	18th -22nd Sept 2017	18th - 22nd Sept 2017

Species and Standards

Standard	Species (scientific name) produced	Included in scope (Yes/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used	Version Number
Salmon	*Salmo Salar*	Yes	ASC Salmon Standard	Version 1.0 June 2012

Planned Stakeholder Consultation(s) and How Stakeholders can Become Involved

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in-person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted
David Suzuki Foundation	Conservation	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
Living Oceans Society	Conservation	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
Coast Forestry Products Association	Forestry	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
BC Seafood Alliance	Fisheries	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
Vancouver Island North Tourism	Tourism	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
Sayward Town Council	Local Gov	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
Wei Wai Kum First Nation	Local Gov	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
We Wai Kai First Nation	Local Gov	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
K'ómoks First Nation	Local Gov	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
James Walkus Fishing Company	Contractors/Suppliers	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
Skretting	Contractors/Suppliers	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
BC Centre for Aquatic Health Sciences	Research	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email
BC Salmon Farmers Association	Industry	Via email	Prior to audit and when the Draft Assessment Report is posted on the ASC website	Via email

Proposed Timeline

Contract Signed:	Jan-17
Start of audit:	Sep-17
Onsite Audit(s):	18th - 22nd September 2017
Determination/Decision:	Dec-17

Audit Team

Title	Name	ASC Registration Reference
Lead Auditor	Paul Casburn	N/A
Social Auditor	Leon Reed	N/A
Auditor	Javier Unibazo	N/A

ASC Audit Report - Opening

General Requirements

C1 Audit reports shall be written in English and in the most common language spoken in the areas where the operation is located.

C2 Audit reports may contain confidential annexes for commercially sensitive information.

- **C2.1** The CAB shall agree the content of any commercially sensitive information with the applicant, which can still be accessible by the ASC and the appointed accreditation body upon request as stipulated in the certification contract.
- **C2.2** The public report shall contain a clear overview of the items which are in the confidential annexes.
- **C2.3** Except for the annexes that contain commercially sensitive information all audit reports will be public.

C3 The CAB is solely responsible for the content of all reports, including the content of any confidential annexes.

C4 Reporting Deadlines* for certification and re-certification audit reports

- **C4.1** Within thirty (30) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a draft report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- **C4.2** Within five (5) days the ASC should post the draft report to the ASC website.
- **C4.3** The CAB shall allow stakeholders and interested parties to comment on the report for fifteen (15) days.
- **C4.4** Within twenty (20) days of the close of comments, the CAB shall submit the final report to the ASC in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- **C4.5** Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.
- **C4.6** Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducible results.

C5 Reporting Deadlines* for surveillance audit reports

- **C5.1** Within ninety (90) days of the completing of the audit the CAB shall submit a final report in English and the national or most common language spoken in the area where the operation is located.
- **C5.2** Within five (5) days the ASC should post the final report to the ASC website.
- **C5.3** Audit reports shall contain accurate and reproducible results.

1 Title Page

1.1 Name of Applicant	Marine Harvest Canada
1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report]	Final Initial Audit Report
1.3 CAB name	SAI Global Dundalk.
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Paul Casburn
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Leon Reed Social auditor. Javier Unibazo Technical Assessor.
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Katherine Dolmage, Certification manager.
1.7 Date	18/09/2017

2 Table of Contents

3 Glossary

Terms and abbreviations that are specific to this audit report and that are not otherwise defined in the ASC glossary	NA

4 Summary

A concise summary of the report and findings. The summary shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.

4.1	A brief description of the scope of the audit	The marine site located at co-ordinates 50 28.455; -125 48.507 in Sunderland Channel off Johnson strait in Northwestern Vancouver Island.
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	The site has 7 steel cages that are 36 x 36 x 20m deep.
4.3	Type of unit of certification (*select only one type of unit of certification in the list)*	Single Farm
4.4	Type of audit (*select all the types of audit that apply in the list)*	Initial
4.5	Did the audit include harvesting activities of the principle product to be audited?	Yes but not on this site. Duncan Island was surveilled at the same time and it was harvesting ASC fish for the same company and going to the same Processing plant in Port Hardy. All owned by Marine Harvest Canada.
4.6	If not, provide a justification for the alternative timing.	NA
4.7	A summary of the major findings	There were 3 major findings during the audit. Two were due to the benthic sampling results not yet being available for the audit and the third was due to Health and safety issues not being up to the required standard.
4.8	The Audit determination	Approved for certification.

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1	CAB Name	SAI Global
5.2	CAB Mailing Address	3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland
5.3	Email Address	Linda.McDonnell@saiglobal.com

5.4	Other Contact Information	0035342 932 0912

6 Site Contact Details

6.1	Company Name	Marine Harvest Canada
6.2	Contact Name	Brice McCannel
6.3	Mailing Address	#124 - 1334 Island Highway Campbell River, British Columbia, Canada V9W 8C9
6.4	Email Address	katherine.dolmage@marineharvest.com
6.5	Other Contact Information	NA

6.6 Annual production volume in metric tonnes

Year	
2016	0
2017	862
2018	3048
2019	3380
2020	0

7 Background on the Applicant

7.1	Information on the Public Disclosure Form (Form 3) except 1.2-1.3 All information updated as necessary to reflect the audit as conducted.	
7.2	A description of the unit of certification (*for initial audit)* / changes, if any (*for surveillance and recertification audits)*	7 steel cages that are 36 x 36 x 20 deep
7.3	Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	GAA BAP certification
7.4	Other certification(s) obtained before this audit	GAA BAP certification
7.5	Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the current year	862 tons

7.6	Actual annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the previous year *(mandatory for surveillance and recertification*	0
7.7	Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification *(select one or more in the list)*	Steel pens
7.8	Number of employees working at the unit of certification	5 staff

8 Scope

8.1	The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Salmon V1.1
8.2	The species produced at the applicant farm	Atlantic salmon. Salmo salar.
8.3	A description of the scope of the audit including a description of whether the unit of certification covers all production or harvest areas (i.e. ponds) managed by the operation or located at the included sites, or whether only a sub-set of these are included in the unit of certification. If only a sub-set of production or harvest areas are included in the unit of certification these shall be clearly named.	The scope of the audit is the marine fish site located at the co-ordinates previously stated. Only this site is in the Scope. The Althorp site is one of 30 active sites from 60 tenures that Marine Harvest Canada operates.
8.4	The names and addresses of any storage, processing, or distribution sites included in the operation (including subcontracted operations) that will potentially be handling certified products, up until the point where product enters further chain	The Well Boat is a subcontractor but only works for Marine Harvest.
8.5	Description of the receiving water body(ies).	Sunderland channel which is located off the Johnson strait in the North East of Vancouver Island.

9 Audit Plan

9.1	The names of the auditors and the dates when each of the following were undertaken or completed: conducting the audit, writing of the report, reviewing the report, and taking the certification decision.	Paul Casburn, Leon Reed and Javier Unibazo. Audit 18th to 22nd September. Writing the report started 18th September and ended 16th October 2017 following some reviews by auditors.
9.2	Was harvesting witnessed? If not, when is harvesting scheduled to be witnessed?	Yes but not on this site. Duncan Island was surveilled at the same time and it was harvesting ASC fish for the same company and going to the same Processing plant in Port Hardy. All owned by Marine Harvest Canada. The fish were being harvested on the harvest vessel the Pacific Joye and being transferred to the RSW vessel the Nicole Joye. The harvest vessels and related harvest company is owned by James Walkus fishing company. He harvests exclusively for Marine Harvest Canada. On the day of harvest the plan was to harvest 35,000 pieces. The fish were in the region of 7kg. The documented traceability system consists of a 3 copy document that is filled in on the harvest boat that describes the site, cage number, date, time and fish number harvested plus any other comments. One copy is left on the farm, one copy is left on the harvest boat and the last copy goes to the Processing plant. A further 3 copy document is filled in by the farm itemising the last treatments of anaesthetic, antibiotics and lice treatments if any. This document details the withdrawal of any therapeutants of chemicals and is used in the history of the harvest fish. Again the farm keeps a copy, the harvest boat keeps a copy and the processing plant does not proceed with processing without their copy.

9.3 Previous Audits (if applicable):

		NC reference number	Standard clause reference	Closing deadline - status - closing date of each NC
9.3.1	Initial audit - mm/yyyy			
	Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy			
	Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy			
	Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy			
	Unannounced audit - mm/ yyyy			
	NC close-out audit - mm/ yyyyy			
	Scope extension audit mm/ yyyy			

9.4 Audit plan as implemented including:

		Dates	Locations
9.4.1	Desk Reviews	14th to 17th September	Office
9.4.2	Onsite audits	18th to 22nd September	On site and in the office located in Campbell River.
9.4.3	Stakeholder interviews and Community meetings		
9.4.4	Draft report sent to client		
9.4.5	Draft report sent to ASC		
9.4.6	Final report sent to Client and ASC		

9.5 Names and affiliations of individuals consulted or otherwise involved in the audit including: representatives of the client, employees, contractors, stakeholders and any observers that participated in the audit.

Katherine Dolmage, Certification Manager. Richard Opala, Regulatory affairs manager. Diane Morrison, Director of fish health and food safety. Jason Stocker, Harvest manager. Blaine Trembley, Health and Safety manager. Dean Dobrinsky, HR Director. Renee Hamil, Certification administrator.

9.6 Stakeholder submissions, including written or other documented information and CAB written responses to each submission.

Name of stakeholder (if permission given to make name public)	Relevance to be contacted	Date of contact	CAB responded Yes/No	Brief summary of points Raised	Use of comment by CAB	Response sent to stakeholder

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard
Created by the Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue

Scope: species belonging to *the genus Salmo and Oncorhynchus*

PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS						
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations						
		Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	**Audit evidence** 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe also in the cells below.	**Evaluation** (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	**Description of NC** Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability	**Value/ Metric** Provide values - if applicable for the respective Indicator
1.1.1	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws. b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable. c. Keep records of inspections for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation). d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas. e. Others, please describe	Farm established in the area for more than 20 year. Copies of relevant applicable land and water laws are accessible by the DFO website internet. License AQFF 115324 2016/2022, valid until 30/06/2022. Provincial Aquaculture Licence 1407426, issued 07/01/2012. License of Occupation 111915, file 1407426, 25/05/2005, issued by BC, licensed for the sea bed. Navigable Water Permit issue by Transport Canada, Pacific Region, under Navigable Water Protection Division, dated 09/08/2006. Farm inspected by DFO in areas of lice monitoring, fish health record, FHMP compliance, benthic surveys and site debris. Last inspection 13/01/2016. Inspection report seen. No issues raised. Marine Plan Partnership for the North Vancouver Island (MaPP) map confirms that the farm is not located in a conservation area but in a Special Management Zone, where off-bottom finfish aquaculture is conditionally allowed.	Compliant		
1.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CABs will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public. b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates. c. Register with national or local authorities as an “aquaculture activity". d. Others, please describe	2017 Property Tax Notice seen, issued under The Taxation (Rural Area) Act. eTaxBC Enrolment Code: L0L6 BC, Ministry of Finance. Confirmed paid 04/07/2017.	Compliant		
1.1.3	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labour laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain copies of national labour codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.) b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labour laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation). c. Others, please describe	The BC Employment Standards Act - this details minimum wages and rights for employees and collective agreements and bargaining. The Minister of Labour, Citizens Services and Open Government is the relevant Authority. The minimum wage is $10.25/hour and the minimum work age is 15. Inspections are not required in BC	Compliant		
1.1.4	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable. b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations. c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required. d. Others, please describe	Not specific permits for water quality impacts apart from PAR licence sections in relation to environmental water quality as benthic monitoring, blood water collection, water contamination, disposal of disinfectants and domestic sewage.	Compliant		
PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION						
Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]						

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

2.1.1	**Indicator:** Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare a map showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification [3] to the CAB. b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1c-f, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard. d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I-1 (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations). e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. If site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC. h. Others, please describe	A map of all of the sample points was available and provided during the audit. Site used site specific AZE based in DEPOMOD. Sediment was described as 'mud' throughout all sample points, including the reference stations. Farm chose Option #2 Sulphide. Sampling carried out at peak biomass in SEP 2017 and in compliance with the requirements of Appendix I- 1. GPS coordinates available for all sampling points and cross checked with sulphide results report. Sulphide concentration in sediments ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l at each sampling station outside the AZE. Available data recorded on 'Transparency checklist' and submitted to ASC.	***Compliant***		
2.1.2	**Indicator:** Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25 **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1). b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement. c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1). d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method. e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method. f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method. g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method. h. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analysed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results. i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle. j. Others, please describe	Samples were collected during SEP 2017, when the site reached peak biomass. A map of the farm showing the boundary of AZE and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations was available. At the time of the audit, the faunal index score was not available as the farm was waiting to receive the results.	Major	The faunal index score was not available at the audit thus, it was not possible to confirm the ecological quality classification.	

2.1.3	**Indicator:** Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b. b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method. c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species. d. Retain documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained. If samples were analysed by an independent lab, obtain copies of results. e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	Samples were collected during SEP 2017, when the site reached peak biomass. A map of the farm showing the boundary of AZE and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations was available. At the time of the audit, the faunal index score was not available as the farm was waiting to receive the results.	Major	The faunal index score was not available at the audit thus, it was not possible to confirm the abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna.	
2.1.4	**Indicator:** Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modelling system **Requirement:** Yes, within three years of the publication [8] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015) **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern before 3 years have passed since publication of the Standard on June 13, 2012. b. Maintain records to show how the analysis (in 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modelling using a multi-parameter approach [7]. c. Maintain records to show that modelling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data. d. Others, please describe	Depomod has been carried out following the 'Guide to the Pacific Marine Finfish Aquaculture Application' . Modelled in APR 2013, avg feed rate 882 kg/cage/day, carbon flux avg. 17836 m2.The company has used detailed bathymetry and chart data to computer model the site. Three measurements are used in the water column 15 metres from the surface, 5 meters from the bottom and the mid depth. Cage setup with FCR, growth rate and chart data are input. DFO have ground truthed the DEPOMOD model on site in the area and have adopted the model based on this ground truthing as a tool they are willing to accept. DEPOMOD has been used and validated as per DFO requirements.	Compliant		
Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [12]						
2.2.1	**Indicator**: Weekly average percent saturation [13] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [14] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4 **Requirement:** ≥ 70% [15] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [15]	a. Monitor and record on-farm percent saturation of DO at a minimum of twice daily using a calibrated oxygen meter or equivalent method. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months. b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time. c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data. d. If any weekly average DO values are < 70%, or approaching that level, monitor and record DO at a reference site and compare to on-farm levels (see Instructions). e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site. f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year. g. Others, please describe	Weekly average monitoring records of DO percent saturation on farm covering > 6 months were available and calculation reviewed. Confirmed that all weekly averages > 70%. Data submitted to ASC. The site use a Steinvik Oxygen probes are located in cages 2 and 6. There is a site reference probe located beside the feed shed. Each morning a hand held Oxyguard probe is used in conjunction with the phytoplankton analysis. The hand held probe is calibrated before use by setting the display reading to 100% prior to use.	Compliant		
2.2.2	**Indicator**: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/litre DO **Requirement:** 5% **Applicability:** All	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/l DO. b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year. c. Others, please describe	Reviewed calculation confirm that none of the weekly samples fall under 2 mg/l DO. Data submitted to ASC.	Compliant		

2.2.3	**Indicator**: For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets [16], demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently [17] classified as having “good” or “very good” water quality [18] **Requirement:** Yes [19] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Inform the CAB whether relevant targets and classification systems are applicable in the jurisdiction. If applicable, proceed to "2.2.3.b". If not applicable, take action as required under 2.2.4 b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification. c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates. d. Others, please describe	The CAB have been informed that the area has been classified so, the indicator is applicable. The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment established water quality guidelines for the BC area. In 2014 Stephen F. Cross, Ph.D., from Global AquaFoods Development Corp., was contracted to do a literature review of papers that had looked at data from the BC area on water quality. This report classified the water as very good. The Marine Harvest Nutrient Monitoring & Data Analysis report, dated APR 2017 and conducted by Dr. Cross, based in samples taken in five MHC's production areas, included Campbell River, during May-OCT 2016, 204 samples in total, showed that, for the selected parameters, ammonia, nitrate and phosphate, the results are lower than the established in the aquatic life protection criterion.	Compliant		
2.2.4	**Indicator**: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [20] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5, testing a minimum of once weekly in both locations. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months. b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations. c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. d. Others, please describe	N/A. See above 2.2.3	N/A		
2.2.5	**Indicator**: Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [21]) of the farm on a production cycle basis **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box. b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle. c. Others, please describe	First audit so, no calculation of BOD as the current cycle has not finished. Confirmed that data has been collected during current cycle. Calculation of BOD for previous production cycle was available confirming that it is understood by the farm. BOD for the cycle ending in March 2016 is 4,928,802.9. No submission to ASC as the current cycle has not finished yet.	Compliant		
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
2.3.1	**Indicator**: Percentage of fines [22] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [23] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) **Requirement:** < 1% by weight of the feed **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [23]	a. Determine and document a schedule and location for quarterly testing of feed. If testing prior to delivery to farm site, document rationale behind not testing on site. b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations. c. Conduct test according to detailed methodology in Appendix I-2 and record results for the pooled sample for each quarter. For first audits, farms must have test results from the last 3 months. d. Others, please describe	Fines testing is being conducted by the feed company and not the farm.	Minor	Fines testing is being conducted by the feed company and not the farm.	
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species						
	Indicator: Evidence of an assessment of the farm’s potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby	a. Perform (or contract to have performed) a documented assessment of the farm's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3.	CEAA Screening Environmental Assessment Report, dated 09/01/2003, and			

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

2.4.1	Impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outlined in Appendix I-3 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	b. If the assessment (2.4.1a) identifies potential impact(s) of the farm on biodiversity or nearby critical, sensitive or protected habitats or species, prepare plan to address those potential impacts. c. Keep records to show how the farm implements plan(s) from 2.4.1b to minimize potential impacts to critical or sensitive habitats and species. d. Others, please describe	leaded by Transport Canada in place confirmed addressing components outlined in Appendix I-3 including Environmental Effects, Species/Habitat of special concern, Mitigation and Significance. The assessment reports that no eelgrass or kelp beds are found in the immediate vicinity of the fish farm, and no herring spawn areas noted by DFO as vital, major or important within a 1 km radius of the location.	Compliant		
2.4.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [24] or High Conservation Value Areas [25] (HCVAs) **Requirement:** None [26] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [26]	a. Provide a map showing the location of the farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) as defined above (see also 1.1.1a). b. If the farm is <u>not</u> sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Area as defined above, prepare a declaration attesting to this fact. In this case, the requirements of 2.4.2c-d do not apply. c. If the farm <u>is</u> sited in a protected area or HCVA, review the scope of applicability of Indicator 2.4.2 (see Instructions above) to determine if your farm is allowed an exception to the requirements. If yes, inform the CAB which exception (#1, #2, or #3) is allowed and provide supporting evidence. d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA and the exceptions provided for Indicator 2.4.2 <u>do not apply</u>, then the farm does not comply with the requirement and is ineligible for ASC certification. e. Others, please describe	Marine Plan Partnership for the North Pacific Coast (MaPP) map provided confirms that the farm is not located in a protected area but in a Special Management Zone, SMZ, where off-bottom finfish aquaculture is conditionally allowed. According to the North Vancouver Island Marine Plan, 2015, a SMZ is a single zone that represents potentially compatible and coexisting uses, activities, values and interests. It is assigned to management emphasis areas that are intended to strengthen, encourage and/or maintain opportunities for important existing values, uses or activities associated with local communities, First Nations and marine economic sectors that are related to the area emphasis.	N/A		
Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]						
2.5.1	**Indicator**: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used **Requirement:** 0, within three years of the date of publication [28] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015) **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a written statement affirming that the farm's management is committed to eliminate all usage of acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) by June 13, 2015. b. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs were used by the farm after June 13, 2015 (applicable only after the specified date). - d. Others, please describe	ADDs and AHDs are not allowed under British Columbia regulation. Confirmed not used by the site.	N/A		
2.5.2	**Indicator**: Prior to the achievement of 2.5.1, if ADDs or AHDs are used, maximum percentage of days [29] in the production cycle that the devices are operational **Requirement:** ≤ 40% **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2015	a. Maintain a log for the use of any ADDs or AHDs on farm that includes recording the number of days (24-hour cycles) during which the devices were used. b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle. - d. Submit data on number of days that ADDs/AHDs were used to the ASC as per Appendix VI. Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). e. Others, please describe	ADDs and AHDs not used by the site.	N/A		
	Indicator: Number of mortalities	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations. b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.	The site use anti-predator net surrounding the cages, electrified wire one feet			

2.5.3	[30] of endangered or red-listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All	c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death. d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1) - f. Others, please describe	above the water line and bird nets above each cage. Farm records shows no mortalities of marine mammals or birds. The condition of the site licence establish that mortalities and incidents have to be reported to DFO. Information evidenced at the site was cross checked with DFO website which shows all the lethal incidents in farms in BC. None of the species named in the website are listed as endangered or critically endangered by the IUCN, the SARA or the COSEWIC species list.	Compliant		
2.5.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [32] against a predator: 1. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action 2. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager 3. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority **Requirement:** Yes [33] **Applicability:** All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [33]	a. Provide a list of all lethal actions that the farm took against predators during the previous 12-month period. Note: "lethal action" is an action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds. b. For each lethal action identified in 2.5.4a, keep record of the following: 1) a rationale showing how the farm pursued all other reasonable avenues prior to using lethal action; 2) approval from a senior manager above the farm manager of the lethal action; 3) where applicable, explicit permission was granted by the relevant regulatory authority to take lethal action against the animal. c. Provide documentary evidence that steps 1-3 above (in 2.5.4b) were taken prior to killing the animal. If human safety was endangered and urgent action necessary, provide documentary evidence as outlined in [33]. d. Others, please describe	No lethal actions in the current/past crop.	N/A		
2.5.5	**Indicator**: Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34] **Requirement:** Yes	a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence. b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website). c. Others, please describe	No lethal incidents in the current/past crop. The condition of the site licence establish that incidents have to be reported to DFO.	Compliant		
2.5.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior two years **Requirement:** < 9 lethal incidents [36], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.4a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required. b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period. c. Send ASC the farm's data for all lethal incidents [35] of any species other than the salmon being farmed (e.g. lethal incidents involving predators such as birds or marine mammals). Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). d. Others, please describe	No lethal incidents in the current/past crop.	Compliant		
2.5.7	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Keep records showing that the farm undertakes an assessment of risk following each lethal incident and how those risk assessments are used to identify concrete steps the farm takes to reduce the risk of future incidents. b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.7a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents. c. Others, please describe	No lethal incidents has been reported by the site however, the documentation in place to record such incidents and the associated assessment of risk following each incident was not available at the farm and the procedure was not known by the site management.	Minor	The documentation in place to record incidents and associated assessment of risk following each lethal event was not available at the farm and the procedure was not know by the site management.	

PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS						
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [38,39]						
3.1.1	**Indicator**: 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. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme. b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including: - coordination of stocking; - fallowing; - therapeutic treatments; and - information sharing. c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with all requirements in Appendix II-1, including definition of area, minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements. d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year. e. Others, please describe	There are three sites currently in operation in this immediate vicinity, which surround Hardwicke Island, including the audited site. The three operated and owned by MHC. They are classed under the DFO fish health surveillance sub-zone 3.2, Discovery Islands. Site fallowed from 14/03/2016 until 28/11/2016. Reference VR 145 on the ASC website.	Compliant		
3.1.2	**Indicator**: A demonstrated commitment [40] to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Retain records to show how the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups (NGOs, academics, governments) to agree on and collaborate towards areas of research to measure impacts on wild stocks, including records of requests for research support and collaboration and responses to those requests. b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either: - providing researchers with access to farm-level data; - granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way. c. When the farm and/or its operating company denies a request to collaborate on a research project, ensure that there is a written justification for rejecting the proposal. d. Maintain records from research collaborations (e.g. communications with researchers) to show that the farm has supported the research activities identified in 3.1.2a. e. Others, please describe	The company demonstrate involvement in a series of research collaborations and research engagement with different parties, some of them thru the BC Salmon Farmers Association, i.e. "Investigations into implementing the use of kelp perch and pile perch as sea lice cleaner fish for farmed Atlantic salmon in BC (Vancouver Aquarium Marine Science Centre, Marine Harvest Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, SeaPact, BC Centre for Aquatic Health Sciences)", and "Marine reservoirs of infectious agents associated with proliferative gill disorders in farmed salmon (BC Centre for Aquatic Health Sciences, BC Animal Health Centre, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Marine Harvest Canada)". Other research collaboration evidenced is "The Strategic Salmon Health Initiative", research project in is 2nd phase now and under the umbrella of Genome British Columbia. The project looks at microbes in wild salmon and possible links to farmed salmon. For each project in which the company is involved, a staff is appointed as MHC responsible contact person.	Compliant		
3.1.3	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Keep records to show that a maximum sea lice load has been set for: - the entire ABM; and - the individual farm. b. Maintain evidence that the established maximum sea lice load (3.1.3a) is reviewed annually as outlined in Appendix II-2, incorporating feedback from the monitoring of wild salmon where applicable (See 3.1.6). c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the ABM has set (3.1.3a) and annually reviewed (3.1.3.b) maximum sea lice load in compliance with requirements in Appendix II-2. d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. e. Others, please describe	Lice load is set by the governmental body DFO. Under the farms licence conditions there is a trigger level of 3 motile lice from March to June following bi-weekly monitoring. For the rest of the year the tests shall be carried out every 4 weeks unless the level exceeds 3 motiles. MHC has calculated max lice levels based on stocking numbers and regulatory threshold of 3. For this area the max load is 6,688,679 lep salmonis.	Compliant		
		a. Prepare an annual schedule for testing sea lice that identifies timeframes of routine testing frequency (at a minimum, monthly) and for high-frequency testing (weekly) due to sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles).				

3.1.4	**Indicator**: Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	b. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for sea lice. If farm deviates from schedule due to weather [41] maintain documentation of event and rationale. c. Document the methodology used for testing sea lice ('testing' includes both counting and identifying sea lice). The method must follow national or international norms, follows accepted minimum sample size, use random sampling, and record the species and life-stage of the sea lice. If farm uses a closed production system and would like to use an alternate method (i.e. video), farm shall provide the CAB with details on the method and efficacy of the method. d. Make the testing results from 3.1.4b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within seven days of testing. If requested, provide stakeholders access to hardcopies of test results. e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public. f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year. g. Others, please describe	Annual schedule seen in place. The company counts sea lice on a twice monthly basis across all farm sites except from the ASC sites which are tested weekly during the sensitive period, from MAR 1st to JUN 30th, as it was evidenced in Aquafarmer records and confirmed by farm checks on paper records, signed off by staff involved. A SOP on lice counting, Sealice Monitoring - Marine Sites SW 822, is in place which provide and state the requirements of Federal Government. Monitoring results posted on the website Marine Harvest Canada under the ASC Dashboard confirmed, on average, after 5 days of sampling. Last sample taken on the 8th of AUG, 1.01 motile L. salmonids. Results confirmed as submitted in the ASC Transparency Checklist.	Compliant		
3.1.5	**Indicator**: In areas with wild salmonids [43], evidence of data [44] 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Identify all salmonid species that naturally occur within 75 km of the farm through literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. If the farm is not in an area with wild salmonids, then 3.1.5b and c do not apply. b. For species listed in 3.1.5a, compile best available information on migration routes, migration timing (range of months for juvenile outmigration and returning salmon), life history timing for coastal resident salmonids, and stock productivity over time in major waterways within 50 km of the farm. c. From data in 3.1.5b, identify any sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. periods of outmigration of juveniles) within 50 km of the farm. - e. Others, please describe	There are six salmonid species in the area. Five are pacific salmon and the sixth is the rainbow trout, all listed on the DFO website. The sensitive period for this area is listed as March 1st to June 30th. DFO compile a 'Preliminary 2017 Salmon Outlook ' report dated December, 2016. The outlook, which has been done since 2002 includes river and bay areas. This information is available online and it had been demonstrated by the company that it is aware of the data comprised in the report and the sensitive periods.	Compliant		
3.1.6	**Indicator**: In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Artic char, with results made publicly available. See requirements in Appendix III-1. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply. b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids. c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids is in compliance with the requirements in Appendix III-1. d. Make the results from 3.1.6b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within eight weeks of completion of monitoring. e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI. f. Others, please describe	The farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. An annual report, Wild Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring Program - Discovery Islands - 2017, is prepared by Mainstream Biological Consulting. The report provides the results of beach seine sampling completed to monitor sea lice abundance, prevalence and intensity on juvenile wild salmon within the Discovery Islands. Sampling was conducted during two separate sampling events in APR and MAY 2017, selected to coincide with the peak outmigration period of juvenile salmonids. Confirmed methodology in compliance with the requirements in Appendix III-1. Results of monitoring of sea lice in wild salmonids posted on the MHC website ASC Dashboard on July 25, 2017 and submitted to ASC.	Compliant		

3.1.7	**Indicator**: In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish [45]. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2. **Requirement:** 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish **Applicability:** All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply. b. Establish the sensitive periods [45] of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before. c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2. d. Provide the CAB with evidence there is a 'feedback loop' between the targets for on-farm lice levels and the results of monitoring of lice levels on wild salmonids (Appendix II-2). e. Others, please describe	The farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. The sensitive period is from March 1st to June 30th. On-farm lice levels monitoring results reported in Aquafarmer and on paper records, signed off by staff involved. Fifteen samples during last sensitive period. There are two variances on the ASC website in reference to this indicator, numbers 88 and 141, that allows the farm to use the DFO trigger levels of 3 motile lice for compliance to this indicator. Feedback loops are being developed based on sea lice levels on outmigrating smolts with data from the wild smolt sampling.	Compliant		
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species						
3.2.1	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially produced in the area by the date of publication of the SAD standard **Requirement:** Yes [47] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [47]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply. b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard (i.e. before June 13, 2012). c. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish that includes details on accuracy of sterility effectiveness. d. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b or 3.2.1c, provide documented evidence that the production system is closed to the natural environment and for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce [47]; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material [47] that might survive and subsequently reproduce (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of any effluent water exiting the system to the natural environment). - f. Others, please describe	Marine Harvest Canada farm Atlantic Salmon, Salmo salar, on this site, which is not native to the area. According to the Fisheries and Oceans Canada website (Farming the seas – A timeline), Atlantic Salmon were first farmed in British Columbia in the 1980's.	Compliant		
3.2.2	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research [48] 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 [49] **Requirement:** Yes, within five years of publication of the SAD standard [50,51] **Applicability:** All	a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI). b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply. c. If yes to 3.2.2b, provide evidence of scientific research completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction. Alternatively, the farm may request an exemption to 3.2.2c (see below). d. If applicable, submit to the CAB a request for exemption that shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified in instruction box above. e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review. f. Others, please describe	ASC and the CAB have been informed that the fish farmed is Atlantic salmon which is a non-native specie. The report "Wild Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring Program - Discovery Islands - 2017, prepared by Mainstream Biological Consulting Inc and signed by Lance Stewardson, member of the College of Applied Biology, showed no evidence of risk of establishment of the species. 5244 fish were collected during the monitoring program from 29 sites around Discovery Island. No Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar) were captured during sampling completed.	Compliant		
	Indicator: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.				

3.2.3	for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	b. Maintain records (e.g. invoices) to show the species name and origin of all fish used by the farm for purposes of sea lice control. c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region. d. Others, please describe	The farm does not use any species for sea lice control.	N/A		
			Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species			
3.3.1	**Indicator**: Use of transgenic [53] salmon by the farm **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon. b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases. c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic. d. Others, please describe	Declaration in place, Marine Harvest Position on Genetically Modified Salmon, dated 15/04/2016, stating that Marine Harvest Canada does not use transgenic salmon. All the stocks are provided by the MHC own hatcheries. Transfer records are in place. See section 8.	Compliant		
			Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]			
3.4.1	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [56] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 [57] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [57]	a. Maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees. b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle. c. Maintain the monitoring records described in 3.4.1a for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [57]). d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [57]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the farm could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode. e. Submit escape monitoring dataset to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). f. Others, please describe	Manager states no escapes suspected. Evidenced records and reporting to DFO support this. Data submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
3.4.2	**Indicator**: Accuracy [58] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers **Requirement:** ≥ 98% **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of accuracy of the counting technology used by the farm at times of stocking and harvest. Records include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts. b. If counting takes place off site (e.g. pre-smolt vaccination count), obtain and maintain documents from the supplier showing the accuracy of the counting method used (as above). c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm). - e. Submit counting technology accuracy to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). f. Others, please describe	Counting of stocking from hatcheries of origin and wellboats and harvest reconciliation for end counts present. Aquascan counters are mostly used on the wellboats with hatcheries using Vaki counters. Calibration takes place at the beginning of every pen transfer. The available specifications sheets states that the accuracy of the machines is >98%. Records of smolt transfers seen for Dalrymple, Ocean Falls and Big Tree Creek, from JAN to MAY 2016, confirm technology accuracy. Data on counting technology accuracy confirmed as listed in ASC Transparency Checklist.	Compliant		
		a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1).				

3.4.3	**Indicator**: Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	b. Calculate the estimated unexplained loss as described in the instructions (above) for the most recent full production cycle. For first audit, farm must demonstrate understanding of calculation and the requirement to disclose EUL after harvest of the current cycle. c. Make the results from 3.4.3b available publicly. Keep records of when and where results were made public (e.g. date posted to a company website) for all production cycles. d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. - f. Others, please describe	Records for stocking , mortalities and harvest count available for previous cycle in both, papers records and Aquafarmer database. EUL fro previous cycle was 1,5% (8041 fish), which is within technology counting accuracy. Data submitted to ASC. Evidenced farm understanding of the calculation and requirement to disclose the EUL data after the end of current cycle.	Compliant		
3.4.4	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare an Escape Prevention Plan and submit it to the CAB before the first audit. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document as long as it addresses all required elements of Indicator 3.4.4. b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - net strength testing; - appropriate net mesh size; - net traceability; - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. d. Maintain records as specified in the plan. e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan. - g. Others, please describe	The farm operates an open (net pen) system. A documented Escape Prevention and Response Plan – Marine Sites, document #SW 951, is in place at the farm, confirmed incorporating requested areas. A documented Fish Containment Plan, #SW 962, and an Escape Response, #SW 964, are also in place. The farm conducted a site-specific escape risk assessment, last update JAN 24, 2016 which includes provision for Sapphire containment and predator nets. A Fisk Escape Kit is located on the site cages which includes steps to follow in a event of escapes in the form of flowchart, a list of materials and equipment within the kit (netting, needles, weights, ropes etc.) and emergency contact numbers. Documented training records for staff on the Plan were evidenced on site and personnel demonstrated adequate level of knowledge on its implementation when interviewed. A mock escape drill is performed once per year and its result is documented, last conducted 29/08/2017. Net logs and servicing records were available and reviewed during the audit. Pen 5 Net ID was G36-1615. Service record for the net that it's a new net dated July 1st 2016 and manufactured by Gareware. The net was dived on the 11/8/17. It was cleaned on the 6th June 2017.	Compliant		
		PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER				
		Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed				
		a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records. b. Inform each feed supplier in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to production of salmon feeds and send them a copy of the ASC Salmon Standard.				

4.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [62]. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	c. For each feed producer used by the farm, confirm that an audit of the producer was recently done by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme. Obtain a copy of the most recent audit report for each feed producer.	Skretting Canada is the only feed supplier of MHC. Records of supply and usage covered by invoicing and site Aquafarmer records. The feed supplier had been informed of the requirement when previous farms were put forward for certification. Skretting Canada has GAA BAP certification, BAP1451, valid until 22/10/2017, which insures effective traceability. Skretting Canada have declared that they will be adopting method #2 for mass balance. Skretting assures traceability for all ingredients that makes up more than 1% of the feed. This is regularly verified with different certifications such as ISO 9001:2008, HACCP, BAP and Skretting's Nutrace internal standard.	Compliant		
		d. For each feed producer, determine whether the farm will use method #1 or method #2 (see Instructions above) to show compliance of feed producers. Inform the CAB in writing.				
		e. Obtain declaration from feed supplier(s) stating that the company can assure traceability of all feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed to a level of detail required by the ASC Salmon Standard [62].				
		-				
		g. Others, please describe				
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]						
4.2.1	**Indicator**: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1) **Requirement:** < 1.35 **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used including: - Quantities used of each formulation (kg); - Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation used; - Source (fishery) of fishmeal in each formulation used; - Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation derived from trimmings; and - Supporting documentation and signed declaration from feed supplier.	Inventory of feed used available and recorded in Aquafarmer. Feed bag labels display ingredient information. Feed supplier had provided list of species used as fishmeal and fish oil production including the species used in by-products. Sources of fish used are classed in geographic areas. The average % of fish meal in feed from previous production cycle was 7.5%, excluding the meal from trimmings, and the site eFCR was 1.115. Calculated FFDRm value of 0.35 for previous cycle provided during the audit and confirmed submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
		b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.				
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).				
		d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1.				
		e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.				
		f. Others, please describe				
4.2.2	**Indicator**: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1), OR Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [64] (calculated according to Appendix IV-2) **Requirement:** FFDRo < 2.95 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.	Inventory of feed used available and recorded in Aquafarmer. Feed bag labels display ingredient information. Feed supplier had provided list of species used as fishmeal and fish oil production including the species used in by-products. Sources of fish used are classed in geographic areas. The farm selected option #1. The average % of fish oil in feed from previous production cycle was 9.7 %, excluding the oil from trimmings, and the site eFCR was 1.115. Calculated FFDRo value of 2.16 for previous cycle provided during the audit and confirmed submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
		b. For FFDRo and EPA+DHA calculations (either option #1 or option #2), exclude fish oil derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.				
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.				
		d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.				
		e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2.				
		f. Submit FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.				

		g. Others, please describe				
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials						
4.3.1	**Indicator**: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries **Requirement:** < 5 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers purchases of fishmeal and fish oil to fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in 4.3.1a c. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, use feed inventory and feed supplier declarations in 4.2.1a to develop a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients. d. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that fishmeal and fish oil used in feed come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries. e. Others, please describe	Not required, as per the Interim Amendment of ASC Farm Standards	N/A		
4.3.2	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score [68] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived **Requirement:** All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 8 **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2017	a. Record FishSource score for each species from which fishmeal or fish oil was derived and used as a feed ingredient (all species listed in 4.2.1a). b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 8. c. If the species is not on the website it means that a FishSource assessment is not available. Client can then take one or both of the following actions: 1. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as a priority for assessment. 2. Contract a qualified independent third party to conduct the assessment using the FishSource methodology and provide the assessment and details on the third party qualifications to the CAB for review. - e. Others, please describe	Feed supplier submitted a table for the species and sources of fishmeal and fish oil used for the ASC approved feed formulation and the related score from FishSource.org. Submitted scores for all species listed were ≥ 6 thus, in compliance with the required criteria as per the Interim Amendment of ASC Farm Standards. Amongst species confirmed Menhaden, from Gulf of Mexico, scoring 8.8 for current and 10 for future health, and Norway pout from the North Sea, scoring 10 for current health and future health.	Compliant		
4.3.3	**Indicator**: 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. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2017	a. Obtain from the feed supplier documentary evidence that the origin of all fishmeal and fish oil used in the feed is traceable via a third-party verified chain of custody or traceability program. b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a). c. Others, please describe	Skretting Canada has GAA BAP certification, BAP1451, valid until 22/10/2017. BAP require a verified chain of custody for compliance to their standard. Species used for ASC feed production via mass balance calculation confirmed as covered.	Compliant		
	Indicator: Feed containing fishmeal	a. Compile and maintain, consistent with 4.2.1a and 4.2.2a, a list of the fishery of origin for all fishmeal and fish oil originating from by-products and trimmings.				

4.3.4	and/or fish oil originating from by-products [69] or trimmings from IUU [70] catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71] **Requirement:** None [72] **Applicability:** All except as noted in [72]	b. Obtain a declaration from the feed supplier stating that no fishmeal or fish oil originating from IUU catch was used to produce the feed. c. Obtain from the feed supplier declaration that the meal or oil did not originate from a species categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71] and explaining how they are able to demonstrate this (i.e. through other certification scheme or through their independent audit). d. If meal or oil originated from a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, obtain documentary evidence to support the exception as outlined in [72]. e. Others, please describe	All species of fish used are listed and do not appear on the IUCN list s endangered. Skretting declaration confirms that no fish meal or fish oil used originates from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. This is also a BAP requirement. Skretting, under its Nutreco Sustainable Procurement Policy for Marine Products, state under Section 7, that the supplier needs to provide documentation that the meal and oil is IFFO RS or MSC certified.	Compliant		
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed						
4.4.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums [75] and local laws [76] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a) b. Obtain from each feed manufacturer a copy of the manufacturer's responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients showing how the company complies with recognized crop moratoriums and local laws. c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented. d. Others, please describe	Only Skretting feeds are used by MHC. Contact information provided. The feed supplier is part of the Nutreco group and a Supplier Code of Conduct, version June 2014, and a "Quality Assurance Policy", is in place, dated 24/05/2017 and signed by G.S. The policy state that all suppliers must sign applicable declarations guaranteeing source. Skretting Canada is BAP certified, BAP1451,with a certificate valid until 22/10/2017 and GlobalG.A.P. certified, GGN 4052852980685. BAP have a similar principle which was provided to compare.	Compliant		
4.4.2	**Indicator**: Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77] **Requirement:** 100%, within five years of the publication [78] of the SAD standards **Applicability:** All, after June 13, 2017	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent) c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b). d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed. e. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77] f. Others, please describe	A declaration, Marine Harvest Position on Sustainable Sources of Non-Marine Raw Materials in Salmon Feed, signed by the Global Director R&D and Technical, and the Group Manager Environment and Sustainability, dated 29/11/13, stating the required supporting efforts. The document refers to the Roundtable for responsible soy (RTRS). Soya is not used in feed manufacture by Skretting for MHC, as evidenced in labels ingredients declarations and diets specifications.	N/A		
4.4.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of disclosure to the buyer [79] of the salmon of inclusion of transgenic [80] plant raw material, or raw materials derived from transgenic plants, in the feed **Requirement:** Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [81] **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of soya and other plant raw materials in feed and whether it is transgenic. b. Disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure. For first audits, farm records of disclosures must cover > 6 months. c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	Declarations in place from Skretting stating that canola oil and corn gluten are used and they may contain >1% transgenic material. A Suppliers Quality Assurance (SQA) certificate, dated 10/01/2017 and signed by J.V, Food Safety Assurance Tech., is sent to buyers . The certificate disclose raw material derived from transgenic. An Excel record seen shows dates when the certificate had been send to buyers. Confirmed that ASC have been informed.	Compliant		

		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production						
4.5.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [83] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a policy stating the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the farm's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation. b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean. c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. e. Others, please describe	It was evidenced during the audit that not all the compressors located at the feed barge are equiped with spill trays. Also, spill trays were missing from two of the three of the portable capstan winches located at the cages.	Minor	Spill trays were missing on a compressor located at the feed barge and from two of the three of the portable capstan winches located at the cages.	
4.5.2	**Indicator**: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. (see also 4.5.1c) b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d) c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken.. d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment. e. Others, please describe	Pallets, feed bags and domestic waste are amongst the most common production waste materials. Nets ropes and other production equipment are also included in the farm description but would not occur as often as the packing materials. The company has a website for used equipment sales, www.marineharvestusedsales.com. Disposal forms are used by the site managers when equipment is being de-commissioned and there is a column for describing what happens to the item i.e. either, sold, re-cycled or donated. Equipment is also donated to enhancement facilities. Used oil is shipped off-site to safe disposal. Records of disposal were available from Gemini. Certification Manager states that there have been no fines imposed within the last 12 months.	Compliant		
Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]						
4.6.1	**Indicator**: 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 **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle. b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last production cycle. c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle. d. Using results from 4.6.1b and 4.6.1c, calculate energy consumption on the farm as required, reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle. e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. g. Others, please describe	Energy consumption records were available for current and previous cycle. Items recorded include petrol, diesel and propane gas. Last cycle energy consumption was 4,323,598,835 KJ. Total weight of fish produced during last cycle was 3744 mt resulting in 1,154,807 KJ/mt. Confirmed result submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
	Indicator: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [85]) emissions [86] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in	a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm. b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1. c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors.	Site records of GHG emissions are maintained using the DEFRA diagnostic tool			

4.6.2	Appendix V-1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO_2 gases to CO_2 equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source. e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually. g. Others, please describe	database. GHG for 2016 resulted in 292,641 kg CO2e. GWP took from DEFRA guidelines on UK Government figures. Result confirmed submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
4.6.3	**Indicator**: Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [87] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2 **Requirement:** Yes, within three years of the publication [88] of the SAD standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015) **Applicability:** All, after June 13, 2015	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed). b. Multiply the GHG emissions per unit feed by the total amount of feed from each supplier used in the most recent completed production cycle. c. If client has more than one feed supplier, calculate the total sum of emissions from feed by summing the GHG emissions of feed from each supplier. d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. e. Others, please describe	46.2 kg CO2e/MT of feed stated by Skretting, resulting in 192,945.337 CO2e of the feed used In previous cycle. Confirmed data submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [89,90]						
4.7.1	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper-treated nets [91], evidence that nets are not cleaned [92] or treated in situ in the marine environment **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping. b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets. c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets. d. If copper-based treatments are used, maintain documentary evidence (see 4.7.1b) that farm policy and practice does not allow for heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ. e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	The farm does not use copper-treated nets. This was confirmed by observation on-site and nets technical sheet. The nets being used are Sapphire nets.	N/A		
4.7.2	**Indicator**: For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment [93] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land. b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place. c. If yes to 4.7.2b, obtain evidence that effluent treatment used at the cleaning site is an appropriate technology to capture of copper in effluents. d. Others, please describe	Site clean nets in situ with mechanical cleaners during their use at sea. Cleaning operation seen during the site visit.	N/A		
	Indicator: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level	a. Declare to the CAB whether the farm uses copper nets or copper-treated nets. (See also 4.7.1c). If "no", Indicator 4.7.3 does not apply.				

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

4.7.3	evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	b. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, measure and record copper in sediment samples from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE. c. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, maintain records of testing methods, equipment, and laboratories used to test copper level in sediments from 4.7.3b. d. Others, please describe	The farm does not use copper-treated nets.	N/A		
4.7.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that copper levels [94] 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89] and excluding those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3	a. Inform the CAB whether: 1) farm is exempt from Indicator 4.7.4 (as per 4.7.3a), or 2) Farm has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment. b. Provide evidence from measurements taken in 4.7.3b that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight. c. If copper levels in 4.7.4b are ≥ 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, provide evidence the farm tested copper levels in sediments from reference sites as described in Appendix I-1 (also see Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). d. Analyse results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body. e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	The farm does not use copper-treated nets.	N/A		
4.7.5	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Identify all biocides used by the farm in net antifouling. b. Compile documentary evidence to show that each chemical used in 4.7.5a is approved according to legislation in one or more of the following jurisdictions: the European Union, the United States, or Australia. c. Others, please describe	No biocides of any type stated to be used to treat nets. No indication of any such products being used during the site inspection.	N/A		
PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [95]						
5.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a fish health management plan that incorporates components related to identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document. b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [96]. c. Others, please describe	A Salmonid Health Management Plan (HMP) is present, dated OCT 2015, reviewed and signed by Diane Morrison, Fish Health and Food Safety Director of MHC. The plan refers to what is required under licence conditions but also has links and references to applicable SOP's.	Compliant		
5.1.2	**Indicator**: Site visits by a designated veterinarian [96] at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager [97] at least once a month **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of visits by the designated veterinarian [96] and fish health managers [97]. If schedule cannot be met, a risk assessment must be provided. b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed as the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [96] and fish health manager(s) [97]. c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.	Regular visits by vet and health team confirmed through visitor log checks. Fish health Techs T M and T M visit the site monthly, visits confirmed monthly through visitors log. Health visit reports reviewed for visit on 16/04/2017 and 25/05/2017. Diane Morrison, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, Ontario Veterinary College is the managing vet and visits the site quarterly. Designated vet. Visited the farm on 10/06/2017.	Compliant		

		d. Others, please describe				
5.1.3	**Indicator**: Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner **Requirement:** 100% [98] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner. b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities. c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification. d. Others, please describe	Mortality records logged in Aquafarmer and were reviewed on-site during the visit. This included cause allocated in each case. Mortality removal observed during on-site inspection. Mortalities are uplifted, classified and recorded and stored in sealed tubs prior to disposal by approved contractor. Process detailed in Document #SW124. No exceptional mortality events recorded.	Compliant		
5.1.4	**Indicator**: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis **Requirement:** 100% [99] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain detailed records for all mortalities and post-mortem analyses including: - date of mortality and date of post-mortem analysis; - total number of mortalities and number receiving post-mortem analysis; - name of the person or lab conducting the post-mortem analyses; - qualifications of the individual (e.g. veterinarian [96], fish health manager [97]); - cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and - classification as 'unexplained' when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6). b. For each mortality event, ensure that post-mortem analyses are done on a statistically relevant number of fish and keep a record of the results. c. If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive and disease is suspected or results are inconclusive over a 1-2 week period, ensure that fish are sent to an off-site laboratory for diagnosis and keep a record of the results (5.1.4a). d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications. e. Provide additional evidence to show how farm records in 5.1.4a-d cover all mortalities from the current and previous two production cycles (as needed). f. Submit data on numbers and causes of mortalities to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). g. Others, please describe	The farm mortality records were reviewed in Aquafarmer along with the protocols for assigning cause of mortality. All the staff have been trained in assigning reasons for mortality. Fish health staff work with site staff on coding of mortalities and sign off on the staff for competency. Unknown reasons or any unusual counts or types of lesions/mortality are to be referred to the Fish Health Management Team. No specific inconclusive on-site diagnoses stated during current production cycle. Third party assistance available under contract from BC Centre for Aquatic Health Sciences, located in Campbell River. Data on numbers and causes of mortalities were confirmed as submitted to the ASC in the required Transparency checklist.	Compliant		
5.1.5	**Indicator**: Maximum viral disease-related mortality [100] on farm during the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 10%	a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease. b. Combine the results from 5.1.5a with the total number of unspecified and unexplained mortalities from the most recent complete production cycle. Divide this by the total number of fish produced in the production cycle (x100) to calculate percent maximum viral disease-related mortality.	There was no viral detections of mortalities in previous or current cycle. The number of unspecified and unexplained mortalities from the most recent complete production cycle was 2.21%. Confirm that client has submitted data on mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	Compliant		

	Applicability: All	c. Submit data on total mortality and viral disease-related mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).				
		d. Others, please describe				
5.1.6	**Indicator**: Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6% **Requirement:** ≤ 40% of total mortalities **Applicability:** All farms with > 6% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle.	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for the most recent full production cycle. If rate was ≤ 6%, then the requirement of 5.1.6 does not apply. If total mortality rate was > 6%, proceed to 5.1.6b.	Unexplained mortality rate for the most recent full production was 2.21%.	N/A		
		b. Calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for each of the two production cycles immediately prior to the current cycle. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.				
		c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.				
		d. Others, please describe				
5.1.7	**Indicator**: A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.	Monthly mortality data is recorded in both, percentage terms for count and biomass. Historical information and how each site has produced in the past is reviewed. Based in the reviewed data, target are set. Explicit actions to reduce overall and unexplained lost are documented in site specific mortality reduction program. Reduction targets actions includes the use of Sapphire nets and electrical fence to deter predators, which the aims to improve fish welfare. Site staff were questioned on mortality recording, classification and reduction targets.	Compliant		
		b. Use the data in 5.1.7a and advice from the veterinarian and/or fish health manager to develop a mortalities-reduction program that defines annual targets for reductions in total mortality and unexplained mortality.				
		c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.				
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]						
5.2.1	**Indicator**: On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals [102] 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	Record of therapeutants used available on-site for current and previous cycle. During current cycle, Slice used between 19-28/01/2017, prescription DM 17-001/002, signed by D. M. Records includes dosage, amount of product used, mt fish treated, WHO classification and supplier. One peroxide treatment also performed during current year class. The peroxide treatment was applied by wellboat to fish during transfer to Althorp, not at the site itself. Records were well maintained. Confirmed that information was submitted by the farm to ASC.	Compliant		
		b. If not already available, assemble records of chemical and therapeutant use to address all points in 5.2.1a for the previous two production cycles. For first audits, available records must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.				
		c. Submit information on therapeutant use (data from 5.2.1a) to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).				
		d. Others, please describe				

5.2.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [103] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [104] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a list of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [104]. b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles. - d. Others, please describe	The company maintains a global register of the therapeutants and other chemicals permitted and banned along with withdrawal period requirements and residue limits, which is monitored and updated regularly. MHC procedures establish that, following the use and a theraputant, the Aquafarmer system locks in place the withdrawal time according to the prescription. Maxxam Analytics (Standards Council of Canada Accredited Laboratory No. 117) carry out pre-harvest testing for sites for a range of possible contaminants and possible treatment residues.	Compliant		
5.2.3	**Indicator**: Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain prescription for all therapeutant use in advance of application from the farm veterinarian (or equivalent, see [96] for definition of veterinarian). b. Maintain copies of all prescriptions and records of veterinarian responsible for all medication events. Records can be kept in conjunction with those for 5.2.1 and should be kept for the current and two prior production cycles. c. Others, please describe	Prescriptions kept on site and information is logged in Aquafarmer. Prescriptions confirmed as prescribed by D. Morrison. Treatment log confirmed to go back two production cycles.	Compliant		
5.2.4	**Indicator**: Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a). b. Compile and maintain documentation on legally-required withholding periods for all treatments used on-farm. Withholding period is the time interval after the withdrawal of a drug from the treatment of the salmon before the salmon can be harvested for use as food. c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle. d. Others, please describe	Withdrawal referenced in section 2.10.2. of the HMP and Document #SW820. Health Canada website lists all veterinary drugs that are authorized for sale by Health Canada for use in food-producing aquatic animals and includes details of withdrawal periods. http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/dhp-mps/vet/legislation/pol/aquaculture_anim-eng.php . Interviewed site staff showed awareness of withdrawal period and its implementation within the farm.	Compliant		
5.2.5	**Indicator**: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII **Requirement:** PTI score ≤ 13 **Applicability:** All	a. Using farm data for therapeutants usage (5..2.1a) and the formula presented in Appendix VII, calculate the cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score for the most recent production cycle. Calculation should be made and updated on an ongoing basis throughout the cycle by farm manager, fish health manager, and/or veterinarian. b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score. c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. d. Others, please describe	One peroxide treatment also performed during current year class. The peroxide treatment was applied by wellboat to fish during transfer to Althorp, not at the site itself. Records were well maintained. Current cumulative PTI calculated as 3.2. Calculation records seen. Confirmed submitted to ASC.	Compliant		
5.2.6	**Indicator**: For farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [105] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles **Requirement:** Yes, within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All farms with a	a. Review PTI scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle. If yes, proceed to 5.2.6b; if no, Indicator 5.2.6 does not apply. b. Using results from 5.2.5 and the weight of fish treated (kg), calculate parasiticide load in the most recent production cycle [105]. c. Calculate parasiticide load in the two previous production cycles as above (5.2.6b) and compute the average. Calculate the percent difference in parasiticide load between current cycle and average of two previous cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.	Cumulative PTI <6.	N/A		

	cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle	d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI). e. Others, please describe				
5.2.7	**Indicator**: Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments [106] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles. b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3) c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.9). d. Others, please describe	Treatment records checked and show no use of antibiotics recorded for the site.	Compliant		
5.2.8	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO [107]) **Requirement:** None [108] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [107]. b. If the farm has not used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit. c. If the farm has used antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit. d. If yes to 5.2.8c, request an exemption from the CAB to certify only a portion of the farm. Prior to the audit, provide the CAB with records sufficient to establish details of treatment, which pens were treated, and how the farm will ensure full traceability and separation of treated fish through and post- harvest. e. Others, please describe	The company uses the WHO website on critically important antimicrobials for human medicine. No antibiotics have been used on this unit of certification (farm site).	Compliant		
5.2.9	**Indicator**: Number of treatments [109] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 5.2.1a). For first audits, farm records must cover the current and immediately prior production cycles in a verifiable statement. b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation. c. Others, please describe	Evidenced drug use records for current and previous production cycle shows that antibiotics has not been used.	Compliant		
5.2.10	**Indicator**: If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load [110] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles **Requirement:** Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All	a. Use results from 5.2.9b to show whether more than one antibiotic treatment was used in the most recent production cycle. If not, then the requirement of 5.2.10 does not apply. If yes, then proceed to 5.2.10b. b. Calculate antibiotic load (antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotic used in kg) for most recent production cycle and for the two previous production cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle. c. Provide the auditor with calculations showing that the antibiotic load of the most recent production cycle is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles.	Evidenced drug use records for current and previous production cycle shows that antibiotics has not been used.	N/A		

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

		d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.				
		e. Others, please describe				
5.2.11	**Indicator**: Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers [112] of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [112] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutants used in production (see 4.4.3b).	The CFIA Aquaculture Therapeutant Residue Monitoring List, rev. 07/03/2016, is referenced in the Suppliers Quality Assurance (SQA) send to buyers. Confirmed updated yearly.	Compliant		
		b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.				
		c. Others, please describe				
Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments						
5.3.1	**Indicator**: Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. In addition to recording all therapeutic treatments (5.2.1a), keep a record of all cases where the farm uses two successive medicinal treatments.	Only single Slice and peroxide treatment applied to the year class. The peroxide treatment was applied by wellboat to fish during transfer to Althorp, not at the site itself. Lice monitoring records evidenced on site showed expected effect. No need to conduct bio-assay.	N/A		
		b. Whenever the farm uses two successive treatments, keep records showing how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.				
		c. For any result of 5.3.1b that did not produce the expected effect, ensure that a bio-assay analysis of resistance is conducted.				
		d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.				
		e. Others, please describe				
5.3.2	**Indicator**: When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Review results of bio-assay tests (5.3.1d) for evidence that resistance has formed. If yes, proceed to 5.3.2b. If no, then Indicator 5.3.2 is not applicable.	No need to conduct bio-assay as per 5.3.1 above.	N/A		
		b. When bio-assay tests show evidence that resistance has formed, keep records showing that the farm took one of two actions: - used an alternative treatment (if permitted in the area of operation); or - immediately harvested all fish on site.				
		c. Others, please describe				
Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]						
5.4.1	**Indicator**: Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class [114] **Requirement:** 100% [115] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [115]	a. Keep records of the start and end dates of periods when the site is fully fallow after harvest.	Records of all harvest and smolt inputs are kept on the Aquafarmer system. Site fallowed from 14/03/2016 until 28/11/2016. Stocked until 14/12/2016.Stocking records shows single year class. Inspected fish correspond with fish size reported in Aquafarmer.	Compliant		
		b. Provide evidence of stocking dates (purchase receipts, delivery records) to show that there were no gaps > 6 months for smolt inputs for the current production cycle.				
		-				
		d. Others, please describe				
	Indicator: Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable	a. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, show evidence that the farm promptly evaluated each to determine whether it was a statistically significant increase over background mortality rate on a monthly basis [116]. The accepted level of significance (for example, $p < 0.05$) should be agreed between farm and CAB.				
		b. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, record whether the farm did or did not suspect (yes or no) an unidentified transmissible agent.				

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

5.4.2	transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, [116] the farm has: 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM 3. Promptly [118] made findings publicly available **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	c. Proceed to 5.4.2d if, during the most recent production cycle, either: - results from 5.4.2a showed a statistically significant increase in unexplained mortalities; or - the answer to 5.4.2b was 'yes'. Otherwise, Indicator 5.4.2 is not applicable. d. If required, ensure that the farm takes and records the following steps: 1) Report the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority; 2) Increase monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM; and 3) Promptly (within one month) make findings publicly available. e. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). f. Others, please describe	There was no statistically significant increase in background mortalities. No suspected mortality events with unidentified transmissible agent.	Compliant		
5.4.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [119] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [120] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code on site or ensure staff have access to the most current version. b. Develop policies and procedures as needed to ensure that farm practices remain consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (5.4.3a) and with actions required under indicator 5.4.4. - d. Others, please describe	The HMP - Appendix I, revised 28/07/2017, includes a link to the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code and reference the HMP sections and SOPs in relation to the consistency of the farm practices and the Code, and actions required if an OIE-notifiable disease is confirmed on the farm. A copy of the appendix is available to the staff through the 'SharePoint'. Policies found implemented and the staff well informed as per discussions relating to e.g. biosecurity and mortality handling.	Compliant		
5.4.4	**Indicator**: If an OIE-notifiable disease [121] is confirmed on the farm, evidence that: 1. the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected 2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease 4. the farm promptly [123] made findings publicly available **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Ensure that farm policies and procedures in 5.4.3a describe the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4 in response to an OIE-notifiable disease on the farm. b. Inform the CAB if an OIE-notifiable disease has been confirmed on the farm during the current production cycle or the two previous production cycles. If yes, proceed to 5.4.4c. If no, then 5.4.4c an 5.4.4d do not apply. c. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm (see 5.4.4b), then retain documentary evidence to show that the farm: 1) immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected; 2) immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3) enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease; and 4) promptly (within one month) made findings publicly available. d. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	Confirmed through examination of Mortality records that no OIE notifiable diseases have been recorded for this site.	Compliant		

		-				
		f. Others, please describe				
PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]						
6.1.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Workers have the freedom to join any trade union, free of any form of interference from employers or competing organizations set up or backed by the employer. Farms shall prepare documentation to demonstrate to the auditor that domestic regulation fully meets these criteria.	There is a Code of Conduct, which is provided to all employees and they are tested to show they have understood the Code of conducts. The Code of Conduct can also be accessed via intranet, which also allows access to human resources Policy & Procedure Manual. Code of Conduct section 5.3. relates to this area and states "Marine Harvest recognizes the right of all workers and employees freely to form and join groups for the promotion and defence of their occupational interests, including the right to engage in collective bargaining".	Compliant		
		b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits “acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control or employers or employers’ organizations."				
		c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.				
		d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.				
		e. Others, please describe				
6.1.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association.	There is a Code of Conduct, which is provided to all employees and they are tested to show they have understood the Code of conducts. The Code of Conduct can also be accessed via the intranet, which also allows access to human resources Policy & Procedure Manual. Code of Conduct section 5.3 relates to this area. The workers confirmed that that the above information was provided to them.	Compliant		
		b. Employer communicates that workers are free to form organizations to advocate for and protect work rights (e.g. farm policies on Freedom of Association; see 6.12.1).				
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.				
		d. Others, please describe				
6.1.3	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Local trade union, or where none exists a reputable civil-society organization, confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees’ freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.	No outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees’ freedom of association and collective bargaining rights. Workers confirmed that they are aware of the code of conduct section 5.3 and confirmed that they understood their rights.	Compliant		
		b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.				
		c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions).				
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.2 Child labour						

6.2.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of child [125] labour [126] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All except as noted in [125]	a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions: - in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years (see footnote 125); or - in countries where the legal minimum age is set higher than 15 years, in which case the legal minimum age of the country is followed. If the farm operates in a country where the legal minimum ages is not 15, then the employer shall maintain documentation attesting to this fact.	Ages of all workers are stored on Human Resources management system. There are no persons employed under the age of 15. Marine Harvest state in section 5.4 of the code of conduct " Marine Harvest is committed to the abolition of child labour, and all forms of forced or compulsory labour." "Marine Harvest considers the minimum age for employment as not lower than the age of completion of compulsory schooling as set by national law, and in any event not lower than 15 years of age." The age of the workers was verified through the Human Resources Management System and proves compliance. Identification is held on file for all farm employees and is signed and verified by Senior Management	Compliant		
		b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above).				
		c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance.				
		d. Others, please describe				
6.2.2	**Indicator:** Percentage of young workers [127] that are protected [128] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.	There is a policy stating the rules on employing young workers. The Marine Harvest code of conduct section 5.4 sets out the main rules. Young workers risk assessment is carried out and displayed within the working areas. All young workers are assessed before employment. All workers including young workers have the working hours recorded on a time management system. There are no young workers employed at the facility at the time of the audit. No young workers are employed at this site at the time of the audit.	Compliant		
		b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.				
		c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.				
		d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.				
		e. Young workers are not exposed to hazards [129] and do not perform hazardous work [130]. Work on floating cages in poor weather conditions shall be considered hazardous.				
		f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.				
		g. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labour						
6.3.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labour **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no 'pay to work' schemes through labour contractors or training credit programs).	All employees are provided with contracts of employment. Confirmed by employee interviews that employees received a copy of the contract of employment. All contracts have been signed by workers. Through worker interviews and documentation checks, it was confirmed that all working hours are conducted on a voluntary basis. The employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents. This was confirmed through employee interviews. The employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents to oblige them to continue working for the employer. This was confirmed in employee interviews Employees confirmed they are not repaying debt.	Compliant		
		b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.				
		c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.				
		d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.				
		e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.				
		f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.				
		g. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]						

6.4.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has written anti-discrimination policy in place, stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints. c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises. d. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective. e. Others, please describe	Stated in Marine Harvest Code of conduct section 5.2 & 6.1. The anti-discrimination policy that is in place, states that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. Discrimination complaints are dealt with through the grievance procedures. Grievance procedures are communicated to all workers Employees confirmed that they are respected with regards equal treatment. All managers have been trained in equality and diversity. This is part of the code of conduct training.	Compliant		
6.4.2	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of discrimination **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination. b. Be advised that worker testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. c. Others, please describe	The facility has a process to record of all discrimination complaints. To date, there have not been any complaints. There is no evidence of discrimination. Employees interviewed stated that the company did not discriminate against them. Workers that were interviewed had not experienced or heard of any issues with regards to discrimination.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety						
6.5.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [135] and policies on a yearly basis **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has documented practices, procedures (including emergency response procedures) and policies to protect employees from workplace hazards and to minimize risk of accident or injury. The information shall be available to employees. b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures. c. Employer conducts health and safety training for all employees on a regular basis (once a year and immediately for all new employees), including training on potential hazards and risk minimization, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and effective use of PPE. d. Others, please describe	The facility has established good procedures and policies to protect employees. However, there were unsafe hazards noted during the tour. 1. Rope is being used for whip checks and needs to be replaced with proper purpose made whip checks. 2. Compressed airlines on the cage have been joined, and no Whip Checks have been installed. 3. Operation department equipment used on site needs to be checked to ensure that it meets safety requirements. It was noted that some operations team equipment had emergency stops held on with cable ties and one of the emergency stops was broken. There is a requirement to fix the issues identified, but also management systems need to be reviewed to ensure that operation department equipment is in good working order. 4. There was two compressor shut off values noted to be damaged (on the cage) and missing the shut-off handles. The facility has established good procedures and policies to protect employees. However, there were unsafe hazards noted during the tour.	Major	The health and Safety of the site as observed during the site visit was not up to the required level.	
6.5.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals). b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards. c. Employees receive annual training in the proper use of PPE (see 6.5.1c). For workers who participated in the initial training(s) previously an annual refreshment training may suffice, unless new PPE has been put to use. d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	The site has carried out risk assessments for all operations and has identified the PPE required for each task. The site uses the risk assessment to understand the risks and eliminate the risks where possible. The site understands that PPE should only be used where it is not possible to reduce the risk without the use of PPE. Employees all receive induction training which includes the correct and proper use of PPE. There are modules that are built into the online health & Safety management system that employees have to complete each year. The site manager ensures this training is carried out and recorded. Workers confirmed within interview process that PPE was provided and training was provided if required.	Compliant		

6.5.3	**Indicator:** Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer makes regular assessments of hazards and risks in the workplace. Risk assessments are reviewed and updated at least annually (see also 6.5.1a). b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c). c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents. d. Others, please describe	Risk assessments are carried by the site manager every year. All reviews are documented. Changes are made sooner if the process changes or new machinery is implemented. Risk assessments are used to identify the risk and employees are trained against the risk assessments. The site has trained employees that carry out risk assessments. This training is recorded on the MH internal DATS system. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments. Risk assessments are reviewed when changes are made to the processes to avoid potential accidents. It was noted that the Marine Harvest Risk methodology had not been completed and implemented on the risk assessments. Risk assessments need to be updated, and methodology needs to be understood.	Minor	Risk Assessment methodology has not been completed and implemented on the risk assessments.	
6.5.4	**Indicator:** Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents. b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations. c. Employer implements corrective action plans in response to any accidents that occur. Plans are documented and they include an analysis of root cause, actions to address root cause, actions to remediate, and actions to prevent future accidents of similar nature. d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made. e. Others, please describe	Facility records all health & safety related accidents. Accidents are investigated by the Health & Safety manager. Monitoring systems have been implemented to review year on year results. The facility has systems to maintain documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations. Employees stated within the interview process that accidents were investigated and steps were taken and improvements made if required.	Compliant		
6.5.5	**Indicator:** Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance (accident or injury) for 100% of worker costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains documentation to confirm that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries (if not covered under national law). Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers. Written contract of employer responsibility to cover accident costs is acceptable evidence in place of insurance. b. Others, please describe	Insurance is available for all workers to ensure that they are compensated to cover costs related to occupational accidents. Public liability insurance is also available to cover all over parties.	Compliant		
6.5.6	**Indicator:** Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer keeps records of farm diving operations and a list of all personnel involved. In case an external service provider was hired, a statement that provider conformed to all relevant criteria must be made available to the auditor by this provider. b. Employer maintains evidence of diver certification (e.g. copies of certificates) for each person involved in diving operations. Divers shall be certified through an accredited national or international organization for diver certification. c. Others, please describe	Employer keeps records of farm diving operation. All external divers are given full details of the operations that are required. All diving certification was provided. All divers have the required accreditations. Dive certifications are checked by site staff every 60 days and annual reviews are also carried out.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.6 Wages						
		a. Employer keeps documents to show the legal minimum wage in the country of operation. If there is no legal minimum wage in the country, the employer keeps documents to show the industry-standard minimum wage.				

6.6.1	**Indicator:** The percentage of workers whose basic wage [136] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [137] **Requirement:** 0 (None) **Applicability:** All	b. Employer's records (e.g. payroll) confirm that worker's wages for a standard work week (≤ 48 hours) always meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. If there is no legal minimum wage, the employer's records must show how the current wage meets or exceeds industry standard. If wages are based on piece-rate or pay-per-production, the employer's records must show how workers can reasonably attain (within regular working hours) wages that meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	Wages are recorded on an electronic accounting system and verified. All wages paid are in line or above minimum wage requirements. Wages are well above minimum wage (starting at $17 compared to $10.25 minimum).	Compliant		
6.6.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [138] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and the use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages. Includes review of any national basic needs wage recommendations from credible sources such as national universities or government. b. Employer has calculated the basic needs wage for farm workers and has compared it to the basic (i.e. current) wage for their farm workers. c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers. d. Others, please describe	MHC use Hays group to assist with setting pay levels and carry out their own reviews to ensure that levels are correct. There are details of living wages for BC available which states the living wage is $16.42 MHC starting wage is $17.00	Compliant		
6.6.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [139] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts. b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers. c. Employer renders wages and benefits in a way that is convenient for the worker (e.g. cash, check, or electronic payment methods). Workers do not have to travel to collect benefits nor do they receive promissory notes, coupons or merchandise in lieu of payment. d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	Wages and benefits are documented before the point of employment. Employees are paid bi-weekly by electronic bank transfer Employees confirmed within interview process that information was available and electronic transfer payments are made	Compliant		
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labour) including subcontracting						
6.7.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers who have contracts [141] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts. b. There is no evidence for labour-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes. c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	All employees provided with a contract of employment, and a copy of the contract was available in the personnel files. There was no evidence of Labour only contracts or false apprenticeships. Workers confirmed that there are no, Labour only contracts or false apprenticeships.	Compliant		
6.7.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible practices and policies. b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors. c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2. d. Others, please describe	There was no evidence of Labour only contracts. It was confirmed by the employee's interviews that no labour only contracts are used, and no false apprenticeships are used.	Compliant		

Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution						
6.8.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has a clear labour conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner. b. Workers are familiar with the company's labour conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access. c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. complaint or grievance filings, minutes from review meetings) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	There is a complaint procedure detailed in the HR Policy which explains the reporting procedure including bullying and harassment and confidentiality policy. All employees have access to policies through the intranet. This was confirmed through employee interviews. All communication such as complaints, grievances and discipline is recorded within the employee personnel file. Their communications are detailed in writing within the employee personnel files.	Compliant		
6.8.2	**Indicator:** Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [142] within a 90-day timeframe **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labour conflicts that are raised. b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed. c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe. d. Others, please describe	The established grievance policy and procedures are well documented. Any grievances that are raised are documented in the employee's personnel files and have agreed action plans if required. None of the workers interviewed had any grievances so unable to confirm. The company policy is to respond to each stage of the process within 14 days.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices						
6.9.1	**Indicator:** Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity. b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors. c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions. d. Others, please describe	None of the policies or procedures used is threatening, humiliating or has any punishing disciplinary practices. The practice of the disciplinary does not impact the workers physical, mentally.	Compliant		
6.9.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [143] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [143]. b. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. worker evaluation reports) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that the disciplinary action policy is fair and effective. c. Others, please describe	The company has written policy disciplinary action that "explicitly" states to improve the worker. The company does have performance management policy, so this should be noted alongside the disciplinary policy. None of the workers had been involved with a disciplinary procedure but confirmed workers are regularly evaluated and reviewed.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime						
6.10.1	**Indicator:** Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [145] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has documentation showing the legal requirements for working hours and overtime in the region where the farm operates. If local legislation allows workers to exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime) then requirements of the international standards apply. b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law. c. If an employer requires employees to work shifts at the farm (e.g. 10 days on and six days off), the employer compensates workers with an equivalent time off in the calendar month and there is evidence that employees have agreed to this schedule (e.g. in the hiring contract).	The company holds document for Employment Standards Act for BC for working regulations. The working shift pattern is carried out over two weeks. The shift pattern consists of 8 days on and six days off. The average hours over the two weeks is 40 hours per week. Working hours are provided by site managers to the payroll and working hours' department. The workers confirm that working hours are correct before this. Records on Time Solutions system show that workers are not exceeding the working hours that are allowed.	Compliant		

		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.				
		e. Others, please describe				
6.10.2	**Indicator:** Overtime is limited, voluntary [146], paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except as noted in [146]	a. Payment records (e.g. payslips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours.	Workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours they are paid 150% for the first 2 hours and 200% for any hours worked after that. Dayforce System confirmed that overtime is infrequent. Workers confirmed that overtime is rare and is voluntary.	Compliant		
		b. Overtime is limited and occurs in exceptional circumstances as evidenced by farm records (e.g. production records, time sheets, and other records of working hours).				
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that all overtime is voluntary except where there is a collective bargaining agreement which specifically allows for compulsory overtime.				
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.11 Education and training						
6.11.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g., courses, certificates and degrees) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers. Company provides incentives (e.g. subsidies for tuition or textbooks, time off prior to exams, flexibility in work schedule) that encourage workers to participate in educational initiatives. Note that such offers may be contingent on workers committing to stay with the company for a pre-arranged time.	The company encourages employees to increase knowledge and participate in training courses and supports the workers in doing this. As stated in HR policy section 9 Employee training and development and education assistance programs. All training records are maintained on the DATS system. Workers confirmed that they are encouraged to learn and be involved with training courses. Other than compulsory health and safety training workers dictate the speed of additional training.	Compliant		
		b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).				
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.				
		d. Others, please describe				
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility						
6.12.1	**Indicator:** Demonstration of company-level [148] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labour requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.	The Code of Conduct Policy and also the HR Policy are in line with all social and labour requirements Corporate policy is approved by the Senior Management Team in Campbell River The scope of all corporate policies cover all company operations. All documentation was provided and reviewed	Compliant		
		b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located.				
		c. The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covers all company operations relating to salmonid production in the region (i.e. all smolt production facilities, grow-out facilities and processing plants).				
		d. The site that is applying for certification provides auditors with access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above).				
		e. Others, please describe				
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN						
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement						
	Indicator: Evidence of regular and meaningful [149] consultation and engagement with community	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).	There is a community engagement letter it is an invitation sent to the mayor of each community it covers the direction of the company and initiatives that are being developed. There is an agreement in place with the FN in this area. The company recently sent out communication to all the local communities			
		b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.				
		c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.				

7.1.1	representatives and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3). e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above. f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above. g. Others, please describe	with details on new technology, Therapeutic Treatments, opportunities for future growth and information regarding certification The community engagement letter states the agenda. Notes are taken during the meeting, and follow-up emails are sent out to stakeholders No representatives made themselves available to the auditors.	Compliant		
7.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence and evidence of an effective [150] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations. b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder describing corrective actions). c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders). d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	MHC has a policy Doc#5/FW905 External Complaint resolution. All external complaints go to the SMT. A log has been created. The Log details who raised the complaint and the nature of the complaint. The complaints are managed and closed off when the matter has been dealt with. The company policy is all complaints are passed to the communications manager and then forwarded to senior management should it be required. The complaints procedure is detailed and sets out the requirements for handling each complaint.	Compliant		
7.1.3	**Indicator:** Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice [151] at the farm during times of therapeutic treatments and has, as part of consultation with communities under 7.1.1, communicated about potential health risks from treatments **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (use of anaesthetic baths is not regarded a therapeutant) b. Notices (above) are posted where they will be visible to affected stakeholders (e.g. posted on waterways for fishermen who pass by the farm). c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1) d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	Notices are posted on the site if Therapeutic Treatments are being carried out. The signage that is used was seen during the farm inspection. The signage used is clear and can be seen by anyone passing the farm. Notices are posted on the side farmhouse so that it can be seen by anyone entering the site. This has been communicated in the engagement letter No stakeholders, representatives from the local community requested any form of engagement with the auditors	Compliant		
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories						
	Indicator: Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations	a. Documentary evidence establishes that the farm does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]). If not then the requirements of 7.2.1 do not apply. b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.	Althorp is located in the K'ómoks ,Wei Wai Kum, We Wai Kai First Nation traditional territory. There are three separate agreements in place with first nations with these groups.			

7.2.1	laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR - farm confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence. d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	The agreements demonstrate that MHC is aware of Local/national laws and regulations for each FN group. There is a spreadsheet detailing agreements with each FN. There is also a log sheet that records all meetings/calls and communication. No indigenous representatives were interviewed	Compliant		
7.2.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes [152] **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm. b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations. c. Others, please describe	Althorp is located in the K'ómoks ,Wei Wai Kum, We Wai Kai First Nation traditional territory. There are three separate agreements in place with first nations with these groups. No indigenous groups requested any form of engagement with the auditors	Compliant		
7.2.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [153] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm. b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) reached a protocol agreement with the indigenous community and this fact is documented; or 2) continued engagement in an active process [153] to reach a protocol agreement with the indigenous community. c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable. d. Others, please describe	MHC are operating in some indigenous territories and have several agreements (IBA) in place with FN. MH has an agreements with the K'ómoks ,Wei Wai Kum, We Wai Kai FN groups. No indigenous groups requested any form of engagement with the auditors	Compliant		
	Criterion 7.3 Access to resources					
7.3.1	**Indicator:** Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [154] without community approval **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Resources that are vital [155] to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under Indicator 7.3.2). b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented. c. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has not restricted access to vital resources without prior community approval. d. Others, please describe	As detailed in CEAA screening report MHC does not have exclusive use of the location the farms are located in. There is no restriction of access and report notes the site is located in a territory with no issues with the use of the location. No stakeholders, representatives from the local community requested any form of engagement with the auditors	Compliant		
7.3.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. There is a documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources. Can be completed as part of community consultations under 7.1.1. b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a. c. Others, please describe	The CEAA report for the site includes consultation with FN, local community and government. It is noted in the report that FN has no issues with the license application. No stakeholders, representatives from the local community requested any form of engagement with the auditors	Compliant		
	INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION					
	SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT					
	Standards related to Principle 1					

8.1	**Indicator**: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Identify all of the farm's smolt suppliers. For each supplier, identify the type of smolt production system used (e.g. open, semi or closed systems) and submit this information to ASC (Appendix VI). b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits. c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required. - e. Others, please describe	The farm is supplied by three own company smolts semi-closed systems, Big Tree Creek, Dalrymple and Ocean Falls. Information on the suppliers send to ASC. Legal authorizations were present during the audit for the three suppliers. Big Tree Creek, Licence AQFW 112572 2015 by DFO, valid until 18/06/2024. BC Provincial Aquaculture Licence 1403852.2016. Dalrymple, Licence AQFW 112571 2015 by DFO, valid until 18/08/2014. BC Provincial Aquaculture Licence PR083. Ocean Falls, Licence AQFW 112568 2015 by DFO, valid until 18/06/2024. BC Provincial Aquaculture Licence 5406670. On the licence there are conditions referring to parameters such as Ammonia, BOD, Nitrate and Phosphate emissions, which are monitored monthly.	Compliant		
8.2	**Indicator**: Compliance with labour laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labour laws and regulations. b. Keep records of supplier inspections for compliance with national labour laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation; see 1.1.3a) c. Others, please describe	The suppliers are all owned by MHC and apply the same labour principles as the sea sites.	N/A		
		Standards related to Principle 2				
8.3	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a documented assessment of the smolt site's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3. b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration confirming they have developed and are implementing a plan to address potential impacts identified in the assessment. c. Others, please describe	BIAs present for the three suppliers and conducted by Mainstream Biological Consulting on NOV 2014. The assessment incorporates key freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems resources and mitigation measures.	Compliant		
8.4	**Indicator**: Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1) **Requirement:** 5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the SAD standards, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months. b. For all feeds used by the smolt suppliers (result from 8.4a), keep records showing phosphorus content as determined by chemical analysis or based on feed supplier declaration (Appendix VIII-1). c. Using the equation from Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a and b, calculate the total amount of phosphorus added as feed during the last 12 months of smolt production. d. Obtain from smolt suppliers records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months. e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1. f. If applicable, obtain records from smolt suppliers showing the total amount of P removed as sludge (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months.	Feed and fish production records verified in Aquafarmer. Phosphorus level from feed confirmed via Skretting Declaration, dated 21/07/2017, Nutra ST 1.6-1.7 mg/kg, Nutra XP 1.6-1.7 mg/kg and Nutra RC 1.5-1.6 mg/kg. Total Phosphorous in feed calculated for Dalrymple as 4.87 mt and for Big Tree Creek as 2.45 mt (1.4% of feed fed as an average across the content for feed sizes used). Biomass produced in Dalrymple 326.52 mt (1.4 mt total phosphorous in fish biomass) and in Big Tree Creek 181.47 mt (0.78 mt total phosphorous in fish biomass). Total phosphorus removed as sludge in Dalrymple 2.18 mt and for BIG Tree Creek 0.73 mt. Total phosphorus released into the environment Dalrymple 0.0039 kg/mt and Big Tree Creek 0.0052 kg/mt. VR 92 applied for Ocean Falls (discharge direct into sea water).	Compliant		

		g. Using the formula in Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a-f (above), calculate total phosphorus released per ton of smolt produced and verify that the smolt supplier is in compliance with requirements.				
		h. Others, please describe				
Standards related to Principle 3						
8.5	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication [156] of the SAD standards **Requirement:** Yes [157] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers except as noted in [157]	a. Obtain written evidence showing whether the smolt supplier produces a non-native species or not. If not, then Indicator 8.5 does not apply.	Non-native Atlantic salmon are farmed. DFO website shows that introductions occurred in 1985 from Scotland.	Compliant		
		b. Provide the farm with documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard. (See definition of area under 3.2.1).				
		c. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish.				
		d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b or 8.5c, provide documented evidence for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.				
		e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.				
		f. Others, please describe				
8.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [158] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 fish [159] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers except as noted in [159]	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers maintained monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.	The suppliers are all Marine Harvest facilities. All monitoring records are submitted to DFO who keep them indefinitely and are available on their website. No escape reported or suspected by the smolt suppliers. An Escape Prevention and Response Plan - Freshwater Hatchery Operation, Document #FW926, is in place and includes risk during transport activities, equipment and operation. Maps showing screens was evidenced for the three facilities.	Compliant		
		b. Using smolt supplier records from 8.6a, determine the total number of fish that escaped. Verify that there were fewer than 300 escapees from the smolt production facility in the most recent production cycle.				
		c. Inform smolt suppliers in writing that monitoring records described in 8.6a must be maintained for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which the farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [159]).				
		d. If an escape episode occurs at the smolt production facility (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [159]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the smolt producer could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.				
		e. Others, please describe				

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

8.7	**Indicator**: Accuracy [160] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish **Requirement:** ≥98% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records showing the accuracy of the counting technology used by smolt suppliers. Records must include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts. b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%. c. Others, please describe	Document FW#269 covers counting (Smolt Inventory control) and specifies the ≥98% anticipated counter accuracy, this is supported by supplier spec sheets. Aquascan counters were mostly used on the wellboats with hatcheries using Vaki counters. Records of transfers to Althorp seen for the three suppliers Big Tree Creek, Dalrymple and Ocean Falls. Max. discrepancy recorded 2 %.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 4						
8.8	**Indicator**: Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain a policy which states the supplier's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the supplier's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation. b. Others, please describe	An Environmental and Biodiversity Policy is in place covering freshwater operations. Material Storage, Handling and Waste Disposal Plan, Marine and FW sites Document #693.	Compliant		
8.9	**Indicator**: Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection 1 for guidance and required components of the records and assessment) **Requirement:** Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year. b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last year. c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year. d. Confirm that the smolt supplier used results from 8.9b and 8.9c to calculate energy consumption on the supplier's facility as required and that the units are reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle. e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a-e. f. Others, please describe	Records and calculations provided during the audit and found adequate. Dalrymple biomass 327 mt, 57,347,184 kj/mt. Ocean Falls biomass 409 mt, 24,594,639 kj/mt. Big Tree Creek biomass 181 mt, 74,980,223 kj/mt.	Compliant		
8.10	**Indicator**: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [161]) emissions [162] at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment (See Appendix V, subsection 1) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility. b. Confirm that, on at least an annual basis, the smolt supplier calculates all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1. c. For GHG calculations, confirm that the smolt supplier selects the emission factors which are best suited to the supplier's operation. Confirm that the supplier documents the source of the emissions factors. d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO2 gases to CO2 equivalents, confirm that the smolt suppliers specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	Dalrymple GHG 2,018,685 kg CO2e. Ocean Falls 1,219,951 kg CO2e. Big Tree Creek 1,112,364 kg CO2e. GWP took from DEFRA guidelines on UK Government figures. Updated quarterly.	Compliant		

		e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually.				
		f. Others, please describe				
		Standards related to Principle 5				
8.11	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites. b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian. c. Others, please describe	Salmonid Health Management Plan (HMP) is present, dated OCT 2015, reviewed and signed by Diane Morrison, Fish Health and Food Safety Director of MHC. The plan refers to what is required under licence conditions but also has links and references to applicable SOP's. The plan is submitted DFO for approval.	Compliant		
8.12	**Indicator**: Percentage 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 [163] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Maintain a list of diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region, developed by farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence. b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence. c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received. d. Demonstrate, using the lists from 8.12a-c above, that all salmon on the farm received vaccination against all selected diseases known to present a significant risk in the regions for which an effective vaccine exists. e. Others, please describe	A list of diseases and available vaccines is presented in HMP. FW sites vaccinations are recorded in Aquafarmer. All smolts were vaccinated against IHN, Furunculosis, Vibrio and BKD. Vaccine used was APEX-IHN, Renogen and Forte Micro.	Compliant		
8.13	**Indicator**: Percentage of smolt groups [164] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier a list of diseases of regional concern for which smolt should be tested. List shall be supported by scientific analysis as described in the Instruction above. b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration and records confirming that each smolt group received by the farm has been tested for the diseases in the list (8.13a). c. Others, please describe	Regional concern diseases are listed on the PAR licence. Prior to moving fish, transfer permits are required to be issued by DFO. These permits are granted once DFO has verified health status of fish. Permits were available on site, e. g. Fish Health Inspection report for Dalrymple prior to transfer seen, dated 16/08/2016, conducted by Kennebec River Biosciences.	Compliant		
8.14	**Indicator**: 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 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use for the fish sold to the farm that is signed by their veterinarian and includes: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant. b. Others, please describe	Treatments applied are available through the Aquafarmer system. Diane Morrison, Fish Health and Food Safety Director of MHC, is also responsible for therapeutants control and prescription. Aquafarmer records confirm there have been no treatments involving antibiotic use over the most recent production cycle at Dalrymple and Big Tree Creek. One florfenicol treatment at Ocean Falls, prescribed by D. M. Prescription Rx; #16-025 seen, dated 12/06/2016 and confirmed that includes required information.	Compliant		

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

8.15	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [165] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [166] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [166]. b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification. c. Compare therapeutant records from smolt supplier (8.14) to the list (8.15a) and confirm that no therapeutants appearing on the list (8.15a) were used on the smolt purchased by the farm. d. Others, please describe	The company maintains a global register of the therapeutants and other chemicals permitted and banned along with withdrawal period requirements and residue limits, which is monitored and updated regularly. Full records of therapeutic treatments can be found on the Aquafarmer database.	Compliant		
8.16	**Indicator**: Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a). b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle. c. Others, please describe	Full records of therapeutic treatments can be found on the Aquafarmer database. Only one treatment with florfenicol at Ocean Falls.	Compliant		
8.17	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [167] **Requirement:** None [168] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [167]. b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification. c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm. d. Others, please describe	The company uses the WHO website on critically important antimicrobials for human medicine. Only one treatment with florfenicol at Ocean Falls.	Compliant		
8.18	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [169] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [170] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide the smolt supplier with a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (or inform the supplier how to access it from the internet). b. Inform the supplier that an ASC certified farm can only source smolt from a facility with policies and procedures that ensure that its smolt production practices are compliant with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. c. Obtain a declaration from the supplier stating their intent to comply with the OIE code and copies of the smolt suppliers policies and procedures that are relevant to demonstrate compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. d. Others, please describe	All smolts are supplied internally. Farms have access through 'SharePoint'.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 6						
8.19	**Indicator**: Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain copies of smolt supplier's company-level policies and procedures and a declaration of compliance with the labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11. b. Review the documentation and declaration from 8.19a to verify that smolt supplier's policies and procedures are in compliance with the requirements of labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11. c. Others, please describe	The hatcheries are owned by Marine Harvest so Principle 6 applies.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 7						

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

8.20	**Indicator**: Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community. b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements. c. Others, please describe	The smolt supplier is the same as the farm owner, Marine Harvest . Refer to Principle 6.	Compliant		
8.21	**Indicator**: Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations. b. Others, please describe	The smolt supplier is the same as the farm owner, Marine Harvest . Refer to Principle 7.	Compliant		
8.22	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people (see Indicator 7.2.1). If not then the requirements of 8.22 do not apply. b. Obtain documentation to demonstrate that, as required by law in the jurisdiction: smolt supplier consulted with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR smolt supplier confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence. c. Others, please describe	The smolt supplier is the same as the farm owner, Marine Harvest . Refer to Principle 7.	Compliant		
8.23	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier. b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities. c. Others, please describe	The smolt supplier is the same as the farm owner, Marine Harvest . Refer to Principle 7.	Compliant		
	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT					
8.24	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids. b. Request smolt suppliers to identify all water bodies in which they operate net pens for producing smolt and from which facilities they sell to the client. c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results. d. Others, please describe	No net pens	N/A		
8.25	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body	a. Take steps to ensure that by June 13, 2017 the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens. b. Others, please describe	No net pens	N/A		
		a. For the water body(s) where the supplier produces smolt for the client (see 8.24b), obtain a copy of the most recent assessment of assimilative capacity.				

8.26	**Indicator**: Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body has been established by a reliable entity [171] within the past five years [172, and total biomass in the water body is within the limits established by that study (see Appendix VIII-5 for minimum requirements) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.	No net pens	N/A		
		c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5.				
		d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a).				
		e. If the study in 8.26a is more than two years old and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since completion, request evidence that an updated assessment study has been done.				
		f. Others, please describe				
8.27	**Indicator**: Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≤ 20 µg/l [174] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements of Appendix VIII-6.	No net pens	N/A		
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations.				
		c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station.				
		d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body.				
		e. Confirm that the average value for TP over the last 12 months did not exceed 20 ug/l at any of the sampling stations nor at the reference station.				
		f. Others, please describe				
8.28	**Indicator**: Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimetres above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≥ 50% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a).	No net pens	N/A		
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months.				
		c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.				
		d. Others, please describe				
	Indicator: Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7)	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable).				
		b. If the trophic status of the waterbody has not been classified (see 8.29a), obtain evidence from the supplier to show how the supplier determined trophic status based on the concentration of TP.				

8.29	**Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	c. As applicable, review results from 8.29b to verify that the supplier accurately assigned a trophic status to the water body in accordance with the table in Appendix VIII-7 and the observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months. d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported for all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change. e. Others, please describe	No net pens	N/A		
8.30	**Indicator**: Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** 25% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable. b. Compare the baseline TP concentration (result from 8.30a) to the average observed TP concentration over the past 12 months (result from 8.27e). c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration. d. Others, please describe	No net pens	N/A		
8.31	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water body **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water bodies where the supplier operates. b. Others, please describe	No net pens	N/A		
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS						
8.32	**Indicator**: Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** Yes [177] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing that water quality monitoring was conducted at least quarterly (i.e. once every 3 months) over the last 12 months. b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness. c. Submit the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix to ASC as per Appendix VIII-2 and Appendix VI at least once per year. d. Others, please describe	Water quality monitoring matrix confirmed as completed and submitted to ASC for the three internal suppliers. Hatcheries monitor Total Ammonia, BOD, Nitrate, Nitrite, Total Phosphorus and TSS.	Compliant		
8.33	**Indicator**: Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** 60% [178,179] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b). b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation. c. If a single DO reading (as reported in 8.33a) fell below 60%, obtain evidence that the smolt supplier performed daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for a least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2). d. Others, please describe	All internal smolt suppliers. DO matrix record obtained for the three sites. No readings below 60%.	Compliant		
8.34	**Indicator**: Macro-invertebrate surveys downstream from the farm's effluent discharge demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3)	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys. b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).	Surveys present and conducted by Mainstream Biological Consulting, JUL 2016. For Big Tree Creek results shows no negative effect of effluent discharge on the benthic macroinvertebrate community downstream. Both upstream and	Compliant		

	Requirement: Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	c. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm the survey results show that benthic health is similar to or better than upstream of the supplier's discharge.	downstream were dominated by similar community, CAT. 5. For Dalrymple, results upstream and downstream shows similar benthic health, CAT 4. Ocean Falls discharge directly to seawater.			
		d. Others, please describe				
8.35	**Indicator**: Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2.	Documented Biosolids Management Plan available. Schematic plans for each supplier site. Sludge disposal in terms of quantity and method are recorded. Disposal is thru approved companies Renewable Resources Ltd., Able & Ready Septic Tank Service and Vortex Drain Service. Records of disposals 2017 all seen, e.g. Invoice dated 22/08/2017 to UBC Farm.	Compliant		
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly.				
		c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months.				
		d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2.				
		e. Others, please describe				

SAI Global Assurance Services, 3rd Floor, Block 3, Quayside Business Park, Mill Street, Dundalk, Co. Louth, Ireland.
T + 353 42 932 0912; F + 353 42 938 6864
www.saiglobal.com/assurance

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	Related VR (#)	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions implemented	Deadline for NC close-out	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay
1	2.1.2	Major	The faunal index score was not available at the audit thus, it was not possible to confirm the ecological quality classification.	=('C:\Users\caspau0\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\Content.Outlook\V5LW7OWN\[Form 12 ASC Audit report template CARv.2.0 June 2017 Salmon MHC Sept17 Master 1-Althrope.xlsx]II. Audit template - Salmon'!D33)	22/09/2017	Closed	NA	Site not at peak biomass; previous cycle results not available as data not gathered for regulatory monitoring	Sampling conducted, results included separately. Sampling to continue at each peak.	22/12/2017	Benthic Biodiversity Assessment, Althorp Point, Finfish Aquaculture Site, Sunderland Channel, BC, Site License AQ1300, (Survey Date – September 18 and 19, 2017 Mainstream Biological) Report supplied. Also used as a biodiversity index, the Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score at the stations outside the AZE on Transects A, B and C indicates that these locations possess good to high ecological quality of sediment scoring greater than the lower acceptable limit of 25 required in the ASC Salmon Standard. 22/12/17.		
2	2.1.3	Major	The faunal index score was not available at the audit thus, it was not possible to confirm the abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna.	Samples were collected during SEP 2017, when the site riched peak biomass. A map of the farm showing the boundary of AZE and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations was available. At the time of the audit, the faunal index score was not available as the farm was waiting to receive the results.	22/09/2017	Closed	NA	Site not at peak biomass; previous cycle results not available as data not gathered for regulatory monitoring	Sampling conducted, results included separately. Sampling to continue at each peak.	22/12/2017	Benthic Biodiversity Assessment, Althorp Point, Finfish Aquaculture Site, Sunderland Channel, BC, Site License AQ1300, (Survey Date – September 18 and 19, 2017 Mainstream Biological) Report supplied. Highly abundant macrofaunal taxa (> 100 individuals/m2) that are not pollution indicator species were identified in the sediment obtained within the AZE on Transects A, B and C. The number of highly abundant taxa found at all of these sampling locations was greater than the ASC Salmon Standard acceptable lower limit of two. 22/12/17		
3	2.3.1	Minor	Fines testing is being conducted by the feed company and not the farm.	Fines testing is being conducted by the feed company and not the farm.	22/09/2017	Delayed	VR 246	Previous auditor accepted this result	Variance request to be submitted to allow sampling by feed company, samples being held to be sieved if necessary	22/12/2017 or if longer required the an agreed closeout plan with the CAB.	VR has been applied for a different CAB audit to allow fines to be tested by the feed company. 22/12/17		
4	2.5.7	Minor	The documentation in place to record incidents and associated assessment of risk following each lethal incident was not available at the farm and the procedure was not know by the site management.	No lethal incidents has been reported by the site however, the documentation in place to record such incidents and the associated assessment of risk following each incident was not available at the farm and the procedure was not know by the site management.	22/09/2017	Closed	NA	Site had not accessed document as there had been no lethal incidents on the site	Link to incident report form included on ASC monthly data sheet (see tab 1)	22/12/2017 or if longer required the an agreed closeout plan with the CAB.	ASC reporting and implementation sheet now shows that if there is an animal mortaltiy the site must fill in an animal incident de-brief form on the companies sharepoint. 22/12/17		

5	4.5.1	Minor	Spill trays were missing on a compressor located at the feed barge and from two of the three of the portable capstan winches located at the cages.	It was evidenced during the audit that not all the compressors located at the feed barge are equiped with spill trays. Also, spill trays were missing from two of the three of the portable capstan winches located at the cages.	22/09/2017	Closed	NA	Identified by site staff but not closed out in time for audit	Spill tray replaced (see tab 2)	22/12/2017 or if longer required the an agreed closeout plan with the CAB.	Photograph of spill tray in place in Tab 2.22/12/17		
6	6.5.1	Major	The health and Safety of the site as observed during the site visit was not up to the required level.	The facility has established good procedures and policies to protect employees. However, there were unsafe hazards noted during the tour. 1. Rope is being used for whip checks and needs to be replaced with proper purpose made whip checks. 2. Compressed airlines on the cage have been joined, and no Whip Checks have been installed. 3. Operation department equipment used on site needs to be checked to ensure that it meets safety requirements. It was noted that some operations team equipment had emergency stops held on with cable ties and one of the emergency stops was broken. There is a requirement to fix the issues identified, but also management systems need to be reviewed to ensure that operation department equipment is in good working order. 4. There was two compressor shut off values noted to be damaged (on the cage) and missing the shut-off handles. The facility has established good procedures and policies to protect employees. However, there were unsafe hazards noted during the tour.	22/09/2017	Closed	NA	H&S review of operations equipment ongoing. H&S has identified issues with whip checks and replaced company-wide. Lack of proper reporting structure in operations teams. Capstan maintenance had fallen to site staff, with few options for replacements should capstans be removed for servicing. Now responsibility of operations crews developing regular maintenance programs. Capstans are not being used until service is complete.	Whip checks replaced, shut off values replaced. Capstans out of service and awaiting shipment to Westport Welding for repair. See attachments. New operations manager developing better oversight for operations teams H&S. (See tab 2) Operations team developing tracking system for capstans which will include annual maintenance program. In the meantime, H&S focussing on capstans and all units currently being inspected with emergency stops (and other safety controls) being installed where necessary.	22/12/2017	Photographs of proper whipchecks in place in tab 2. The capstan with poor emergency stops are not being used and this is accepted. New operations manager in place to deal with issues. Discussion on this took place with audit team in the area for a revisit to Duncan and Doyle on the 18th of December 2017. Further evidence was received (pictures) on the Capstan Safety Improvements in relation to push button start controls and foot pedal control valve to operate capstan head (hands free) which is sufficient to close the NC. JU 22/12/17		
7	6.5.3	Minor	Risk Assessment methodology has not been completed and implemented on the risk assessments.	Risk assessments are carried by the site manager every year. All reviews are documented. Changes are made sooner if the process changes or new machinery is implemented. Risk assessments are used to identify the risk and employees are trained against the risk assessments. The site has trained employees that carry out risk assessments. This training is recorded on the MH internal DATS system. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments. Risk assessments are reviewed when changes are made to the processes to avoid potential accidents. It was noted that the Marine Harvest Risk methodology had not been completed and implemented on the risk assessments. Risk assessments need to be updated, and methodology needs to be understood.	22/09/2017	Closed	NA	Training for risk assessments not adequate	Risk assessments have been updated to include more detail to ensure proper completion. Risk assessment methodology reviewed by all staff at Althorp. H&S to introduce new "Supervising Safety" course to all supervisors	22/12/2017 or if longer required the an agreed closeout plan with the CAB.	Email with copy of the DATS training records supplied to show that staff have and are being trained up on Risk Assessments. 22/12/17		

VR246_Salmon_v1.1_2.3.1

Company name:
MHC ASC certified and MHC ASC applicant sites

Indicator: Percentage of fines in the feed at point of entry to the farm (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2)

Requirement: <1% by weight of the feed

This application is on behalf of Marine Harvest Canada (MHC) and is requested for all MHC ASC certified and MHC ASC applicant sites.

Basis for Variance

As identified by the SAD process, nutrient release from salmon farms is a key impact of production. A number of indicators within the ASC standard evaluate this impact, considering both nutrient levels in the waters surrounding the farm site, and impact of uneaten food and fish waste on the benthos beneath the farm.

Feed for MHC's sea sites is purchased exclusively from Skretting Canada. Feed is milled at a facility in Vancouver, and transported within two to three weeks of production by covered barge or truck in one tonne bags (primarily, though twenty kilogram bags are required occasionally), to MHC sea sites. During milling and prior to shipment, Skretting Canada has in place a quality assurance program that carefully verifies the quality of feed produced. While the standard QC program for fines targets specific feed sizes that are of a higher likelihood of having feed fines or breakage (in practice, only the smallest feed sizes see any significant level of fines), Skretting has developed a testing program to meet the intent of the ASC standard for MHC feeds, included below.

Skretting Feed Fines Procedure

Each quarter, five lots from each of the five pellet sizes (n=25) will be sampled. Lots will be spread across the quarter as much as possible depending on production schedule.

A fines test will consist of feed collected across the manufacturing period for that lot (as much as possible depending on the size of the lot).

In the circumstances that a pellet size doesn't have five production lots across the quarter, another pellet size shall make up for the missing test (so that the total of sampling events across the quarter is always n=25).

Data is to be compiled quarterly and communicated to the customer no later than two weeks into the new quarter.

Marine Harvest Canada SOP SW952- Feed Delivery and Storage (Appendix III) outlines the staff requirements for receiving feed. One of these requirements is to return any feed bags showing signs of free oil, damage, etc. to the delivery barge in order for it to be returned to Skretting for disposal. Each feed delivery is also subject to feed sampling (Appendix IV, SOP SW129 – Feed Sample Procedure). In this SOP, the same ASC requirement for feed to be <1% fines is stated. Rather than weigh each delivery, initial procedure is visual inspection, followed by sieving of the feed when fines identified as being present. If greater than 0.5% dust is found, the feed manager is to be contacted immediately. This SOP also includes evaluation of other feed aspects that could potentially result in nutrient release, such as oil leakage. Any concerns with feed are immediately forwarded to the MHC feed manager, who will provide guidance.

Proper transport, storage and delivery of feed, as outlined in the ASC standard, are a priority of both MHC and Skretting. Appropriate development of these processes ensures both companies that feed will arrive on site in optimal condition.

Request:

Through this variance, we request that the ASC accept fines results produced by Skretting as an acceptable proxy to farm-level sampling. Comparison of farm-level and source-level sampling do not yield significant differences in fines. We argue that sampling at source does not differ significantly to "point of entry" as outlined in Section 2.3 of the ASC standard. Acceptance of this variance will eliminate logistical challenges of sampling feed on site, without creating concern that poor feed quality is negatively impacting the surrounding ecosystem.

The following appendices were sent separately to ASC but are not published because of reasons of commercial sensitivity. Appendix I – Skretting feed fines results can be requested from ACOURA via mail: asc@acoura.com

Appendix I – Skretting feed fines results

Appendix II – MHC feed fines results

Appendix III – SOP SW952 Feed Delivery and Storage

Appendix IV – SOP SW129 – Feed Sample Procedure

ASC Audit Report - Traceability

10	Traceability Factor	Description of risk factor if present	Describe any traceability, segregation, or other systems in place to manage the risk.
10.1	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, produced within the same operation.	There are adequate controls in place to prevent accidental substitution and although deliberate substitution could take place, staff are well trained, and the risk is low. The company is listed on the stock exchange and substitution if it was discovered, would have severe consequences for the company.	The company runs a product CV that accompanies the fish whenever they are moved from a cage including harvest. The CV has all the history for the fish in that cage including hatchery of origin, any medications or treatments, the feed that was used and any other relevant historical information e.g. family history.
10.2	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, present during production, harvest, transport, storage, or processing activities.	Only deliberate substitution could take place, staff are well trained. No fish are sold as ASC certified.	Unlikely due to system in place at central harvest facility. The fish are killed on site and are transferred to the harvest unit directly using Refrigerated seawater vessels RSW's. The processing unit is based in Port Hardy and is owned by Marine Harvest. Only Marine harvest fish are harvested and processed in this processing unit.
10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.	The fishing company owned by and called J. Walkus is used to harvest however they only harvest for Marine Harvest Canada.	The same trace system is used as described earlier in the audit. The fish are still under the control of Marine Harvest.
10.4	Any other opportunities where certified product could potentially be mixed, substituted, or mislabelled with non-certified product before the point where product enters the chain of custody.	No other opportunities.	None.

10.5	Detail description of the flow of certified product within the operation and the associated traceability system which allows product to be traced from final sale back to the unit of certification	The fish are harvested on site and transported to the Port Hardy processing plant by James Walkus fishing company. There are 3 harvest / killing boats which are the Nicole Joye, Amarissa Joye and the Serina Joye. There are 2 other RSW boats that transport the fish from the point of harvest to the processing plant. They are the Pacific Joye and the Island Joye. The traceability system consists of a 3 copy document that is filled in on the harvest boat that describes the site, cage number, date, time and fish number harvested plus any other comments. One copy is left on the farm, one copy is left on the harvest boat and the last copy goes to the Processing plant. A further 3 copy document is filled in by the farm itemising the last treatments of anaesthetic, antibiotics and lice treatments if any. This document details the withdrawal of any therapeutants of chemicals and is used in the history of the harvest fish. Again the farm keeps a copy, the harvest boat keeps a copy and the processing plant does not proceed with processing without their copy.
10.6	<u>Traceability Determination:</u>	
10.6.1	The traceability and segregation systems in the operation are sufficient to ensure all products identified and sold as certified by the operation originate from the unit of	The company has GAA BAP certification for all its sites including the processing facility. The processing facility also has MSC CoC certification.
10.6.2	The traceability and segregation systems are not sufficient and a separate chain of custody certification is required for the operation before products can be sold as ASC-certified or can be eligible to carry the ASC logo.	NA. The farm does not sell the fish as ASC certified.
10.6.3	The point from which chain of custody is required to begin.	From the point that the fish arrives at the processing plant.
10.6.4	Is a separate chain of custody certificate required for the producer?	The processor has ASC CoC and also MSC CoC and BAP Processing certification. The company is not currently selling any produce specifically as ASC certified.

ASC Audit Report - Closing

11 Findings

11.1 A summary table that lists all non-conformities and observations

NC reference	NC Status	Clause Reference	Description of NC	Description of actions pending
1	Major	2.1.2	The faunal index score was not available at the audit thus, it was not possible to confirm the ecological quality classification.	Closed 22/12/17.
2	Major	2.1.3	The faunal index score was not available at the audit thus, it was not possible to confirm the abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna.	Closed 22/12/17.
3	Minor	2.3.1	Fines testing is being conducted by the feed company and not the farm.	VR has been applied for a different CAB audit to allow fines to be tested by the feed company. VR Approved Closed.
4	Minor	2.5.7	The documentation in place to record incidents and associated assessment of risk following each lethal incident was not available at the farm and the procedure was not know by the site management.	Closed 22/12/17.

5	Minor	4.5.1	Spill trays were missing on a compressor located at the feed barge and from two of the three of the portable capstan winches located at the cages.	Closed 22/12/17.
6	Major	6.5.1	The health and Safety of the site as observed during the site visit was not up to the required level.	Closed 22/12/17.
7	Minor	6.5.3	Risk Assessment methodology has not been completed and implemented on the risk assessments.	Closed 22/12/17.

11.2 A copy of the non-conformity report form completed for each non-conformity and observation raised.

11.3 If any approved requests for variations or interpretations have been used, a full copy of the approved variation or interpretation form shall be appended to the report. If used in rating a NC, the ASC reference number (NCF 5) and a justification for its use (NCF 6) shall be completed in the NC report form.

12 Evaluation Results

12.1 A report of the results of the audit of the operation against the specific elements in the standard and guidance documents.	The audit was comprehensive and well executed.
12.2 A clear statement on whether or not the audited unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard(s).	The unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard.

123	In cases where Biodiversity Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA) or Participatory Social Impact Assessment (PSIA) is available, it shall be added in full to the audit report. IF these documents are not in English, then a synopsis in English shall be added to the report as well.	NA

13 Decision

13.1	Details of any delays in the proposed timeline for the decision on certification due to the consideration of new or additional information.	N/A
13.2	Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	Yes
13.3	The Eligibility Date (if applicable)	
13.4	Is a separate coc certificate required for the producer? (yes/no)	Yes
13.5	If a certificate has been issued this section shall include:	
13.5.1	The date of issue and date of expiry of the certificate.	Marine Harvest Canada Inc, 7200 Coho Rd, Port Hardy, British Columbia, V0N 2P0, Canada Certificate Issue Date: 15th January 2018 Certificate Expiry Date: 14th January 2021

13.5.2 The scope of the certificate	Scope: Atlantic Salmon (Salmo Salar)
13.5.3 Instructions to stakeholders that any complaints or objections to the CAB decision are to be subject to the CAB's complaints procedure. This section shall include information on where to review the procedure and where further information on complaints can be found.	Any objections or complaints in respect of this decision are subject to SAI complaints procedure. Should a stakeholder wish to register a complaint , please either register the details with ukmarketing@saiglobal.com Or GTCenquiries@saiglobal.com

14 Surveillance

14.1 Next planned Surveillance	
14.1.1 Planned date	
14.1.2 Planned site	
14.2 Next audit type	
14.2.1 Surveillance 1	
14.2.2 Surveillance 2	
14.2.3 Re-certification	
14.2.4 Other (specify type)	