Aquaculture Stewardship Council Salmon Standard Certification Assessment Report

Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda - Quetros 1 Farm

Onsite Dates: 16-19 August 2016
Report release Dates:

Public Comment Draft Report: 14-Oct-16
Final report: November 11 2016

Public Disclosure Form / Divulgación de Información Pública

This form shall be submitted by the CAB no less than thirty (30) calendar days prior to any onsite audit. Any changes to this information shall be submitted to the ASC within five (5) days of the change and not later than 10 days before the planned audit. If later, a new announcement is submitted and another 30 days rule will apply.
Este formulario deberá ser presentado por el CAB no menos de treinta (30) días calendario antes de cualquier auditoría in situ. Cualquier cambio o esto información se presentarán a la ASC dentro de los cinco (5) días del cambio y no más tarde de 10 días antes de la auditoría prevista. Si más tarde, un nuevo anuncio se presenta y se aplicará otra regla de los 30 días.

The information on this form shall be public and should be posted on the ASC website within three (3) days of submission.
La información en este formulario será pública y debe ser publicado en el sitio web ASC dentro de los tres (3) días siguientes a la presentación.

This form shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.
Este formulario deberá ser escrito para ser legible para los grupos de interés y otras partes interesadas.

This form should be translated into local languages when appropriate
Este formulario debe ser traducido a los idiomas locales cuando sea apropiado

PDF 1 **Public Disclosure Form / Formulario de divulgación pública**

PDF 1.1	**Name of CAB / Nombre del CB**	SCS Global Services
PDF 1.2	**Date of Submission / Fecha de Presentación**	
PDF 1.3	**CAB Contact Person / Persona de contacto CB**	
PDF 1.3.1	Name of Contact Person /Nombre de la persona de contacto	Juan Aguirre
PDF 1.3.2	Position in the CAB's-organisation / Posición dentro de la organización del OC	Project Manager ASC
PDF 1.3.3	Mailing address / Dirección postal	2000 Powell Street, Suite 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
PDF 1.3.4	Email address / Correo electrónico	JAguirre@scsglobalservices.com
PDF 1.3.5	Phone number / Número de teléfono	1.510.452.6395 direct
PDF 1.3.6	Other / Otros	1.510.452.6884 fax
PDF 1.4	**ASC Name of Client**	
PDF 1.4.1	Name of Contact Person /Nombre de la persona de contacto	Carol Fernandois
PDF 1.4.2	Position in the client's organisation / Posición en la organización del cliente	Environment Head / Jefa de Medio Ambiente
PDF 1.4.3	Mailing address / Dirección postal	Diego Portales 2000 Piso 8
PDF 1.4.4	Email address / Correo electrónico	cfernand@agrosuper.com
PFD 1.4.5	Phone number / Número de teléfono	56 65 2 484708
PDF 1.4.6	Other / Otros	
PDF 1.5	**Unit of Certification / Unidad de certificación**	
PDF 1.5.1	Single Site / Sitio individual	x
PDF 1.5.2	Cluster of Sites /Multisitio	

PDF 1.6 **Sites to be audited / Centros a ser auditados**

Site Name / Nombre del centro	GPS Coordinates / Coordenadas GPS	Other Location Information / Otra información de lugar	Planned Site Audit(s) / Auditoria(s) planificadas en sitio	Date of planned audit / Fecha de la auditoria planificada
Quetros 1 Farm	44°34'38.41" S 73°50'09.38" W		August 16-19, 2016 / 16 al 19 Agosto de 2016	August 8-10, 2016: Office; August 16-19 Onsite Farm / 8 al 10 Agosto, 2016: Oficina; 16 al 19 Agosto, 2016 Auditoria en terreno

PDF 1.7 **Species and Standards / Especies y Normas**

Standard / Norma	Species (scientific name) produced / Especies (nombre científico) producida	Included in scope (Yes/No) / Incluido en el alcance (Yes/No) / (Si/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used / Norma ASC aprobada a ser usada	Version Number / Número de versión
Salmon	*Oncorhynchus kisutch / Salmón del Pacifico*	Yes / Si	ASC Salmon Standard / Norma ASC	Version 1.0 June 2012 / Version 1.0 Junio 2012

PDF 1.8 **Planned Stakeholder Consultation(s) and How Stakeholders can Become Involved / Consulta(s) planificadas a Grupos de Interés y como pueden verse involucrados**

Name/organisation Nombre/organización	Relevance for this audit Relevancia para esta auditoría	How to involve this stakeholder (in-person/phone interview/input submission) / Cómo involucrar a los Grupos de Interés (personalmente/teléfono/ envio de información)	When stakeholder may be contacted / Cuando los Grupos de Interés pueden ser contactados	How this stakeholder will be contacted / Cómo estos Grupos de Interés serán contactados
Ms. Yasna Valdez	Environmental chairperson / Presidente Comité Ambiental	Interview / Entrevista	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting. Antes de la auditoria y durante la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting. Correo electrónico y en persona si está disponible para la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.
Ms. Maria José Becker	Committee of health promotion chairperson / Presidente Comité Salud	Interview / Entrevista	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting. Antes de la auditoria y durante la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting. Correo electrónico y en persona si está disponible para la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.
Mr. Luis Torres Figueroa	Cultural group chairperson / Presidente Comité Cultural	Interview / Entrevista	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting. Antes de la auditoria y durante la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting. Correo electrónico y en persona si está disponible para la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.
Mr. Juan Carcamo Nauto	Soccer school of Puerto Cisnes chairperson / Presidente escuela de futbol de Puerto Cises	Interview / Entrevista	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting. Antes de la auditoria y durante la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting. Correo electrónico y en persona si está disponible para la reunión de las partes interesadas de la comunidad.

PDF 1.9 **Proposed Timeline / Calendario propuesto**

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed / Firma del contrato:	July 4th, 2016 / 4 de Julio de 2016
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit / Inicio de la auditoria:	August 8th, 2016 / 8 de Agosto de 2016
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s) / Auditoria en terreno:	August 16th -19th, 2016 / 16 al 19 de Agosto de 2016
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/Decision / Determinación - Decisión:	September,2016 / Septiembre de 2016

PDF 1.10 **Audit Team / Equipo Auditor**

	Column1 / Columna 1	Name / Nombre	ASC Registration Reference / Referencia de registro ASC
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor / Auditor Lider	Ms. Aracelly Pino	
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts /Expertos técnicos	N/A	
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor / Auditor Social	Mr. Guillermo Ganoza Price	

ASC Audit Report - Opening / Informe de auditoria ASC - Apertura

1 Title Page / Página de Título

1.1 Name of Applicant /Nombre del solicitante	Quetros 1 Farm / Centro de cultivo Quetros 1
1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report] / Título del Reporte	Certification Report / Informe de certificación
1.3 CAB name / Nombre del OC	SCS Global Services
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor / Nombre del Auditor Líder	Alexcelly Pino
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers: / Nombres y cargos de los autores de los reportes y revisores:	Alexcelly Pino- Author-Lead Auditor Guillermo Ganoza Price- Social Auditor Juan Aguirre- Technical reviewer- SCS Pr. Manager Aquaculture certification
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title / Persona de contacto del cliente: Nombre y título	Carol Fernandez Environmental Manager / Jefa de Medio ambiente
1.7 Date / Fecha	October 3 2016

2 Table of Contents / Tabla de contenidos

Section 1: Title Page / Sección 1: Página de título
Section 2: Public Disclosure Form / Sección 2: Divulgación de Información Pública
Section 3: Audit Report Opening / Sección 3: Auditoria Informe de Apertura
Section 4: Non-conformity Report / Sección 4: Informe de incumplimiento
Section 5: CAB Contact Information / Sección 5: Información de contacto de auditoría
Section 6: Audit Report -Traceability / Sección 6: Informe de auditoría - Trazabilidad
Section 7: Audit Report Summary / Sección 7: Resumen del informe de auditoría

3 Glossary / Glosario

Terms and abbreviations that are specific to this audit report and that are not otherwise defined in the ASC glossary / Términos y abreviaciones específicas para este reporte de auditoría, no están definidas en el glosario de ASC

ABM - Area-Based Management
ADDs - Acoustic Deterrent Devices
AHDs - Acoustic Harassment Devices
BOD - Biochemical Oxygen Demand
CH - Critical Habitat
ELL - Estimated unexplained loss
FCR – Feed Conversion Ratio
FFDRm - Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ration
FFDRo - Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio
HACCP – Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points
HAPs - Harmful Algal Blooms/ Pseudo-nitzschia
PMV - Veterinary Medical prescription
PTI - Parasiticide Treatment Index
RTRS - Roundtable for Responsible Soy
WHO – World Health Organization

4 Summary / Resumen

A concise summary of the report and findings. The summary shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties / Un resumen conciso del reporte y hallazgos. El resumen deberá ser escrito de tal forma que sea leíble por los grupos de interés y otras partes interesadas.

4.1 A brief description of the scope of the audit / Una breve descripción del alcance de la auditoría	Initial Certification for Farm (Pacific Salmon - *Oncorhynchus kisutch*) Los Fiordos Quetros 1 farm (single site) and associated smolt producer Piscicultura Llaima –Chenquen / Certificación inicial para Centro de cultivo (Salmón del Pacífico - *Oncorhynchus kisutch*) Los Fiordos centro de cultivo Quetros 1 (sitio individual) y asociado al productor de smolt Piscicultura Llaima -Chenquen.
4.2 A brief description of the applicant's operations / Una breve descripción de las operaciones del solicitante	Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda was born in 1989. For 25 years have been dedicated to production quality products white respecting our enviroinment. Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda Segan operations farming Coho Salmon and Trout. In 1999 we introduced farming of Atlantic salmon and today the focus are the development, spawning, fattening, processing and marketing of these three species. Also have a food plant, which allows to conduct a completely integrated process and ensure the quality and sustainability of your products / Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda fue fundada en 1989. Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda iniciando sus operaciones asociadas de Salmón Coho y la trucha. En 1999 se introdujo el cultivo de salmón del Atlántico y en la actualidad es el foco del desarrollo, desove, engorda, procesamiento y comercialización de estas tres especies. Los Fiordos también tiene una planta de alimento, lo que permite llevar a cabo un proceso completamente integrado y asegurar la calidad y la sostenibilidad de sus productos.
4.3 A summary of the major findings / Un resumen de los hallazgos mayores	During the technical/environmental assessment, 0 Major NC's , 2 Minor NC and 12 Recommendations were raised. During the social assessment, 0 Major NC's, 0 Minor NC's and 0 Recommendation were raised / Durante la evaluación técnica / del medio ambiente, se plantearon 0 NC's Mayores, 2 NC's Menores y 12 recomendaciones. Durante la evaluación social, se plantearon 0 NC's Mayores, 0 NC's Menores y 0 Recomendaciones.
4.4 The Audit determination / Determinación de Auditoría	

5 CAB Contact Information / Información de contacto del OC

5.1 CAB Name / Nombre del OC	SCS Global Services
5.2 CAB Mailing Address / Correo postal del OC	2000 Powell Street, Suite 600 Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
5.3 Email Address / Correo electrónico	jaguirre@scsglobalservices.com
5.4 Other Contact Information / Otra información de contacto	1.510.452.6395 direct

6 Background on the Applicant / Antecedentes sobre el Solicitante

6.1 Information on the Public Disclosure Form (Form 3) except 1.2-1.3 All information updated as necessary to reflect the audit as conducted / Información del formulario de comunicación pública (Formulario 3) excepto 1.2-1.3. Toda la información actualizada que sea necesaria que refleje la forma en que se llevó a cabo la auditoría.

6.2 A description of the operation being evaluated / Descripción de la operación que esta siendo evaluada

Quetros 1 Farm, is owned by Exportadora Los Fiordos. It is located in the ASC AL Neighbour or Barrio N° 20 in Golfo Ladrado de Quetros at Este de Islas Baesa, comuna de Puerto Cisnes, Region de Aysén, Chile. The concession has an area of 3 hectares with coordinates: Latitude: 44° 31' 37,75", Longitude 73° 47' 05,47". The farm operates in aquaculture according to the licenses issued by the Secretary of the Navy of Chile and Sernapesca (National Chilean Fisheries Service). The smolt cultured in Quetros 1 farm comes from Piscicultura Llaima Chenquen and Melipeuco which are approved by the government of Chile. Hatcheries and nursery (smolt farm) are located in freshwater and the fish are transported by truck from the port of Melinka to the farms, located to 120 minutes away. The farm has a production capacity of 800 tons per cycle. The cycle lasts approximately 18 months. The farm has developed a Community Relationship Plan with the surrounding community (Melinka) in the direct influence area. Industrial waste, household and hazardous wastes produced in the farm are classified and stored separately according to the type of waste in sealed containers. These are then disposed of in a place authorized by law. Besides recycling waste, some materials are disposed of in authorized locations. The silage (mortality dump)has a capacity of 8 cubic meters. Quetros 1 farm holds certificates of ISO9001, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, BAP and Global Gap. The estimated production capacity of the farm is 4,000 Ton/cycle.
Centro de cultivo Quetros 1, es propiedad de Exportadora Los Fiordos. Se encuentra en el Barrio N° 20 en Golfo Ladrado de Quetros al Este de Islas Baesa, comuna de Puerto Cisnes, Región de Aysén, Chile. La concesión tiene una superficie de 3 hectáreas con coordenadas: Latitud: 44° 31' 37,75", Longitud 73° 47' 05,47.
El centro de cultivo opera de acuerdo con las licencias otorgadas por Subpesca y Sernapesca. El cultivo de salmón en Quetros 1 viene desde Piscicultura Rio Llaima Chenquen la cual está aprobada por el Gobierno de Chile. El criadero y el vivero (centros de Smolt)con propiedad de Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda. El promedio de tiempo de cultivo para el crecimiento del salmón del Pacífico es cerca de 10 meses. Planta Alimentos Fargua - Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda. es el abastecedor de alimentos que son usados durante la etapa de crecimiento. El cuerpo de agua receptor es el Archipiélago de los Guaitecas, dónde la temperatura del agua oscila entre un promedio de 16 °C durante los meses de primavera y verano a un promedio de 9,5 °C durante el otoño y el invierno. La salinidad varía de 31 ppt durante todo el ciclo productivo. Los depredadores son mamíferos marinos como lobos marinos y delfines. La densidad de peces en el centro de cultivo tiene un total de 22 jaulas de engorda, todas con un tamaño de 28 m x 25 m x 16 m (ancho, largo y profundidad). Todas las redes usadas en el centro de cultivo están impregnadas y tratadas con anti incrustante con la excepción de las redes pajareras, las aberturas de malla son 4 pulgadas para redes de protección de pájaros, 2 pulgadas para redes peceras y 10 pulgadas para las redes de protección de lobos marinos. Hay 6 empleados en la estructura de cultivo. Los empleados son reclutados desde oficina central de Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda. La logística de transporte para personal, servicios e materiales son transportados por un bote desde Puerto de Melinka hacia los centros de cultivo, que se encuentra a 120 minutos de distancia. El centro de cultivo cuenta con un pozón con capacidad para hasta 8 personas; los habitaciones incluyen una sala de estar, cocina, baños y dormitorios. El centro de cultivo cuenta con un generador de emergencia, que es suficiente para mantener todas las operaciones en caso de emergencia. El personal es contratado de acuerdo con la legislación laboral chilena y todos los pagos requeridos por la Seguridad Social de Chile y los leyes laborales nacionales. El centro de cultivo ha desarrollado un plan de relación con la comunidad aledaña (Melinka) en el área de influencia directa. Los residuos industriales, domésticos y residuos peligrosos producidos en el centro de cultivo son clasificados y almacenados separadamente de acuerdo al tipo de residuos en contenedores sellados. Estas son dispuestas en lugares autorizados por ley. Además el reciclaje de residuos, algunos materiales son dispuestos en lugares autorizados. El enclaje (mortalidad)tiene una capacidad de 8 metros cúbicos. Centro de cultivo Quetros 1 tiene certificación ISO9001, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, BAP y Global Gap. La capacidad de producción estimada de la finca es de 4,000 Ton /ciclo.

6.3 Other certifications held by the applicant / Otras certificaciones realizadas por el solicitante: ISO 9001, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, BAP and Global Gap

6.4 Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification / Estimación de volúmenes de producción anual de la unidad de certificación: 4000 TON/Cycle

7 Scope / Alcance

7.1 The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted / Estándar realizado durante la auditoría	ASC Salmon Standard, Version 1.0 June 2010
7.2 The species produced at the applicant farm / / Especie producida en el sitio solicitante	Pacific Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
7.3 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, please clearly define it / Descripción del alcance de la auditoría, incluyendo si es que la unidad de certificación cubre todas las áreas de producción o cosecha (por ejemplo estanques), administrados o localizados en el sitio de la operación, o si solo un sub-set de estas están incluidas en la unidad de certificación. Si sólo una parte del área de producción o cosecha se incluyen en la unidad de certificación, esto deberá nombrarse e identificarse claramente.	Initial Certification for Farm (Pacific salmon -*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda by Quetros 1 farm (single site) with 22 cages (28x25 mts) are covered by the audit and associated smolt producer Piscicultura Llaima – Chenquen / Certificación inicial para centro de cultivo (Salmón del Pacífico -*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda a traves de su Centro de cultivo Quetros 1 (sitio individual) con 22 jaulas (28x25mts) y todas las jaulas están cubiertas en la auditoría y son asociadas al productor de smolt Piscicultura Llaima –Chenquen.
7.4 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 of custody / Nombres y direcciones de cualquier sitio de almacenaje, procesamiento, o distribución incluidas dentro de la operación (incluyendo operaciones subcontratadas) que puedan manipular producto certificado, hasta el punto en que el producto entre a la posterior cadena de custodia.	
7.5 Description of the receiving water body(ies) / Descripción del cuerpo de agua receptor en donde se localiza el centro de cultivo	Quetros 1 Farm is located in Golfo Ladrado de Quetros at Este de Islas Baesa, Puerto Cisnes commune, XI Region de Aysén del Carlos Ibáñez del Campo, Chile.
Chonos archipelago, is an archipelago located in the Pacific Ocean in the Aysen Region, Chile south of the archipelago of the Guaiteas. Chonos archipelago stretches from the southern part of the Guaiteas Islands to the north coast of the peninsula Taitao, which is separated by the Pulluche canal, mouth Wickham and the Bay Anna Pink. In its axis N-S is about 120 miles with an average width of 30 to 40 miles in direction E-W. In turn this run the Moraleda and Costa channels that separate it from the mainland. The islands of the western part are bathed by the waters of the Pacific Ocean.

Quetros 1 Farm se encuentra ubicado en área Golfo Ladrado de Quetros al Este de Islas Baesa, comuna de Puerto Cisnes, XI Región de Aysén del Carlos Ibáñez del Campo, Chile.
El archipiélago de los Chonos, es un archipiélago situado en el océano Pacífico en la Región de Aysén, Chile al sur del archipiélago de los Guaiteas. El archipiélago de los Chonos se extiende desde la parte sur de las islas Guaiteas hasta la costa norte de la península de Taitao, de la cual está separado por el canal Pulluche, la boca Wickham y la bahía Anna Pink. En su eje N-S mide aproximadamente 120 millas con un ancho medio de 30 a 40 millas en dirección E-W. Por su lado este corren los canales Moraleda y Costa que lo separan del continente. Las islas de su parte occidental están bañadas por las aguas del océano Pacífico. |

8 Audit Plan / Plan de Auditoría

8.1 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 a certification decision. Please also indicate the date by which the farm or operation had to have completed the certification.	Ms. Alexcelly Pino, Lead Auditor / Sra. Alexcelly Pino, Auditor Líder Mr. Guillermo Ganoza Price, Social Auditor / Sr. Guillermo Ganoza, Auditor Social Conducting the audit / Realización de la auditoría: August 8th -10th, 2016 Arch: 16th – 19th August, 2016 (Dive) Report writing / Informe escrito: September 12th, 2016 / 12 Septiembre de 2016 Report review / Revisión del informe: September 26th, 2016 / 26 Septiembre de 2016 Certification decision / Decisión de certificación:
8.2 Previous Audits (if applicable) / Auditorías previas (si aplica):	
8.3 Summary of previous ASC certification audit(s) and conclusion(s), with recommendations or conditions / Resumen de ASC anteriores auditorías de certificación(es) y	N/A
8.4 Audit plan as implemented including / Plan de auditoría	The audit included / La auditoría incluye : : Opening Meeting / Reunión de inicio Document Review (All Principles) / Revisión de documentos (Todos los principios) Visit Farm facilities / Visita a las instalaciones del centro de cultivo Staff Interviews / Visita a las instalaciones del centro de cultivo Closing Meeting / Reunión de cierre
8.5 Desk reviews and other activities undertaken before or after any site visits / Revisión de escritorio y otras actividades llevadas a cabo antes o después de la visita a un área .	Document review began in the week prior to the on-site audit / Revisión de documentos se inició en la semana previa a la auditoría in situ.
8.6 Site visits with date(s) and location(s) / Visitas al sitio con fecha (s) y lugar (es).	August 16th to August 20th, 2016 / 16 al 19 de Agosto de 2016
8.7 Names and affiliations of individuals consulted or interviewed, and a summary description of representatives the client, employees, contractors, stakeholders and any observers that participated in the audit / Nombres y cargos de las personas que participaron durante el proceso de auditoría, incluyendo: representantes del cliente, empleados, grupos de interés y cualquier otro observador en la auditoría.	• Claudio Valenzuela (Site Manager) / Jefe de centro • Carol Fernandez (Environmental Manager) / Jefa de Medio Ambiente • Bernardita Cárdenas (Environmental assistant) / Asistente de Medio Ambiente • Mauricio Labraña (Veterinary) / Gerente de Salud • Jaime Rosa (Resource Human Department) / Encargado de Recursos Humanos • Christopher Pincheira (Health and safety occupational Department) / Encargado de salud y seguridad ocupacional
8.8 Stakeholder submissions, including written or other documented information and CAB written responses to each submission / Envios de los grupos de interés, incluyendo documentos escritos u otra información documentada, y respuestas escritas del OC a cada uno de los envios realizados por los grupos de interés.	

Name of stakeholder (if permission given to make name public) / Nombre del grupo de interés (si autoriza publicar su nombre)	Relevance to be contacted / Importancia para ser contactado	Date of contact / Fecha del contacto	CAB responded Yes/No / Respuesta del OC Si/No	Brief summary of points Raised / Resumen de los puntos levantados	Use of comment by CAB / Uso de comentario por el OC	Response sent to stakeholder / Respuesta enviada a los grupos de interés

Nonconfomity Report Form / Informe de No Conformidades

Definitions / Definiciones:

Minor Non-conformity: *Any non-conformity in which the client does not comply with the standard and these non-conformities do not jeopardize the integrity of the certified product. This includes: 1.) Where there is a systemic failure to conform to ASC requirements; 2.) Where the failure will not produce a non-conforming product; 3.) Where the failure will not produce a non-conforming product; 4.) Where there is no systemic failure to conform to ASC requirements; 4.) Where the impacts are limited in their temporal and spatial scale; 5.) Where there is minimal risk of the shipment of a product that does not conform to ASC requirements; 6.) Where the failure does not meet the definition of a Major Non-conformity; 7.) Where the failure will not produce a non-conforming product.*
Major Non-conformity: *Any non-conformity that has one or more of the following: 1.) The absence or total breakdown of a system that is likely to result in a failure to achieve the objective of the relevant ASC Criteria or another applicable certification requirement; 2.) Would result in the probable shipment of a product that does not conform to ASC requirements; 3.) Is likely to result in a failure of the system or materially reduce the ability of the client to assure the integrity of the certified product; 4.) Is shown to continue over a long period of time; 5.) Is repeated; 6.) Is systemic or is the result of the absence or a total breakdown of a system; 7.) Effects a wide area and/or causes significant damage; 8.) Is not corrected or adequately responded to by the client once identified; 9.) Where two (2) or more minor non-conformities may together meet any of the above criteria.*
No conformidad menor: *Cualquier falta de conformidad en la que el cliente no cumple con la norma y aquellas no conformidades no ponges en peligro la integridad del producto certificado. Esto incluye: 1.) En caso de incumplimiento de un requisito que no es probable que resulte en la ruptura de un sistema para satisfacer un requisito ASC; 2.) Si falla es una sola falta observada e incidente aislada; 3.) Cuando no es sistemático no conforme con los requisitos ASC; 4.) Cuando los impactos son limitados en su escala temporal y espacial; 5.) Cuando hay un riesgo mínimo del envío de un producto que no cumple con los requisitos de ASC; 6.) El fallo no cumple con la definición de un incumplimiento grave; 7.) El fallo no no a producir un producto no conforme.*

No conformidad mayor: *Cualquier falta de conformidad que tiene una o más de las siguientes: 1.) La ausencia o la avería total de un sistema que es probable que resulte en un fracaso para lograr el objetivo de los criterios pertinentes ASC u otra certificación aplicable requisito; 2.) Sería lugar a la expedición probable del producto que no se ajusta a los requisitos de ASC; 3.) Es probable que resulte en un fallo del sistema o reducir materialmente la capacidad del cliente para asegurar la integridad del producto certificado; 4.) Se muestra a continuar durante un largo período de tiempo; 5.) se repite; 6.) es sistemático o es el resultado de la ausencia o una avería total de un sistema; 7.) afecta a una amplia zona y / o causa un daño significativo; 8.) no se corrige o adecuadamente respondido por el cliente una vez identificados; 9.) Cuando dos (2) o más no conformidades menores pueden reunirse cualquiera de los criterios anteriores.*

A copy of this form shall be completed and included in the audit report for each nonconformity raised / Una copia de este forma se completará y se incluye en el informe de auditoría y

		Text to be provided by / texto que ha de proporcionar:	
NCF 1	CAB / OC	NC Reference / Referencia NC	NCF-2016-1
	CAB / OC	NC Detected by / NC Detectada por	Arcadia Pino
	CAB / OC	Date Detected / Fecha Detectada	06/16/2016
	CAB / OC	Audit Reference / Referencia de la auditoria	Quetrus 1 Farm
	CAB / OC	Status of NC /Estatus de la NC	*Open / Abierto*
	CAB / OC		*Closed / Cerrado*
	CAB / OC	Grade of NC / Grado de la NC	*Critical /Crítico*
	CAB / OC		*Major / Mayor*
	CAB / OC		*Minor / Menor*
	CAB / OC		*Observation / Observación*
	CAB / OC	Deadline for closing the nonconformity / Plazo para el cierre	
	CAB / OC	Requirement Reference / Referencia del requerimiento	*Source Document / Fuente del documento*
	CAB / OC		*Clause Number / Numero de cláusula*
	CAB / OC		*Text of Requirement / Texto del Requerimiento*
	CAB / OC	Description of the nonconformity / Descripción de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Statement of evidence detected / Declaración de la evidencia detectada	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de cualquier error de hecho en la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la causa raíz de la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la acción correctiva propuesta y tomada (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Declaración de las acciones preventivas propuestas y tomadas (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Date on which the nonconformity was closed / Fecha en que se cerró la no conformidad	

NCF 1	CAB / OC	NC Reference / Referencia NC	NCF-2016-1
	CAB / OC	NC Detected by / NC Detectada por	Arcadia Pino
	CAB / OC	Date Detected / Fecha Detectada	06/16/2016
	CAB / OC	Audit Reference / Referencia	Quetrus 1 Farm
	CAB / OC	Status of NC /Estatus de la NC	*Open / Abierto*
	CAB / OC		*Closed / Cerrado*
	CAB / OC	Grade of NC / Grado de la NC	*Critical /Crítico*
	CAB / OC		*Major / Mayor*
	CAB / OC		*Minor / Menor*
	CAB / OC		*Observation / Observación*
	CAB / OC	Deadline for closing the nonconformity / Plazo para el cierre de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Requirement Reference / Referencia del requerimiento	*Source Document / Fuente del documento*
	CAB / OC		*Clause Number / Numero de cláusula*
	CAB / OC		*Text of Requirement / Texto del Requerimiento*
	CAB / OC	Description of the nonconformity / Descripción de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Statement of evidence detected / Declaración de la evidencia detectada	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de cualquier error de hecho en la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la causa raíz de la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la acción correctiva propuesta y tomada (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Declaración de las acciones preventivas propuestas y tomadas (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Date on which the nonconformity was closed / Fecha en que se cerró la no conformidad	

NCF 3	CAB / OC	NC Reference / Referencia NC	NCF-2016-1
	CAB / OC	NC Detected by / NC Detectada por	Arcadia Pino
	CAB / OC	Date Detected / Fecha Detectada	06/16/2016
	CAB / OC	Audit Reference / Referencia	Quetrus 1 Farm
	CAB / OC	Status of NC /Estatus de la NC	*Open / Abierto*
	CAB / OC		*Closed / Cerrado*
	CAB / OC	Grade of NC / Grado de la NC	*Critical /Crítico*
	CAB / OC		*Major / Mayor*
	CAB / OC		*Minor / Menor*
	CAB / OC		*Observation / Observación*
	CAB / OC	Deadline for closing the nonconformity / Plazo para el cierre de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Requirement Reference / Referencia del requerimiento	*Source Document / Fuente del documento*
	CAB / OC		*Clause Number / Numero de cláusula*
	CAB / OC		*Text of Requirement / Texto del Requerimiento*
	CAB / OC	Description of the nonconformity / Descripción de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Statement of evidence detected / Declaración de la evidencia detectada	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de cualquier error de hecho en la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la causa raíz de la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la acción correctiva propuesta y tomada (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Declaración de las acciones preventivas propuestas y tomadas (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Date on which the nonconformity was closed / Fecha en que se cerró la no conformidad	

NCF 4	CAB / OC	NC Reference / Referencia NC	NCF-2016-1
	CAB / OC	NC Detected by / NC Detectada por	Arcadia Pino
	CAB / OC	Date Detected / Fecha Detectada	06/16/2016
	CAB / OC	Audit Reference / Referencia de la auditoria	Quetrus 1 Farm
	CAB / OC	Status of NC /Estatus de la NC	*Open / Abierto*
	CAB / OC		*Closed / Cerrado*
	CAB / OC	Grade of NC / Grado de la NC	*Critical /Crítico*
	CAB / OC		*Major / Mayor*
	CAB / OC		*Minor / Menor*
	CAB / OC		*Observation / Observación*
	CAB / OC	Deadline for closing the nonconformity / Plazo para el cierre de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Requirement Reference / Referencia del requerimiento	*Source Document / Fuente del documento*
	CAB / OC		*Clause Number / Numero de cláusula*
	CAB / OC		*Text of Requirement / Texto del Requerimiento*
	CAB / OC	Description of the nonconformity / Descripción de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Statement of evidence detected / Declaración de la evidencia detectada	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de cualquier error de hecho en la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la causa raíz de la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la acción correctiva propuesta y tomada (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Declaración de las acciones preventivas propuestas y tomadas (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Date on which the nonconformity was closed / Fecha en que se cerró la no conformidad	

NCF 5	CAB / OC	NC Reference / Referencia NC	NCF-2016-1
	CAB / OC	NC Detected by / NC Detectada por	Arcadia Pino
	CAB / OC	Date Detected / Fecha Detectada	06/16/2016
	CAB / OC	Audit Reference / Referencia de la auditoria	Quetrus 1 Farm
	CAB / OC	Status of NC /Estatus de la NC	*Open / Abierto*
	CAB / OC		*Closed / Cerrado*
	CAB / OC	Grade of NC / Grado de la NC	*Critical /Crítico*
	CAB / OC		*Major / Mayor*
	CAB / OC		*Minor / Menor*
	CAB / OC		*Observation / Observación*
	CAB / OC	Deadline for closing the nonconformity / Plazo para el cierre de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Requirement Reference / Referencia del requerimiento	*Source Document / Fuente del documento*
	CAB / OC		*Clause Number / Numero de cláusula*
	CAB / OC		*Text of Requirement / Texto del Requerimiento*
	CAB / OC	Description of the nonconformity / Descripción de la NC	
	CAB / OC	Statement of evidence detected / Declaración de la evidencia detectada	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of any errors of fact in the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de cualquier error de hecho en la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the root cause of the nonconformity (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la causa raíz de la no conformidad (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Response (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Respuesta (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the corrective actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Descripción de la acción correctiva propuesta y tomada (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y fecha de envío)	
	Client / Cliente	Statement of the preventive actions proposed and taken (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Declaración de las acciones preventivas propuestas y tomadas (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Evaluation by CAB (include the name of the author and date submitted) / Evaluación por el OC (incluir el nombre del autor y la fecha de envío)	
	CAB / OC	Date on which the nonconformity was closed / Fecha en que se cerró la no conformidad	

EVALUATION RESULTS ASC SALMON v1.0

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 (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
1.1.1	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on farm siting and use. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws.	A. Review compliance with applicable land and water use laws.	Quericus 1 Farm maintains hard copies of applicable water use laws according to Resolución 1447 year 2001 (Mar 2003); Document attached is Permiso unico de Acuicultura 5010-01-01-004.	Conforming
		b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable.	B. Confirm client holds original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements or land titles.	Quericus 1 Farm maintains legalized copies of concession permit. All these documents are with the references to Resolución N° 1447.	
		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).	C. Review inspection records for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (as applicable).	Quericus 1 Farm possesses inspection records for compliance with national and local laws and regulations. Most recent visit was by Sernapesca on March 5th, 2016.	
		d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas.	D. Verify facility does not conflict with national preservation areas and has required operational permits if sited in such an area (see 1.4.2).	Quericus 1 Farm provided permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas. Assessment report was conducted by WWF and PCDV (on national preservation areas).	
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 CAB will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required by law to release it in order to make it public.	A. Verify client has records of tax payments to appropriate authorities. Do not disclose client tax information which is confidential. An independently audited company annual report may be used to confirm tax status.	Quericus 1 Farm maintains records of tax payments to Tesorería General de la República (Form 22 each year) and Servicio Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura by amount of 61 UTM and (as Florida Ltda as company each month pay (through by Formulario 29, tax return of the company	Conforming
		b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates.	B. Confirm client has a basic knowledge of tax requirements for farm.	Quericus 1 Farm maintained copies of tax laws for jurisdiction of Chile : Law 825 (n16), Law 824 (n16), Decreto Ley 1.094 Ministerio de Justicia - Resolución N° 1447.	
		c. Register with national or local authorities as an 'Aquaculture activity'.	C. Verify client is registrated with local or national authorities.	Quericus 1 Farm has an aquaculture permission from national and local authorities as referred to Permiso unico de acuicultura according to Resolución N°1447. Together with this permission, Quericus 1 Farm has approved Environmental Impact Statement and has the Environmental Assessment Report in place.	
1.1.3	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labor laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain copies of national labor codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.)	A. Confirm client has specified documentation.	Quericus 1 farm maintains national labor codes and laws applicable to farm. All this codes are in Spanish and available online. Quericus 1 Farm is aware of the company responsible for handling over the Reglamento Interno to each worker at the first date of work e.g. DFL1 Labour code, Decreto 50, Law 20005, law 20539, law 20721, law 20761, law 20764.	Conforming
		b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation).	B. Review inspection records for compliance with national labor laws and codes (as applicable).	The records of farm inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes are reviewed. In Chile according with the labour law, it is only possible to check documents when the clients has faults.	
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.	A. Verify that client obtains permits as applicable.	Quericus 1 Farm had evidence that complied with aquaculture permits required by Chilean laws as follow: granting of concession by SUBPESCA, Environmental Quality Assessment Report and Environmental permits issued by competent authority. Farm maintains legalized copies of this requirement for water quality impacts (DFA N°31/12 - February 13th,2015)	
		b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations.	B. Review evidence of compliance with discharge laws or regulations.	Quericus 1 Farm, discharge laws are associated to environmental reports (acronym in Spanish: RAA is performed when the farm has the highest biomass in a productive cycle (year per cycle if production cycle is less than a year) or executed on finished cycle immediately before the current cycle starts. Law associated is D.S. 390	
		c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required.	C. Verify that records show compliance with discharge laws and regulations.	Evidence in the environmental report No. 001/12 issued by SUBMAPSUR and sent to U' on Feb 12 2015 which states that Quericus complies with aerobic conditions for farming. The O2 level in water column was recieved. Measurements were done in areas where the pens are located, from 0-10 meters deep.	

PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION

Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[1] Closed production systems that can demonstrate that they collect and responsibly dispose of > 75% of solid nutrients from the production system are exempt from standards under Criterion 2.1. See Appendix VI for requirements on transparency.				
See 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.					

Instruction to Clients and CABs on Criterion 2.1 - Modification of the Benthic Sampling Methodology
For farms located in a jurisdiction where specific benthic sampling locations are mapped under law, clients may request to modify the benthic sampling methodology prescribed in Appendix I to allow for sampling at different locations and/or changes in the total number of samples. Where modifications are sought, farms shall provide a full justification to the CAB for review. Requests for modification shall be supported by mapping of differences in sampling locations. In any event, the sampling locations must at a minimum include samples from the cage edge and samples taken from inside and outside of a defined AZE.
CABs shall evaluate client requests to modify benthic methodology based on whether there is a risk that such changes would jeopardize the intent and rigor of the ASC Salmon Standard. If the CAB determines that proposed modifications are low risk, the CAB shall ensure that details of the modified benthic sampling methodology are fully described and justified in the audit report.

Note: Under Indicator 2.1.1, farms can choose to measure redox potential (Option #1) or sulphide concentration (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both threshold values.

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. **Requirement:** Redox potential: >= 100 millivolts (mV)or Sulphide: < 1,500 microMoles (? **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in (5)	a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE (#2 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification (3) to the CAB.	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (Appendix I C) and evidence (if applicable) to justify use of a site specific AZE.	Quericus 1 Farm has a map showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. The model used was SEPA AUTODEPOMOD. (Refer to enclosed document areas.)	Conforming
		b. If feasible throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1 (c), 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.	B. Review evidence of benthic type and confirm whether to proceed to 2.1.1c.	Quericus 1 Farm provided evidence of bottom type. It is located in a zone with a soft bottom.	
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	C. Record which option the client chose.	Quericus 1 Farm has checked this indicator with Redox Potential tests in sediment outside of the AZE. The methodology used is according to Appendix I.1 and Resolucion 3612 of 2006.	
		d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations).	D. Review documentary evidence (notes, GPS coordinates) showing sampling time, stations, and frequency. Cross-check against farm maps and harvest records.	Quericus samples are collected during peak of sediment deposition (September-April 2016). The farm showed documentary evidence and this was reviewed during the audit.	
		e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.	E. Review results to verify that redox potential of sediments complies with the requirement at each sampling station outside the AZE. Confirm that the testing method used by the farm is appropriate.	Quericus section #1 to demonstrate compliance, measuring and recording redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate nationally recognized testing method, in this case, Decreto 3612/2006 de Subsecretaría de Pesca of Chile. Results of the sediment samples with the requirement of the ASC Standard.	
		f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.	F. Review results to verify that sulphide concentration in sediments complies with the Standard at each sampling station outside the AZE. Confirm that the testing method used by the farm is appropriate.	N/A	
		g. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	G. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Footnote	[2] Farm sites can choose whether to use redox or sulphide. Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both.				
Footnote	[3] Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) is defined under this standard as 30 meters. For farm sites where a site-specific AZE has been defined using a robust and credible modeling system such as the SEPA AUTODEPOMOD and verified through monitoring, the site-specific AZE shall be used.				

Notes:
Under Indicator 2.1.2, farms can choose one of four measurements to show compliance with the faunal Index Requirement: AMBI (Option #1), Shannon-Wiener Index (Option #2), BQI (Option #3), or TI (Option #4). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet all four threshold values.
If a farm is exempt due to hard bottom benthos (see 2.1.1b), then 2.1.2 does not apply and this shall be noted in the audit report.

2.1.2	**Indicator:** Faunal index score indicating good (X) to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I. **Requirement:** AZE1 Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [X] score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener index score > 5, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 75. **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in (5)	a. Prepare a map showing the AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1).	A. Review map to verify appropriate siting of sampling stations (see 2.1.1).	The map was reviewed during the audit and sampling stations are indicated (see map in report from "Plano puntos de muestreos AZE-ISSD TOPO" (See Annex attached). The sampling stations are appropriate according to Appendix I.1.	Conforming
		b. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1, #2, #3, or #4 to demonstrate compliance with the requirement.	B. Record which option the client chose for scoring faunal index.	Quericus 1 Farm informed CAB that they chose option #1 - which AZT1 Marine Biotic Index (AMBI (Option # 1).	
		c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I.1 (see 2.1.1).	C. Confirm sample collection followed Appendix I.1 (see 2.1.1).	The sediment samples was collected in accordance with Appendix I.1. Farm has documentary evidence from laboratory report and was reviewed.	
		d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZT1 Marine Biotic Index [X] score of sediment samples using the required method.	D. Review results (as applicable) to verify that AMBI score of sediments ≤ ≤ 3.3 at each sampling station outside the AZE.	The result of AMBI score of sediments at each sampling station outside the AZE was present at network of the audit and compliance with the requirement.	
		e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener index score of sediment samples using the required method.	E. Review results (as applicable) to verify that Shannon Wiener score of sediments ≤ > 2 at each sampling station outside the AZE.	N/A	
		f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method.	F. Review results (as applicable) to verify that BQI score of sediments ≤ ≥ 15 at each sampling station outside the AZE.	N/A	
		g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method.	G. Review results (as applicable) to verify that ITI score of sediments ≤ ≥ 25 at each sampling station outside the AZE.	N/A	
		h. Obtain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analyzed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results.	H. Confirm that an approved method was used or that a qualified independent laboratory performed the sampling and calculation of faunal index.	Quericus 1 Farm provided documentary evidence, to show how scores were obtained. Samples were analyzed and the index was calculated by an independent laboratory.	
		i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	I. Confirm that client submitted faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Footnote	[4] "Good" Ecological Quality Classification: The level of diversity and abundance of invertebrate taxa is slightly outside the range associated with the type-specific conditions. Most of the sensitive taxa of the type-specific communities are present.				

Footnote	[5] http://www.ascr.es/es/ambientes-acti-marinas-tests-index.html				
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 (B) taxa excluding pollutant indicator species. **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in (5)	a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b.	A. Confirm appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c or exemption as per 2.1.1b.	The map was reviewed during the audit and sampling stations are indicated (see map in report from "Plano puntos de muestreos AZE-ISSD TOPO" The sampling stations are appropriate according to Appendix I.1.	Conforming
		b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method.	B. Confirm that an appropriate method was used or that a suitably qualified independent laboratory performed the analysis.	Quericus 1 Farm had evidences at moment of the audit with the report from the lab was possible to check abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna.	
		c. Identify all highly abundant taxa (B) and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species.	C. Confirm that all samples from within the AZE have ≥ 2 highly abundant (B) taxa (exclusive of pollution indicator species).	The number of benthic macrofauna taxa for each in the sample could be verified and complied with the ASC requirement (≥ 2). Report was attached to ASC.	
		d. Retain documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained. If samples were analyzed by an independent lab, obtain copies of results.	D. Confirm that a suitable method was used or that a suitability qualified independent laboratory performed the scoring of faunal index.	Documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained were available during the audit. The samples were analyzed by an independent lab" PDCV. Annexed. The results are attached in report number 0122.	
		e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	E. Confirm that client has submitted scores to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Footnote	[6] Highly abundant: Greater than 100 organisms per square meter (or equally high to reference strata) if natural abundance is lower than this level.				

Note: Farms may define a site-specific AZE at any time before this date as long as they demonstrate full compliance by June 15, 2015.

2.1.4	**Indicator:** Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible (?) modeling system. **Requirement:** Yes, within three years of the publication [8] of the SAS standard (i.e. full compliance by June 15, 2015) **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in (5)	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 15, 2012.	A. Review documentation (s) confirm that the farm has undertaken an analysis before the required date.	Quericus 1 farm has already undertaken an analysis to determine a site-specific AZE (refer to attached annex).	Conforming
		b. Maintain records to show how the analysis (in 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modeling using a multi-parameter approach (?).	B. Confirm that the farm used a robust and credible modeling system to define the site-specific AZE.	Quericus 1 Farm has a report which shows how the analysis (refer to 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modeling using a multi-parameter approach (Modelling DEPOMOD)	
		c. Maintain records to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data.	C. Confirm that farms have validated the general applicability of the site-specific AZE using monitoring data (i.e. 'ground truthing').	Quericus 1 Farm maintains records and is able to show that modeling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with over 6 months of monitoring data.	
Footnote	[7] Robust and credible: The SEPA AUTODEPOMOD modeling system is considered to be an example of a credible and robust system. The model must include a multi-parameter approach. Monitoring must be used to ground-truth the AZE proposed through the model.				
Footnote	[8] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.				

Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [1]]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[1] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.5.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.1 - Monitoring Average Weekly Percent Saturation of Dissolved Oxygen
Appendix I.4 presents the required methodology that farms must follow for sampling the average weekly percent saturation of dissolved oxygen (DO). Key points of the method are as follows:
- measurements may be taken with a handheld oxygen meter or equivalent chemical method.
- equipment is calibrated according to manufacturer's recommendations.
- measurements are taken at least once per week between 8 am and one in the afternoon (3-6 pm) as appropriate for the location and season;
- salinity and temperature must also be measured when DO is sampled;
- sampling should be done at 1 meters depth in water conditions that would be experienced by fish (e.g. at the downstream edge of a net pen array)
- each week, all DO measurements are used in the calculation of a weekly average percent saturation.
If monitoring deviates from prescribed sampling methodology, the farm shall provide the auditor with a written justification (e.g. when samples are missed due to bad weather). In limited and well justified situations, farms may request that the CAB approve reduction of DO monitoring frequency to one sample per day.
Note 1: Dissolved oxygen (DO) is a key indicator of water quality and organic enrichment from aquaculture. Under optimal conditions, DO concentrations in the water column are at saturation levels. However, DO levels can be depleted to below similar patterns in upwelling to the farm site and is not influenced by nutrient inputs from anthropogenic causes including aquaculture, agricultural runoff or nutrient releases from coastal communities. For any such exceptions, the auditor shall fully document in the audit report how the farm has demonstrated consistency with the reference site.

Note 2: Percent saturation is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sample compared to the maximum amount that could be present at the same temperature and salinity.

2.2.1	**Indicator:** Weekly average percent saturation (?.0) of dissolved oxygen (DO (?A) in farm waters, calculated following methodology in Appendix I.4 **Requirement:** ≥ 70% (?0) **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.	A. Do not schedule audit until client provides a minimum of 6 months of DO data.	Percent saturation of DO data are available for more than 6 months (01.01.2015 to 06.12.2016)	Conforming
		b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.	B. Review records for completeness and conformity with methodology in Appendix I.4.	Records are complete and conform with methodology in Appendix I.4. Measurement is done by a DO probe in cage 8 with control outside the marine farm for monitoring. Values are recorded twice a day, between 8:00 and 9:00 in the morning and before finishing feeding in the afternoon (Probe is submerged at ½ meters depth inside the cage. The calibration procedure is performed with probe membranes and is done under an automatic screen in compliance with the procedure.	
		c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.	C. Review calculation and confirm all weekly averages ≥ 70%.	Calculation is done periodically within a control system (Excel) and no exercise which are calculated in the last 12 months. All weekly average values of percent saturation were higher than 70% (measuring data =6months).	
		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).	D. As needed, review DO data from reference site and document in the audit report (see instructions).	N/A (refer to 2.2.1c)	
		e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.	E. Witness DO monitoring and verify calibration while on site. On-site values should fall within range of farm data for DO. If an out of range measurement is observed, raise a nonconformity.	During the audit, auditor supervised routine DO monitoring with a Swiyl probe inside the cage 8. Calibration of equipment (Oxyview - Inwater) was observed. The program is operated with the values on instrument panel. Measurements are within range and system with standard.	
		f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	F. Confirm that client has submitted DO results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Footnote	[2.3] Percent saturation: Percent saturation is the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water sample compared to the maximum amount that could be present at the same temperature and salinity.				
Footnote	[2.4] Averaged weekly from two daily measurements (grouped at 6 am and 3 pm).				
Footnote	[2.5] An equation to this standard shall be made for farms that can demonstrate consistency with a reference site in the same water body.				

2.2.2	**Indicator:** Maximum percentage of weekly time (%T) where DO is less than half under 2 mg/l(or DO<1mg/l) **Requirement:** 0% **Applicability:** All	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fell under 2 mg/l DO	A. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that ≤ 5% of weekly samples fell under 2 mg/l DO	Quericus 1 farm measures DO with the Oxyview - Inwater System. The on-view equipment reads the saturation of dissolved oxygen, dissolved oxygen and temperature. Excelent for salinity this company uses it in the morning and afternoon. Values are 8.7 - 9.2 mg/l in the morning and 8.4 - 9.0 mg/l in afternoon. The values requirement are higher than 2mg/l for all the cycle.	Conforming
		b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year.	B. Confirm that client has submitted results to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to the ASC.	
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 (≤?) classified as having "good" or "very good" ecological 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.	A. Record whether indicator is applicable.	In Chile, there is no national coastal water quality targets. For this reason, the farm operator takes its own samples and checks for nitrogen and phosphorous. This indicator is not applicable.	Conforming
		b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification.	B. Confirm that there has been a recent third-party analysis (within two years prior to the audit) to classify areas according to national or regional water quality targets.	N/A	
		c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates.	C. Confirm that the analysis and classification shows the farm is located in an area where the water quality complies with the requirement.	N/A. (Refer to 2.2.4)	
Footnote	[16] Related to nutrients (e.g., N, P, chlorophyll A).				
Footnote	[17] Within the two years prior to the audit.				
Footnote	[18] Classifications of "good" and "very good" are used in the EU Water Framework Directive. Equivalent classification from other water quality monitoring systems in other jurisdictions are acceptable.				
Footnote	[19] Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients as well as > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt from standards 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.				

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 3 months.	A. Review the farm's monitoring plan and verify that the farm has collected monitoring data for N and P following the methodology in Appendix I.5.	Quericus 1 farm developed, implemented and documented a weekly monitoring plan (PYRO-14 version 1, 01.02.2014) to check for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I.5. farm has also contracted an external service to take samples and analyze the samples in a certified external laboratory once a year. The weekly samples are taken with a spectrophotometer and analyzed in Quericus 1 Farm's internal lab. The farm has records for more than 6 months (Report N-PRO-47 since 01.05.2016 to 07.01.2016)	Conforming
		b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations.	B. Verify that client calibrates equipment as needed.	The auditor witnessed when the internal lab took the samples and measured the nitrogen according to the colorimeter method (in this case, applicable to the pirimetric). The laboratory which analyzes the annual water samples is accreditied by INN (# 15-LE 215 and NCh-ISO 17025 OF 2005. The annual water samples are analyzed by Lab Florida Internal lab (trained by external accreditied lab).	
		c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	C. Confirm that client has submitted N and P data to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to the ASC.	
Footnote	[20] Farms shall monitor total N, NH4, NO3, total P and Ortho-P in the water column. Results shall be submitted to the ASC database. Methods such as a Hach kit are acceptable.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.2.5 - Calculating Biochemical Oxygen Demand
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) can be calculated based on cumulative inputs of N and C to the environment over the course of the production cycle. BOD = ((total N in feed – total N in fish)*4.57) + (total C in feed – total C in fish)*2.67).
* A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient wasted. In this equation, "fish" refers to harvested fish. In this case, farm must submit breakdown of N & C captured/filtered/absorbed to ASC along with method used to estimate nutrient reduction.
* Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting. Sept 25-29, 2009. Veracruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.ecn.cz/~jpg/aquaterm-gap/text.html.
Note 1: Farms may deduct BOD based on knowledge of data and is required beginning with the production cycle first undergoing certification. If it is the first audit for the farm, the client is required to demonstrate to the CAB that data is being collected and an understanding of the calculations.
Note 2: Farms may seek an exemption to indicator 2.2.5 if the farm collects BOD samples at least once every two weeks, samples are independently analyzed by an accredited laboratory, and the farm can show that BOD monitoring results do not deviate significantly from calculated annual BOD load.

2.2.5	**Indicator:** Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) [21]) of the farm as 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.	A. Review calculation, cross-check data used with feed and harvest records.	Quericus 1 Farm showed understanding of the calculation and collection of the relevant suspected data up to July 2016.	Conforming with Observations
		b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle.	B. Confirm that client has submitted calculated BOD a to ASC (Appendix VI).	Quericus 1 Farm sent information to the ASC. The current cycle is not finished at moment of audit but the condition is maximum biomass. The complete records will be submitted to the ASC when cycle will finished.	
Footnote	[21] BOD calculated as: ((total N in feed – total N in fish)*4.57) + (total C in feed – total C in fish)*2.67). A farm may deduct N or C that is captured, filtered or absorbed through approaches such as IMTA or through direct collection of nutrient wasted. In this equation, "fish" refers to harvested fish. Reference for calculation methodology: Boyd C. 2009. Estimating mechanical aeration requirement in shrimp ponds from the oxygen demand of feed. In: Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society Meeting. Sept 25-29, 2009. Veracruz, Mexico. And: Global Aquaculture Performance Index BOD calculation methodology available at http://web.ecn.cz/~jpg/aquaterm-gap/text.html.				

Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Note: The methodology given in Appendix I.5 is used to determine the fines (dust and small fragments) in finished product of fish feed which has a diameter of 1 mm or more.					
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). **Requirement:** < 1% by weight (?0.5%) **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.	A. Review timing and location of testing. If testing offsite, verify rationale and ensure consistent with (23).	Testing is done directly on-site. Samples are taken from feed bags after they are delivered depending on feed zone. Calculation follows methodology in Appendix I.5. Percentage of fines in the feed are measured every week according to internal control of the company. The internal procedure is performed with PRO-14 version 1, 01.02.2014 and this was complement with format register R-PRO-45. Quericus 1 farm had evidence available of the testing since February until August 2016 and the staff can identified each zone used according with feed size.	Conforming
		b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations.	B. Verify that client has appropriate sieving technology on site and that, if applicable, it is calibrated as required.	The sieving methodology is appropriate and the equipment was calibrated.	
		c. Conduct test according to detailed methodology in Appendix I.5 and record results for the pooled sample for each quarter. For first audits, farms must have test results from the last 3 months.	C. Review testing results and confirm that the pooled sample for each quarter has a percent fines of ≤1%.	Percent of fines in feed was < 1%. The results for the present cycle are: 0.4% (February 2016), 0.3% (March 2016) and 0.3% (April 2016) 0.3% (May 2016) 0.3% (June 2016) 0.3% (July 2016) 0.3 % August (2016) 0.3% 0.3%. Note: Isla Florida has an internal procedure called "Análisis de Finos" PYRO-11, version 1 February 2014, specifying 4 samples per month.	
Footnote	[22] Fines: Dust and fragments in the feed. Particles that separate from feed with a diameter of 1 mm or less when sieved through a 1 mm sieve, or particles that separate from feed with a diameter greater than 1 mm when sieved through a 2.36 mm sieve. To be measured at farm gate (e.g., from feed bags after they are delivered to farm).				
Footnote	[23] To be measured every quarter or every three months. Samples that are measured shall be chosen randomly. Feed may be sampled immediately prior to delivery to farm for sites with no feed storage where it is not possible to sample on farm. Closed production systems that can demonstrate the collection and responsible disposal of > 75% of solid nutrients and > 50% of dissolved nutrients (through biofiltration, settling and/or other technologies) are exempt.				

Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Note: If a farm has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may use such documents as evidence to demonstrate compliance with indicator 2.4.1 as long as all components in Appendix I.3 are explicitly covered.					
2.4.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outlined in Appendix I.3 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	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.	A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I.3.	Quericus 1 farm has contracted an external service with POCH Ambiental. Since June 2016 they have performed a scientific assessment of the marine farm's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment documentation addresses all components outlined in Appendix I.3. Auditor reviewed the document called " METAGENOMA CON LOS HISBATISTS Y COPEPODS IMPORTANTES O ESPECIALES" Quericus 1 Farm has this report since June 2016.	Conforming
		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 these potential impacts.	B. Verify the farm has a plan to address all potential impacts identified in the assessment.	No direct influence on species but there is one report that the farm will continue to monitor in case of any interaction or impact could occur in the future.	
		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.	C. Verify that the farm implements the plan(s).	Isla Florida sitio has implemented an annual monitoring.	

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.4.2 - Exceptions to Requirements that Farms are not sited within Protected Areas or HCVAs
The following exceptions shall be made for indicator 2.4.2:
Exception #1: For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management).
Exception #2: For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVA.
Exception #3: For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected.

Definitions
Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values."
High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA): Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVA are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical conservation values—both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high conservation values are maintained or enhanced.

2.4.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for the farm to be located in proximity to High Conservation Value Areas (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).	A. Review map and cross-check against independent information sources (e.g., 1.1.1d) to determine if the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA.	Quetrico S farm provided a map showing the location of the marine farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas HCVA's) as defined above (see also 1.1.1a). Potential impacts to the ongoing farm were assessed in accordance with the Chilean Environmental Evaluation System (in SENAPESCA), the analysis is merely reviewed of Article 11 of Law 19.300. On the other hand, considering the geographical location of Quetrico S farm, Los Fiordos company prepared a report regarding the Biosphere reserves (UNESCO - MAB Biosphere Reserves Directory), nature sanctuaries (Ministry of Environment) national parks and reserves (CONAF - National System of Protected Areas), Ramsar Wetlands (Ministry of Environment), Ministry of Environment), priority area marine conservation (BNPC) and management areas, among others all these included in the report done by PODA Ambiental.	Conforming
		b. If the farm is not located in a protected area or High Conservation Value Areas as defined above, prepare a declaration attesting to this fact. In this case, the requirements of 2.4.2c -d do not apply.	B. Obtain a copy of the farm's declaration stating that the farm is not sited in a protected area or HCVA (as applicable).	Los Fiordos Ltda provided a declaration stating that Quetrico S farm is not sited in a protected area or HCVA (Refer to annex attached)	
		c. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA, review the scope of applicability of Indicator 2.4.2, open 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.	C. Review the applicability of the exception requested by the farm together with the supporting evidence to determine if the farm is eligible. If yes, Indicator 2.4.2 is not applicable.	N/A	
		d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA and the exceptions provided for indicator 2.4.2 are not applicable, then the farm does not comply with the requirement and is ineligible for ASC certification.	D. Review evidence to determine whether the farm is allowed to be sited in a protected area or HCVA and hence eligible for ASC certification.	N/A	
Footnote	[24] Protected area: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." Source: Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008). Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 86pp.				
Footnote	[25] High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA): Natural habitats where conservation values are considered to be of outstanding significance or critical importance. HCVA are designated through a multi-stakeholder approach that provides a systematic basis for identifying critical conservation values—both social and environmental—and for planning ecosystem management in order to ensure that these high conservation values are maintained or enhanced.(http://www.hcvnetwork.org/).				
Footnote	[26] The following exceptions shall be made for Standard 2.4.2: • For protected areas classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Category V or VI (these are areas preserved primarily for their landscapes or for sustainable resource management). • For HCVAs if the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the HCVA designation. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been identified as a HCVA. • For farms located in a protected area if it was designated as such after the farm was already in operation and provided the farm can demonstrate that its environmental impacts are compatible with the conservation objectives of the protected area and it is in compliance with any relevant conditions or regulations placed on the farm as a result of the formation/designation of the protected area. The burden of proof would be placed on the farm to demonstrate that it is not negatively impacting the core reason an area has been protected.				
Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):**	**Evidence**	**Evaluation**
Footnote	[27] See Appendix H for transparency requirements for 2.5.2, 2.5.3 and 2.5.4.				
2.5.1	**Indicator**: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used **Requirement**: 1. within three years of the date of publication [28] of the SAD standard 2 is fully compliant by June 15, 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 15, 2015.	A. Confirm that farm management has prepared a written statement of commitment.	Quetrico S farm has declared in a written statement of commitment that ADDs and AHDs are not used for predator control (refer to annex attached)	Conforming
		b. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs were used by the farm after June 15, 2015 (applicable only after the specified date).	A. Review documentary evidence (e.g. predator management policies, records of predator incidents) and cross-check against interviews with farm staff and local community members (applicable only after the date specified in 2.5.1a).	Documentary evidence of predator management policies, records of predator incidents were checked and cross-checked against interviews with Quetrico S Farm staff	
			C. During the on-site audit, inspect the farm to confirm that no ADDs or AHDs are present at the facilities (applicable only after June 15, 2015).	No ADD's and AHD's were present at Quetrico S Farm facilities.	
Footnote	[28] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.				
Instruction to Clients for Indicator 2.5.2 - Percentage of Days that ADDs or AHDs were used Farms must calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that ADDs or AHDs were operated using data from the most recent complete production cycle. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 2.5.2 for the most recent complete production cycle if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that: the client understands how to accurately calculate percentage of days the devices were operational; the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate the percentage of operational days based on < 6 months of data for the current production cycle; and the client can show how plans for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. devices in operation <60% of days). Indicator 2.5.2 is applicable until June 15, 2015, after which the use of ADDs and AHDs is not allowed under the standard.				
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 ADDs or AHDs are operational **Requirement**: ≤ 60% **Applicability**: All, until June 15, 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.	A. Review log and cross-check with records of predator incidents.	No ADD's and AHD's were present at Quetrico S Farm facilities.	Conforming
		b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle.	B. Verify calculations and cross-check against records for the duration of the production cycle.	No ADD's and AHD's were present at Quetrico S Farm facilities.	
		c. Maintain records to show that the percentage of days in the production cycle that ADDs or AHDs were operational was ≤ 60%.	C. Confirm devices were operational < 60% of the days of the production cycle.	No ADD's and AHD's were present at Quetrico S Farm facilities.	
		d. Submit data on number of days that ADDs/AHDs were used to the ASC as per Appendix H1 (Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	D. Confirm that client has submitted data on ADDs/AHDs to ASC (Appendix V).	No ADD's and AHD's were present at Quetrico S Farm facilities.	
Footnote	[29] Day: 24-hour cycle.				
2.5.3	**Indicator**: Number of mortalities [30] of endangered or red listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm **Requirement**: 0 (zero) **Applicability**: All	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations.	A. Review list.	no predator control with for protecting against birds and mammals. Quetrico S farm no predator control measure is included in the procedure called " Prevención de Escapes de Peces" (Fish Escape Prevention Procedure PcOPE-07) with a register attached R-ADM-06), with the purpose of the farm is to prevent predation with proper pipes net use mesh to avoid animal entanglement.	Conforming
		b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents.	B. Review farm records of predator incidents and cross-check against relevant records (e.g. mouse).	Up to now there have been no predator incidents. Quetrico S Farm maintains implemented sheets record of all predator incidents in case of occurrence. Also the company has a computer system and in the logbook and maintained publicly available on the webpage of Los Fiordos.	
		c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death.	C. Review records for completeness. Cross-check mortality records against interviews with farm staff and community representatives.	Quetrico S Farm confirmed that no predator incidents have occurred. Register AMB-20, version 1 - 01.08.2014 (information available since January to July 2016) was reviewed.	
		d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1).	D. Review list for consistency with 2.4.1.	up to date list of endangered or restricted marine mammals and birds in the area is available for the farm. List is addressed in the document called " INTERACCIÓN CON LOS MÁRFILES Y CERCOS IMPORTANTES O EN PELIGRO. " Quetrico S Farm this report was developed by June, 2016.	
			C. Compare records from (c) through (d) above to confirm that there were no mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on farm.	Checked with a records from Quetrico S farm. No mortalities of endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds on Quetrico S farm.	
Footnote	[30] Mortalities: Includes animals intentionally killed through lethal action as well as accidental deaths through entanglement or other means.				
Footnote	[31] Species listed as endangered or critically endangered by the IUCN or on a national endangered species list.				
2.5.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that the following procedures are followed 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 farm manager prior to action 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.	A. Review list of lethal actions taken by the farm and cross-check against 2.5.3b.	"There is no list of lethal actions taken by Quetrico S farm because there is no record. In the case of incidences, these will be recorded and listed in Mercaysa and daily records. Los Fiordos company prepared a procedures called "Plan de preparacion y respuesta ante presencia o avistamiento de mamiferos marinos, preparation and response presence or entanglement of mammals, D-AMB04, Version 10) and "Plan de emergencia en caso de ocurrencimiento de seres en redes japanesa" (Emergency plan in case of trapping birds in aquacultures networks, D-AMB-09, version 1)	Conforming
		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) evidence that a senior farm manager approved the lethal action prior to its taking; 3) where applicable, explicit permission was granted by the relevant regulatory authority to take lethal action against the animal.	B. Review documentation to confirm that the farm shows evidence of compliance with requirements in steps 1-3.	Not lethal actions identified due to no incident occur. In Chile there prohibition on the lethal action against predators. Quetrico S farm complies with the National Regulation in Chile. If Quetrico S farm did see dead mammals and floating on sea surface need to notify to SERNAPESCA. This is the national regulation associated in the country with this topic.	
		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].	C. Review documentary evidence to verify actions, permissions, and approvals were taken prior to taking lethal action. If client requests exemption due to human safety, review evidence to verify [33].	YES. No lethal actions identified in Quetrico S Farm.	
Footnote	[32] Lethal action: Action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds.				
Footnote	[33] Exception to these conditions may be made for a rare situation where human safety is endangered. Should this be required, post-incident approval from a senior manager should be made and relevant authorities must be informed.				
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Indicators 2.5.3, 2.5.4, and 2.5.7 - Clarification about the ASC Definition of "Lethal Incident" The ASC Salmon Standard has defined "Lethal Incident" to include all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids (footnote 35). For the purpose of assisting farms and auditors with understanding how to evaluate compliance with Indicators 2.5.3, 2.5.4, and 2.5.7, ASC has clarified this definition further: Total number of lethal incidents = sum of all non-salmonid deaths arising from all lethal actions taken by the farm during a given time period There should be a 1:1 relationship between the number of animal deaths and the number of lethal incidents reported by the farm. For example, if a farm has taken one (1) lethal action in past last two years and that single lethal action resulted in killing three (3) birds, it is considered three (3) lethal incidents within a two year period. The term "non-salmonid" was intended to cover any predatory animals which are likely to try to feed upon farmed salmon. In practice these animals will usually be seals or birds.				
2.5.5	**Indicator**: Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34] **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence.	A. Check farm records for publishing lethal actions against the actions listed in 2.5.4a to confirm that the farm made information available within 30 days.	N/A. No lethal actions identified.	Conforming
		b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website).	B. Verify that requested information is easily publicly available.	Information is publicly available on Los Fiordos website	
Footnote	[34] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available." Shall be made available within 30 days of the incident and see Appendix H for transparency requirements.				
2.5.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior 12 months **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.	A. Review log.	N/A. No lethal incidents nor lethal actions identified.	Conforming
		b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period.	B. Verify that over the previous two years there were < 9 lethal incidents in total and that ≤ 2 of those incidents were marine mammal deaths.	N/A. No lethal incidents nor lethal actions identified.	
		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)	C. Confirm that data on all lethal incidents has been submitted to ASC (Appendix V).	Los Fiordos Ltda confirmed that there have been no lethal incidents in Quetrico S farm. If an incident happens, Quetrico S Farm will reported to the ASC.	
Footnote	[35] Lethal incident. Includes all lethal actions as well as entanglements or other accidental mortalities of non-salmonids.				
Footnote	[36] Standard 2.5.6 applicable to incidents related to non-endangered and non-listed species. This standard complements, and does not substitute, 2.5.3.				
2.5.7	**Indicator**: In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that a review of the circumstances of the lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidents **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Keep records showing that the farm undertakes an assessment of risk following each lethal incident and how these risk assessments are used to identify concrete steps the farm takes to reduce the risk of future incidents.	A. Review farm records to confirm that all the farm performs an appropriate risk assessment following all lethal incidents (see Std 2.5.4a).	N/A. No lethal incidents nor lethal actions identified.	N/A
		b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.7c to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents.	B. Verify that the farm implements steps to reduce risk of lethal incidents.	N/A. Not a procedure was implemented. "Plan de preparación y respuesta ante emergencias" (Plan for emergency preparedness and response, P-EQ04-06 Version 03, 2013) Other related procedures are: Corrective and preventive actions, P-QS04-04 Monitoring, measurement and calibration, P-QS04-03	
PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS					
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or impelled parasites and pathogens [38, 39]		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):**	**Evidence**	**Evaluation**
Footnote	[38] Farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the standards under Criterion 3.1.				
Footnote	[39] See Appendix I1 for transparency requirements for 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7.				
Instruction to Clients and CABs on Exemptions to Criterion 3.1 According to Footnote [38], farm sites for which there is no release of water that may contain pathogens into the natural (freshwater or marine) environment are exempt from the requirements under Criterion 3.1. More specifically, farms are only eligible for exemption from Criterion 3.1 if it can be shown that either of the following holds: 1) the farm does not release any water to the natural environment, or 2) any effluent released by the farm to the natural environment has been effectively treated to kill pathogens (e.g. UV and/or chemical treatment of water with testing demonstrating efficacy). Auditors shall fully document the rationale for any such exemptions in the audit report.					
3.1.1	**Indicator**: Participation in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme for managing disease and resistance to treatments that include coordination of fallowing, stocking, therapeutic treatments and information sharing. Detailed requirements are in Appendix I-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.	A. Review records of farm participation in ABM scheme. Contact other ABM participants as necessary to confirm the accuracy of client records.	There are records of farm's participation in a ABM scheme (Sanitary Neighborhood NF-20 established by the Chilean Sanitary Authority- (SERNAPESCA). This was checked by the auditor. Up to now, ABM scheme participation is over 90%	Conforming
		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.	B. Review description of ABM to verify that the management activities address each of the four elements from Indicator 3.1.1.	It was verified that the management activities address each of the four elements in Indicator 3.1.1. There is a procedure available in the company called "Sanitary management, disease and action plans. This plan includes the description of the zones, in this case the Barrios (ABM) and all associated regulation, referring to Sernapesca as the sanitizing body in Chile, in charge of monitoring and auditing the aquaculture companies. Sernapesca checks for compliance with the sanitary regulations and other requirements. The auditor reviewed several documents called "Records of agreements and commitments" from the Barrios, with the last results or the commitments between companies. The last meeting was held on July and August 2016.	
		c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with all requirements in Appendix I-1, including definition of area, minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements.	C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with Appendix I-1.	Quetrico S farm complied with the indicators. This farm is located in Barrio (ABM) 20. Every 2 months the ABM has a meeting to discuss the actions relating to treatments used against Caligus and the coordination, as well as other commitments held by companies and representations stated in a Resolution issued by authority. Other topics include stocking, harvesting and fallowing time.	
		d. Submit dates of fallowing periods as per Appendix H1 to ASC at least once per year.	D. Confirm that client has submitted dates of fallowing periods to ASC (Appendix V).	Quetrico S farm submitted dates of fallowing periods to ASC. Area-Based Management (ABM) records since August to October 2017 is attached	
Note: Indicator 3.1.2 requires that farms demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks. If the farm does not receive any requests to collaborate on such research projects, the farm may demonstrate compliance by showing evidence of commitment through other proactive means such as published policy statements or directed outreach to relevant organizations.					
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, government) 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.	A. Review evidence that the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups to agree on areas of research about possible impacts on wild stocks and is tracking and responding to research requests.	Los Fiordos Ltda will provide support with these projects: * ASC Farms * Sealflat grind * Ecosystem Services Review of salmon aquaculture in southern Chile * Estudio Comparativo de Mecanismos de Ordenamiento Marino * Mapas de Actores y Definición de Zonas de Influencia de la industria del salmón All projects are associated with WWF	Conforming
		b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either: - providing researchers with access to farm sites; or - granting researchers direct access to farm data; or - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way.	B. Review how the farm and/or its operating company has provided non-financial support for research activities.	Los Fiordos Ltda was provided 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; - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way. Projects are associated with WWF (See in Annex attached)	
		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.	C. As applicable, review the provided record of rejecting proposals to confirm that denials were justified and there is no consistent pattern to indicate that the farm and/or its operating company lacks a demonstrated commitment to collaborate on research activities.	N/A. See 3.1.2 c	
		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.	D. Verify that the farm's communications with researchers demonstrate a commitment to collaborate on relevant areas of research.	You was verified with documents provided by Los Fiordos Ltda. The company had communications with researchers and demonstrated a commitment to collaborate on relevant areas of research. Emails with this collaboration were provided.	
Footnote	[40] Commitment: At a minimum, a farm and/or its operating company must demonstrate this commitment through providing farm-level data to researchers, granting researchers access to sites, or other similar non-financial support for research activities.				
3.1.3	**Indicator**: Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the farm based on the sea lice individual farm as outlined in Appendix I-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.	A. Review records to confirm compliance.	N/A. Sea lice was not available in the Oncorhynchus Kisutch species (zero Caligus). This was verified by reviewing the records for sea lice sampling in the current cycle.	Conforming
		b. Maintain evidence that the established maximum sea lice load (5.1.3a) is reviewed annually as outlined in Appendix I-2, incorporating feedback from the monitoring of wild salmon where applicable (See 3.1.6).	B. Confirm that sea lice load is reviewed annually and, if applicable, the review incorporates information from monitoring of wild salmon.	Sea lice do not cause significant problems in this species in Chile. This is confirmed by scientific evidence and historic data for this species in Chile.	
		c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the farm has met (5.1.3a) and annually reviewed (5.1.3b) maximum sea lice load in compliance with requirements in Appendix I-2.	C. Evaluate documents to confirm the ABM complies with requirements of Appendix I-2 for establishing and reviewing maximum sea lice loads.	Quetrico S farm had all reports required by Sernapesca (Informe Ambiental) and was submitted to SERNAPESCA, and in the case of Oncorhynchus Kisutch, monthly reports regarding the total load of lice lice by fish. Records have been maintained since the beginning of the current productive cycle (February 2016)	
		d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix V at least once per year.	D. Confirm that client has submitted the ABM maximum lice load to ASC (Appendix V).	Once will be submitted to ASC at the end of the year.	
		e. 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).	A. Review sea lice testing schedule to confirm that weekly testing coincides with known sensitive periods for wild salmon (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles).	Reports have been sent to the National Fishery Service (SERNAPESCA) Chilean Sanitary Authority as required by law. For Oncorhynchus Kisutch, monthly reports were available during the audit.	
		f. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for sea lice. If farm deviates from schedules due to weather, [41] maintain documentation of event and rationale.	A. Review records to confirm that testing follows the farm's annual schedule. Review the rationale for any deviations from the schedule.	Reports have been sent to the National Fishery Service (SERNAPESCA) Chilean Sanitary Authority as required by law. For Oncorhynchus Kisutch, monthly reports were available during the audit. No any observed deviations in submitting periodicity throughout the current productive cycle.	
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]	a. Document the methodology used for testing sea lice ("testing" includes both counting and identifying sea lice). The method must follow national or international standards, follow accepted minimum sample sizes, and provide a reasonable estimate of the number of sea lice on the farm. It must be suitable for the 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.	A. Review the farm's methodology for testing sea lice. If practicable, observe testing while on site. If farm is a closed system using an alternate testing method, document the distinction and review evidence of efficacy of the method.	Quetrico S farm has methodology for testing sea lice issued by Sernapesca "PSCVI of Caligidosis" Version 13 de Sernapesca. Since January 2015	Conforming
		b. 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.	B. Test assess from an officer computer to confirm that results are easy publicly available. If applicable, confirm that the farm made hardcopies of test results easily available to stakeholders.	The auditor confirmed that results were easy publicly available in Los Fiordos webpage.	
		c. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.	C. Review records for the past year to confirm the farm posted test results within 7 days of each test. Cross-check against testing schedule (see 3.1.4a).	Results are easly accessible on Los Fiordos webpage. The link was created and during the audit was verified that results were in the webpage: www.sapriochaos.com and easily in the verification section. Quetrico S Farm has no problems with sea lice and this was verified in the government webpage (SERNAPESCA) because each month they send this information to SERNAPESCA- this is obligatory in Chile.	
		d. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix V) at least once per year.	D. Confirm that client has submitted test results to ASC (Appendix V).	Data has been submitted to ASC	
Footnote	[41] Testing must be weekly during and immediately prior to sensitive periods for wild salmonids, such as outmigration of wild juvenile salmon. Testing must be at least monthly during the rest of the year, unless water temperature is so cold that it would jeopardize farmed fish health to test for lice (below 4 degrees C). Within closed production systems, alternative methods for monitoring sea lice, such as video monitoring, may be used.				
Footnote	[42] Posting results on a public website is an example of "easily publicly available."				
Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.1.5 - Evidence for Wild Salmonid Health and Migration In writing this indicator, the SAD Steering Committee concluded that relevant data sets on wild salmonid health and migration are publicly available in the vast majority of, if not all, jurisdictions with wild salmonids. The information is likely to come from government sources or from research institutions. Therefore farms are not responsible for conducting this research themselves. However farms must demonstrate that they are aware of this basic information in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those wild stocks. This indicator requires collection and understanding of general data for the major watersheds within approximately 50 km of the farm. A farm does not need to demonstrate that there is data for every small river or tributary or subpopulation. Information should relate to the wild fish stock level, which implies that the population is more or less isolated from other populations of the same species. Information should be for the same species and, if possible, the same population that the farm is affecting. Information should be for the same life stage as the farm is affecting. For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere. Where a species is not natural to a region (e.g. Atlantic or Pacific Salmon in Chile) the areas are not considered as "areas with wild salmonids" even if salmon have escaped from farms and established themselves as a reproducing species in "the wild".					
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 watersheds 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.	A. Review salmonid species list for accuracy and cross-source references. Confirm whether 3.1.5 b and c are applicable.	According to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile. Statistics provided by Sernapesca in 1990 (Salmon produce) were reviewed.	N/A
		b. For species listed in 3.1.5a, compile best available information on migration routes, migration timing (ranges 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.	B. Review the accuracy of the farm's information on local salmonid migratory patterns and stock productivity. Cross-check source references as necessary.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile	
		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.	C. Confirm accuracy of farm's understanding. Cross-check against 'sensitive periods' listed in the farm's annual schedule for testing for sea lice.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile	
			D. Confirm the farm's understanding of this information through interviews.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile	
Footnote	[43] For purposes of these standards, "areas with wild salmonids" are defined as areas within 75 kilometers of a wild salmonid migration route or habitat. This definition is expected to encompass all, or nearly all, of salmon-growing areas in the northern hemisphere.				
Footnote	[44] Farms do not need to conduct research on migration routes, timing and the health of wild stocks under this standard if general information is already available. Farms must demonstrate an understanding of this information at the general level for salmonid populations in their region, as such information is needed to make management decisions related to minimizing potential impact on those stocks.				
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 Arctic char, with results made publicly available [45] **Requirement**: See Appendix I1-1. **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Adhere the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.	A. Confirm whether the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids based on results from 3.1.5a (above). If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	N/A
		b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids.	B. Review evidence to confirm farm's participation in monitoring.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
		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 I1-1.	C. Evaluate documents to confirm methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids complies with requirements of Appendix I1-1.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
		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.	D. Confirm that results are easily publicly available and that they were posted within the required timeframe.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
		e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix V.	E. Confirm that client has submitted monitoring results to ASC (Appendix V).	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
3.1.7	**Indicator**: In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during juvenile outmigration [46] (see Appendix I1-2 for detailed requirements in Appendix I1, subsection 2) **Requirement**: ≤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. Adhere the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.	A. Confirm whether the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids based on results from 3.1.5a (above). If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	N/A
		b. Establish the sensitive periods (#2) of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.	B. Review farm's designation of sensitive periods and cross-check against datasets presented in 3.1.4 and 3.1.5.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
		c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix I2.	C. Review records from the farm's sea lice monitoring program to confirm that lice levels are in compliance with the requirement based on farm-wide average lice levels (per farmed fish (not values from individual net pens).	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
		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 I- 2).	D. Confirm that monitoring data for lice levels are used in a feedback loop as required by Appendix I-2.	Not applicable, according to the definition of this standard, there are no wild salmonids in Chile.	
Footnote	[45] Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before.				
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species		**Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):**	**Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):**	**Evidence**	**Evaluation**
Note: For the purposes of Indicator 3.2.1, "area" is defined as a contiguous body of water with the lux thermal and temperature profile required to support the farmed species' life and reproduction (e.g. the Northern Atlantic Coast of the U.S. and Canada). Appendix II lists alaskanna further as this definition: "The boundaries of an area should be defined, taking into account the zone in which key cumulative impacts on wild populations may occur, water movement and other relevant aspects of ecosystem structure and function." The intent is that the area relates to the spatial extent that is likely to be put at risk from the non-native salmon. Areas will only rarely coincide with the boundaries of countries.					
3.2.1	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was not 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.	A. Confirm the farm does not produce a non-native species by comparing land species (results from 3.1.5a) to the species produced. Cross-check against recent farm smolt suppliers (e.g. 3.3.1b). If the farm only produces a native species, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply.	Quetrico S Farm does produce a non-native species in Chile (Oncorynchus kisutch). Refer to annex attached declaration by farm.	Conforming
		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).	B. Review evidence to confirm when the non-native species was first brought into wide commercial production in the area of the farm.	Yes, Oncorynchus kisutch is widely produced in Chile. The operation does have evidence on site that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard. Data has been collected by Sernapesca since 1990 in Chile's X Region.	
		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.	C. Review evidence to confirm that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish (N.A. at the time of this writing, the SAD Steering Committee was uncertain that any existing technology could reliably deliver 100% sterile fish). Cross-check against smolt purchase records (e.g. invoices).	Quetrico S Farm provided evidence for 3.2.1b	
		d

3.2.2	that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction and these results submitted to ASC for review. **Requirement**: Yes, within five years of publication of the SAD standard [SG.51] **Applicability**: All	a. 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).	a. Confirm that the scientific research included multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species, used credible methodologies & analyses, and underwent peer review. If the farm requests an exemption then enter "NA" and proceed to 3.2.2d.	Not applicable, compliance by 2017. Currently no risk assessment available on site.	N/A
		b. If appropriate, submit to the CAB a request for exemption that shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified in instruction box above.	b. As appropriate, review the farm's request for exemption. Verify that the evidence shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified above.	Not applicable, compliance by 2017. Currently no risk assessment available on site.	
		c. Submit evidence from 3.2.2b to ASC for review.	c. Confirm the farm submits required evidence to ASC.	Not applicable, compliance by 2017. Currently no risk assessment available on site.	
Footnote	(48) The research must at a minimum include multi-year monitoring for non-native farmed species, use credible methodologies and analysis, and undergo peer review.				
Footnote	(49) If the review demonstrates there is increased risk, the ASC will consider prohibiting the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction under this standard. In the event that the risk tools demonstrate "high" risks, the SAD expects that the ASC will prohibit the certification of farming of non-native salmon in that jurisdiction.				
Footnote	(50) Farms have five years to demonstrate compliance with this standard from the time of publication of the final SAD standards and accompanying auditing guidelines.				
Footnote	(51) Farms are exempt from this standard if they are in a jurisdiction where the non-native species became established prior to farming activities in the area and the following three conditions are met: eradication would be impossible or have detrimental environmental effects; the introduction took place prior to 1997 (when the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was ratified); the species is fully self-sustaining.				
3.2.3	**Indicator**: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on farm management purposes **Requirement**: None **Applicability**: All	a. Where the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice.	a. Confirm whether the farm uses fish for sea lice control. If so, auditor response to 3.2.3b-C is "not applicable" (NA).	Cleaner fish/wrasse are not used for sea lice control. Referred to attached declaration by Quetrios S farm.	N/A
		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.	b. Review purchase records to confirm the origin and identity of all species that are used for sea lice control on farm.	see 3.2.3 a)	
		c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region.	c. Review evidence for compliance with the requirement. Acceptable documentary evidence: peer-reviewed literature, government documentation confirming species is not non-native to the region. Acceptable first hand accounts: community testimonials and direct evidence for historical presence of the species in the water body captured with cast nets, trapping devices, or fishing.	see 3.2.3 a)	

Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Action):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Action):	Evidence	Evaluation
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.	a. Verify declaration of no use of transgenic salmon.	Use of transgenic fish is prohibited by law in Chile. Declarations by Los Fiordos are available. Referred to annex attached.	Conforming
		b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases.	b. Review records to confirm compliance with the requirement.	There are records available (delivery sheets) at Quetrios S farm indicating the origin of all cultured stocks including the smolt supplier name, address and contact person for stock purchases.	
		c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic.	c. If the auditor suspects that transgenic fish are being cultured, test stock identity by collecting a fish and sending it to an ISO 17025 certified laboratory for genetic analysis.	No suspicion of transgenic fish being cultured.	
Footnote	(53) Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get that trait expressed in the offspring (http://www.cvres.usda.gov/ses/biotech/ses/biotechnology_ses_glossary.html).				

Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Action):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Action):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	(55) See Appendix H for transparency requirements for 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.				
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.	A. Review client submission for completeness and accuracy of information. Crosscheck with the estimate of unexplained loss, maintenance records for small losses in net, predator attacks, etc.	So far no fish escapes have been reported to Quetrios S farm. Quetrios S farm has to implement a protocol called "Plan de Prevención de escape de Peces" (Plan for fish escape prevention P-EPM19, Version 3, 2014); this is also included in physical register (RAMA 03 Version 3, 2014) and in computer (Mercator software). The auditor also checked the reports of an external diver services and confirmed this.	Conforming with Observations
		b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle.	B. Review the calculation and confirm compliance with the requirement.	For now there have been no confirmations of fish escape in Quetrios S farm in the current cycle but this is not finished yet.	
		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)).	C. Confirm that farm documents show continuous monitoring of escapes.	There were no fish escapes in Quetrios S farm. But the current cycle is not finished yet. Quetrios S farm has been monitoring and recording number of escapes and cause, in Mercator software.	
		d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 100 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.	D. Review the farm's request for a rare exception to the Standard for an escape event. Confirm no prior exceptional events were documented during the previous 10 years, or since the date of the start of the production cycle during which the farm first applied for certification. An example of a rare exception is a catastrophic event such as a hurricane. Rare exceptional events do not include failures in moorings due to bad weather, boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the farm, human error, and predation.	Not applicable, no escapes.	
		e. Submit escape monitoring dataset to ASC as per Appendix H on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	E. Confirm that client has submitted escape monitoring data to ASC (Appendix H).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted at least once per year and for each production cycle.	
Footnote	(56) Farms shall report all escapes; the total aggregate number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish. Data on date of escape episode(s), number of fish escaped and cause of escape episode shall be reported as outlined in Appendix H.				
Footnote	(57) A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. See auditing guidance for additional details.				
3.4.2	**Indicator**: Accuracy [58] of the counting methodology and 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.	A. Confirm that the farm keeps records of counting accuracy for the counting technology or method used on site at stocking and harvest.	Fishes are counted at each grading period at smolt supplier and before they are sold to Quetrios S farm. The system that used is a "Macro counter Vaki" and "Manual counting" according specification sheet. These specifications for accounting accuracy were reviewed during the audit.	Conforming with Observations
		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).	B. Verify the client obtains information from smolt suppliers (if applicable).	The farm has documentation from smolt suppliers.	
		c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm).	C. Verify that the farm calibrates counting equipment as recommended by the manufacturer.	The Macro counter Vaki is calibrated by smolt supplier at its facilities. The smolt supplier works with Quetrios S farm and Los Fiordos. Both are because the belong to Los Fiordos (the owner of smolt). The smolt supplier provided record of delivery of smolt to Quetrios S farm with specifications of possible differences in the number of fishes. Calibration difference according to counter specifications.	
			D. Confirm the stated accuracy of the farm's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98% at both stocking and harvest. Stated accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.	The stated accuracy of the farm's counting technology or counting method at harvest could not be verified. Specification sheets from the smolt supplier for counter accuracy, stated the error possibility of 2%. Quetrios S farm will be able to verify counting accuracy when the current production cycle is finished through hand-counting at harvest and at processing plant.	
		e. Submit counting technology accuracy to ASC as per Appendix H on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	E. Confirm that client has submitted counting technology accuracy to ASC (Appendix H).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted at least once per year and for each production cycle.	
Footnote	(58) Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand-counts.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 3.4.3 - Calculation of Estimated Unexplained Loss
The Estimated Unexplained Loss (EUL) of fish is calculated at the end of each production cycle as follows: EUL = (stocking count) - (harvest count) - (mortalities) - (recorded escapes).

Units for input variables are number of fish (i.e. count) per production cycle. Where possible, farms should use the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count. This formula is adapted from footnote 59 of the ASC Salmon Standard.

3.4.3	**Indicator**: Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1).	A. Review records for completeness.	All documents were cross checked and have correct traceability in compliance with ASC. The current cycle is not finished and there are no records of harvest count available until the new surveillance audit to be carried out in 2017.	Conforming with Observations
		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.	B. Verify accuracy of farm calculations for estimated unexplained loss.	Estimated unexplained loss can be calculate with the information available at moment of the audit but can not consider at end of the cycle because the current cycle is not finished.	
		c. Make the results from 3.4.3b available publicly. Keep records of when and where results were made public (e.g. data posted to a company website) for all production cycles.	C. Verify that the farm makes the information available to the public.	It was possible to review several procedures and documents with information about EUL losses from Quetrios S farm, including periodic checking sad of cage nets, not evidencing records associated to possible events that may result in escapes. Objective information to demonstrate that an ASC was informed that when the cycle is finished Quetrios S farm will submit EUL information.	
		d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix H for each production cycle.	D. Confirm that client has submitted estimated unexplained loss to ASC (Appendix H).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted at least once per year and for each production cycle.	
			E. Compare EUL values (3.4.3a) and counting accuracy (3.4.2a) to recorded escapes to check whether farm reporting is plausible. If EUL is greater than the combined margin of error related to fish counts, investigate potential sources of error as it could indicate the farm under reported mortalities or escapes.	Quetrios S farm has not compared EUL values (3.4.3a) and counting accuracy (3.4.2a) to recorded escapes and checked whether farm reporting is accurate, because the production cycle is not yet completed. Mortalities & stocking count in Quetrios S farm are not reliable (Mercator software). It was not possible to check objectively if escapes had occurred through a mass balance method because harvest counts will be available at the end of the cycle. However, there was evidence that Quetrios S farm complied to the Fish Escape Prevention Plan have been implemented in the sea farm through the production cycle.	
Footnote	(59) Calculated at the end of the production cycle as: Unexplained loss = Stocking count – harvest count – mortalities – other known escapes. Where possible, use of the pre-smolt vaccination count as the stocking count is preferred.				

3.4.4	**Indicator**: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: predator management; record keeping and reporting of net checks (e.g. net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and reporting of fish events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); planning of staff training to cover all of the above 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.	A. Obtain and review the farm's escape prevention plan prior to scheduling the first audit.	Quetrios S farm provided a farm escape prevention plan at the moment of the audit. The formal procedure is P-EPM19, Version 3 - 2014.	Conforming
		b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: net strength testing; net mesh/opening 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.	B. Confirm the farm's Escape Prevention Plan contains all required elements for open (net pen) systems as applicable.	Fr escape prevention plan is available and covers all required elements.	
		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.	C. Confirm the farm's Escape Prevention Plan contains all required elements for closed systems as applicable.	N/A. Quetrios S farm is an open system.	
		d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.	D. Review documentary evidence showing implementation of the plan.	Documentary evidence showing implementation of the plan was reviewed. There are certificates, traceability for the nets and documentation of the robotic system used for checking for holes in the net and possible escapes.	
		e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan.	E. Review records (i.e. attendance records, meeting notes) to confirm that farm staff attend training on escape prevention planning.	Quetrios S farm has conducted trainings on escape prevention plan for the staff. If any staff member has questions, they can access the escape implementation procedure through an ASC folder available through Quetrio's S computer systems.	
			F. Interview farm workers to confirm that the plan is implemented.	Implementation of plan was confirmed by staff in Quetrios S Farm.	

PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER

Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Action):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Action):	Evidence	Evaluation

Instruction to Clients for Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.3 - Sourcing of Responsibly Produced Salmon Feeds
Farms must show that all feeds used by the farm are produced in compliance with the requirements of Indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.4. To do so, farms must obtain documentary evidence that the feed producers (see note 1) are audited at regular intervals by an independent auditing firm or a conformity assessment body against a recognized standard which substantially incorporates requirements for traceability. Acceptable certification schemes include GlobalGAP or other schemes that have been acknowledged by the ASC (see 4.1.1.c below). Results from these audits shall demonstrate that fee producers have robust information systems and information handling processes to allow the feed producers to be able to bring forward accurate information about their production and supply chains. Declarations from the feed producer that are provided to the farm to demonstrate compliance with these indicators must be supported by the audits. Farms must also show that all of their feed producers are duly informed of the requirements of the ASC Salmon Standard relating to sourcing of responsibly produced salmon feed (see 4.1.3b below).

In addition to the above, farms must also show that their feed suppliers comply with the more detailed requirements for traceability and ingredient sourcing that are specified under indicators 4.1.1 through 4.4.2. The ASC Salmon Standard allows farms to use one of two different methods to demonstrate compliance of feed producers:

Method #1: Farms may choose to source feed from feed producers who used only those ingredients allowed under the ASC Salmon Standards during the production of a given batch of feed. For example, the farm may request its feed supplier to produce a batch of feed according to farm specifications. Audits of the feed producer will independently verify that manufacturing processes are in compliance with ASC requirements.

Method #2: Farms may choose to source feed from feed producers who demonstrate compliance using a "mass balance" method. In this method, feed producers show that the balance of all ingredients (both amount and type) used during a given feed production period meets ASC requirements. However, mixing of ingredients into the general silos and production lines is allowed during manufacturing. Audits of the feed producer will independently verify that manufacturing processes are in compliance with ASC requirements. The mass balance method can be applied, for example, to integrated feed production companies that handle all steps of feed manufacturing (purchasing of raw materials, processing to finished feed, and sales) under the management of a single legal entity.

Note 1: The term "feed producer" is used here to identify the organization that produces the fish feed (i.e. is the "feed manufacturer"). In most cases, the organization supplying feed to a farm (i.e. the feed supplier) will be the same organization that produced the feed, but there may be instances where feed suppliers are not directly responsible for feed production. Regardless of whether the farm sources feeds directly from a feed producer or indirectly through an intermediary organization, it remains the farm's obligation to show evidence that all feeds used are in compliance with requirements.

4.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [61]. **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records.	A. Review feed records for completeness and confirm the number of feed suppliers to the client.	Detailed records for the feed supplier and purchases including contact information, purchase and delivery were available at the moment of the audit.	Conforming
		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.	B. Review farm records to verify that the farm has informed all of its feed suppliers of relevant ASC requirements for feed production.	Los Fiordos has informed the feed supplier of the ASC requirements by email and the feed supplier has sent all documentation requested for these requirements.	
		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.	C. Verify that the farm obtains current audit reports from all relevant feed producers, that these audits were performed by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme, and that audit results demonstrate compliance with requirements.	Audit reports and the certificates are available. The audits were performed for Global GAP standard by Bureau Veritas Chile S.A. (Chile) and BAF Argentina in June, 2015 with Global Trust. These audits demonstrated compliance with requirements regarding traceability.	
		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.	D. Review which method the farm will use and confirm that independent audit results (4.1.1c) show compliance of feed producers.	Method #2 was used.	
		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 [61].	E. Review declaration from each feed supplier to confirm the company assures traceability to the level of detail required by Standard.	Declaration from feed supplier Fiteria de Chilenitha Pergua 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 was available.	
			F. Crosscheck the declarations against results from audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) to verify evidence of required levels of traceability.	Declaration from feed supplier is consistent with audit results of required levels of traceability.	
Footnote	(61) Traceability shall be at a level of detail that permits the feed producer to demonstrate compliance with the standards in this document (i.e., marine raw ingredients must be traced back to the fishery, soy to the region grown, etc.). Feed manufacturers will need to supply the farm with third-party documentation of the ingredients covered under this standard.				

Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [62]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Action):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Action):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	(62) See Appendix H for transparency requirements for 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.2.1 - Calculation of FFDRs
Farms must calculate their fish-in-fish-out ratios (FFDRs) according to formula presented in Appendix H. Using data from the most recent complete production cycle. Farms must also show that they have maintained sufficient information in order to make an accurate calculation of FFDRs as outlined below. For first audits, farms may be exempted from compliance with Indicator 4.2.1 for the most recent complete production cycle (e.g. if the FFDRs of the most recent crop was < 1.35) if the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate to the auditor that:
- the client understands how to accurately calculate FFDRs;
- the client maintains all information needed to accurately calculate FFDRs (i.e. all feed spec for > 6 months) for the current production cycle; and
- the client can show how feed used for the current production cycle will ensure that the farm will meet requirements at harvest (i.e. FFDRs < 1.35).

4.2.1	**Indicator**: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRs) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix H) Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [64] (calculated according to Appendix H-2). **Requirement**: FFDRs ≤ 2.95 or EPA + DHA ≥ 20 g/kg feed **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used including: Feed ingredients and feed types; 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.	A. Verify completeness of records and that values are stated in a declaration from the feed manufacturer.	Records from feed supplier stating percentage of fish oil inclusion and the source of fish oil (fishery) for each formulation were available during the audit. Signed declaration from feed supplier was available in Quetros S Farm.	Conforming with Observations
		b. For FFDRs calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g., the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery.	B. Verify that the farm excludes from the FFDRs calculation any fishmeal rendered from seafood by-products.	Feed company does not use by-products.	
		c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix H (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1).	C. Verify that eFCR calculation was done correctly.	FCR calculation was done correctly during the renewal (FCR with data from February 2010 to July 2016). However, the FCR 2016 is a projected because the production cycle is not finished.	
		d. Calculate FFDRs using formulas in Appendix H-1.	D. Verify that FFDRs calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the requirement.	The calculation of FFDRs was available since February to July, 2016 (first ASC audit) the same was 1.32 is important to know that the current cycle was not completed yet and this indicator will be reviewed by second time when the cycle will be finished.	
		e. Submit FFDRs to ASC as per Appendix H for each production cycle.	E. Confirm that client has submitted FFDRs to ASC (Appendix H).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted for each production cycle.	
Note: Under indicator 4.2.2, farms can choose to calculate FFDRs (Option #1) or EPA & DHA (Option #2). Farms do not have to demonstrate that they meet both thresholds values. Client shall inform the CAB which option they will use.					

4.2.2	**Indicator**: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRs) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix H) Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [64] (calculated according to Appendix H-2). **Requirement**: ≤ 1.35 **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a.	A. Verify completeness of feed records as in 4.2.1A.	Records from feed supplier stating percentage of fish oil inclusion and the source of fish oil (fishery) for each formulation were available during the audit. Signed declaration from feed supplier was available in Quetros S Farm.	Conforming with Observations
		b. For FFDRs 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.	B. Verify client excludes fish oil rendered from byproducts from the FFDRs or (EPA + DHA) calculation.	Feed supplier states that the feed does not include fish oil derived from rendering of by-products.	
		c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard.	C. Record which option the client chose.	Quetros S Farm chose option #1.	
		d. For option #1, calculate FFDRs using formulas in Appendix H-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c.	D. Verify that FFDRs calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the standard.	FFDRs since February to July, 2016 (first ASC audit) the same was 1.76 is important to know that the current cycle was not completed yet and this indicator will be reviewed by second time when the cycle will be finished.	
		e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix H-2.	E. Verify that (EPA+DHA) calculations were done correctly and confirm the value complies with the standard.	N/A. Elected option was #1.	
		f. Submit FFDRs or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix H for each production cycle.	F. Confirm that client has submitted FFDRs or EPA & DHA to ASC (Appendix H).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted for each production cycle.	
Footnote	(64) Calculation excludes DHA and EPA derived from fisheries by-products and trimmings. Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is inspected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption. Fishmeal and fish oil that are produced from trimmings can be excluded from the calculation as long as the origin of the trimmings is not any species that are classified as critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org).				

Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Action):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Action):	Evidence	Evaluation
Note: Indicator 4.3.1 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including IUU) and not to by products or trimmings used in feed.					
4.3.1	**Indicator**: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries 3rd party verified under a scheme that is an GSAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries **Requirement**: Within 3 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full compliance by June 15, 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 GSAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries.	A. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible feed sourcing (e.g. programs at http://www.iseafarms.org/portrait/MyNs/Member).	Auditor reviewed declaration by feed supplier Fiteria de Chilenitha Pergua that fishmeal and fish oil used in 2016 to produce salmon feeds come from suppliers which come from sustainable sources and according with FAO. Feed mill has a certification of Global Aquaculture Alliance (Aprima y aceite de pescado GAA GOTR-22)"complying with BAP and Global Gap standards encouraging and supporting the use fishmeal and fish oil from sustainable sources for the feed industry, responsible manufacturing of nutritionally balanced diets.	Conforming
		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	B. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent.	Auditor obtained a copy and reviewed the client's letter of intent (Refer to Annex attached).	
		c. Starting on or before June 15, 2017, use feed inventory and feed supplier declarations in 4.2.1a to develop a list of the origin of all fish products used in feed ingredients.	C. As of June 15, 2017, confirm that the farm has sufficient evidence for the origin of all fish products. If not, auditor response demonstrates compliance with indicator 4.3.1. Prior to June 15, 2017, 4.3.1c does not apply.	Not applicable yet.	
		d. Starting on or before June 15, 2017, provide evidence that fishmeal and fish oil used in feed come from fisheries 3rd3 certified under a scheme that is an GSAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries.	D. As of June 15, 2017, review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 15, 2017, 4.3.1d does not apply.	Not applicable yet.	
Footnote	(65) This standard and standard 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including IUU) and not to by products or trimmings used in feed.				
Footnote	(66) Meets GSAL guidelines as demonstrated through full membership in the GSAL Alliance, or equivalent as determined by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.				
Footnote	(67) Publication: Refers to the date when the feed standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.2 - Fishbase Score of Fish Used in Feed
To determine Fishbasesc scores of the fish species used as feed ingredients, do the following:
go to http://www.fishbasesc.org/
select "Species" drop down menu on the left and select the relevant species
select "Search" and identify the species. Then select the top tab that reads "Score".
For first audits, farms must have scoring records that cover all feeds purchased during the previous 6-month period.
Note: Indicator 4.3.2 applies to fishmeal and oil from forage fisheries, pelagic fisheries, or fisheries where the catch is directly reduced (including IUU) and not to by products or trimmings used in feed.

4.3.2	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the Fishbasesc score [68] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is sourced. **Requirement**: All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 8 **Applicability**: All, until June 15, 2017	a. Record Fishbasesc score for each species from which fishmeal or fish oil was derived and used as a feed ingredient. (all species listed in 4.3.1a).	A. Cross-check against 4.2.1a to confirm that client recorded a score for each species used in feed.	Was verified that client has records of a score for each species used in feed. All information with records was cross checked and is attached in statement provided by feed supplier.	Minor Non-conformity
		b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 8.	B. Cross-check a sample of the farm's scores against the Fishbasesc website to verify that no individual score is < 6 and no biomass score is < 8.	According to the requirement of this indicator 4.3.2, the feed supplier does not comply with the scores required because some scores were under scores established in the Standard. The species identified as used are: Pacific/ Chilean sardine (Araucanian Herring; Strangomera bentincki) Chile X -X regions the score was 5.0 (Biomass 7.0) 5.0B 18,2- 12,7 - 4,8A 3,8,1 Peruvian Anchovy (anina) northern (Engraulis ringens) the evidence of the scores were: 5 8,2-7,0- 3 -6- 4,8- 9,6-4	
		c. If the species is not on the website it means that a Fishbasesc assessment is not available. Client can choose one of the following options: 1. Contact Fishbasesc or 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 Fishbasesc methodology and provide the assessment and details on the third party qualifications to the CAB for review.	C. If the client provides an independent assessment, review the assessment and qualifications of the independent third party to verify that the assessment was done with the Fishbasesc methodology.	Not applicable. The assessment was done in accordance with the Fishbasesc methodology and it was verified that all species were available on the website.	
			D. If the species does not have a Fishbasesc score then the fish feed does not comply with the requirement.	N/A	
Footnote	(68) Or equivalent score using the same methodology. See Appendix H for explanation of Fishbasesc scoring.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.3.3 - Traceability
Indicator 4.3.3 requires that farms show that their feed producers can demonstrate chain of custody and traceability as verified through third-party audits. Farms may submit reports from audits of feed producers (see 4.1.1c) as evidence that traceability systems are in compliance. Alternatively, farms may show that their feed producers comply with traceability requirements of Indicator 4.3.3 by submitting evidence that suppliers, and the batches of fishmeal and oil, are certified to the International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organisation's Global Standard for Responsible Supply or to the Marine Stewardship Council Chain of Custody Standard.
For the first audit, a minimum of 6 months of data on feed is required and evidence shall relate to species used in said dataset.

4.3.3	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstrate traceability of fishmeal and fish oil using third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.1 **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All, until June 15, 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.	A. Review evidence and confirm that a third party verified chain of custody or traceability program was used for the fishmeal and fish oil.	Feed supplier is certified according to ASC acknowledged scheme of Global Gap. Evidence was reviewed.	Conforming
		b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).	B. Verify that demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody is in place for all species used.	It was verified that demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody is in place for all species used.	
4.3.4	**Indicator**: Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by products [69] or trimmings from tuna [70] cod1s 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)	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.	A. Review list and confirm consistent with 4.2.1a, 4.2.2a, 4.3.3b.	Can is confirmed to be consistent with 4.2.1a, 4.2.2a, 4.3.3b. No use of by products and this is mentioned in the declaration from the feed supplier attached to report.	Conforming
		b. Obtain a declaration from the feed supplier asserting that no fishmeal or fish oil originating from tuna which was used to produce the feed.	B. Verify that the farm obtains declarations from feed suppliers.	Was verified that the farm obtains declarations from feed supplier (Refer to annex attached)	
		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).	C. Review declaration to confirm compliance. The International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organisation's Global Standard for Responsible Supply and the Marine Stewardship Council standards are two options for demonstrating compliance with Indicator 4.3.4.	Declaration to confirm compliance reviewed. (Refer to annex attached)	

		d. If dead or an originated from a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, obtain documentary evidence to support the exception as outlined in (7f).	b. Review evidence to support exception (if applicable).	N/A	
Footnote	[6d] Trimmings are defined as by-products when fish are processed for human consumption or if whole fish is rejected for use of human consumption because the quality at the time of landing does not meet official regulations with regard to fish suitable for human consumption.				
Footnote	[7d] IUU - Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported.				
Footnote	[7f] The International Union for the Conservation of Nature reference can be found at http://www.iucnredlist.org/static/introduction.				
Footnote	[7i] If a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, an exception is made if a regional population of the species has been assessed to be not vulnerable in a National Red List process that is managed explicitly in the same science based way as IUCN. In cases where a National Red List doesn't exist or isn't managed in accordance with IUCN guidelines, an exception is allowed when an assessment is conducted using IUCN's methodology and demonstrates that the population is not vulnerable.				

Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
4.4.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible (RS) management of non-marine raw materials for feed ingredients that comply with recognised crop moratoriums. [7h] and local laws [7k] **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a)	a. Review feed supplier list and cross-check against feed purchases. (See also 4.1.1a)	Only one feed supplier and the purchase records confirm this.	Conforming
		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.	b. Review policies from each feed supplier to confirm required sourcing policy is in place.	Sponsor policies from feed supplier regarding responsible sourcing are available and explained in declaration attached.	
		c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented.	c. Verify that the scope of third party audits of feed suppliers includes review of policies and evidence of implementation.	All these documents were attached: Statement on responsible sourcing since July 2016. Statement Alimentos Pergua sourcing policies since July 2016. Global GAP certificate, valid until January, 2017 Just BRF certificate, valid until June, 2017.	

Footnote	[7h] Moratoriums: A period of time in which there is a suspension of a specific activity until future events warrant a renewal of the suspension or issues regarding the activity have been resolved. In this context, moratoriums may refer to suspension of the growth of defined agricultural crops in defined geographical regions.
Footnote	[7k] Specifically, the policy shall include that vegetable ingredients, or products derived from vegetable ingredients, must not come from areas of the Amazon Biome that were deforested after July 24, 2006, as geographically defined by the Brazilian Soy Moratorium. Should the Brazilian Soy Moratorium be lifted, this specific requirement shall be reconsidered.

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 [7l] **Requirement**: 100%, within five years of the publication [9b] 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.	a. Verify that the client's policy supports responsible sourcing of soya or soya-derived feed ingredients.	Brasil confirmed that this country already promotes Pergua's suppliers' responsible sourcing of soya or soya-derived feed ingredients. This indicator was complemented with a declaration from Alimentos Pergua, a major Brazilian feed producer - Plenty Alimentos Pergua SA mentioned that they want to work with sustainable resources. (Declaration by July,2016)	Conforming
		b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or its equivalent)	b. Obtain a copy of the client's letter of intent.	Copy of the client's letter of intent was reviewed	
		c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b).	c. Verify that farm notifies feed suppliers.	Question 3 Farm notification to feed supplier was verified.	
		d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed.	d. Confirm that the farm has sufficient and supportive evidence for the origin of soya products in feed to demonstrate compliance with indicator 4.4.2	Declaration from feed supplier detailing the origin of soya in the feed was obtained and maintained.	
		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 [7l]	e. As of June 13, 2017, review evidence and confirm compliance. Prior to June 13, 2017, 4.4.2e does not apply.	Not applicable yet.	

Footnote	[7l] A key alternate certification scheme wasat here to be approved as equivalent by the Technical Advisory Group of the ASC.
Footnote	[9b] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.

4.4.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of disclosure to the buyer [7f] of the salmon of inclusion of any transgenic plant raw material or materials derived from transgenic plants in the feed **Requirement**: Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 5% transgenic content [8b] **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.	a. Review feed supplier declaration and ensure declarations from all suppliers are present (see also 4.4.1a).	Available a declaration from feed supplier. Declaration dated from 2016 stated that they cannot verify the use of free GMO raw materials. The declaration shows protein raw materials are derived from Soybean. They may come from GMO. Refer to Annex attached.	Conforming with Observation
		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.	b. Verify evidence of disclosure to all buyers, cross-checking with plant material list (4.4.3a) to see that all transgenic plant ingredients were disclosed	Currently the system to disclose the information from start of ASC sales onwards is in place, the farm has not yet sold any salmon that has GMO feed ingredients in the products. Disclosure from feed company confirms that feed may contain GMO for the received feed types during the last 6 months.	
		c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	c. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether feeds containing transgenic ingredients are used on farm (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted for each production cycle.	

Footnote	[7f] The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product. This standard requires disclosure by the feed company to the farm and by the farm to the buyer of their salmon.
Footnote	[8b] Transgenic: Containing genes altered by insertion of DNA from an unrelated organism. Taking genes from one species and inserting them into another species to get that trait expressed in the offspring.
Footnote	[8b] See Appendix VI for transparency requirement for 4.4.3.

Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
4.5.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible (RS) 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.	a. Review policy to verify the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production is a manner consistent with best practice in the area.	Sponsor commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production in a manner consistent with best practice in the area was verified. Internal procedure is "Plan ejercicio de residuos" IT-AMB-02, Version 37,2015	Conforming
		b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean.	b. Verify the client makes a declaration.	Declaration is included in the Waste management plan.	
		c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.	c. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal.	During the on-site inspection, it was possible to verify the evidence of proper waste disposal by external service contractor.	
		d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.	d. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client.	Proper waste disposal was confirmed on-site (clean and tidy site).	

Footnote	[8d] Proper and responsible disposal will vary based on facilities available in the region and remoteness of farm sites. Disposal of non-biological waste shall be done in a manner consistent with best practice in the area. Dumping of non-biological waste into the ocean does not represent "proper and responsible" disposal.

4.5.2	**Indicator**: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out sites 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)	a. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of proper waste disposal. (See also 4.5.1c)	Proper implementation of Waste Management Plan IT -OPR-12, Version 15, 2014 and the associated logs A-AMB-07, B-GEN-04, was confirmed during on-site inspection. It was possible to check that there was no non-biological waste.	Conforming
		b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)	b. During the on-site inspection look for evidence of recycling of waste materials as described by client. (See also 4.5.1d)	Proper waste disposal was confirmed on-site (clean and tidy site).	
		c. Inform the CAA of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken.	c. Review infractions and corrective actions.	No infractions found in record	
		d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.	d. Review records to verify waste disposal and/or recycling is consistent with client description and policy.	It was possible to review the contracts of recycling & waste components with receipt paid devolved for. This confirm the proper waste disposal and recycling. Supplier of the service Reciser S.A	

Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [8k]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[8k] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.1 - Energy Use Assessment
Indicator 4.6.1 requires that farms must have an assessment to verify energy consumption. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational energy use for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. Boundaries for operational energy use should correspond to the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions (see Appendix V-1). Energy use corresponding to Scope 3 emissions (i.e. the energy used to fabricate materials that are purchased by the farm) is not required. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate energy use assessments across the board in the company.
For the purposes of calculating energy consumption, the duration of the production cycle is the entire life cycle "at sea". It does not include freshwater smolt production stages. Farms that have integrated smolt rearing should break out the grow-out stage portion of energy consumption if possible. Quantities of energy (fuel and electricity) are converted to kilojoules. Verification is done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details).

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 kilojoules/kg live/production cycle **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.	a. Verify that the farm maintains records for energy consumption.	Records of diesel and gasoline used were provided and reviewed.	Conforming with Observations
		b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kJ) during the last production cycle.	b. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	The current calculation was completed in this requirement.	
		c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle.	c. Confirm that the farm accurately reports total weight of fish harvested per production cycle. Cross-check against other farm datasets (e.g. harvest counts, escapes, and mortalities)	In the current cycle the calculation was done with the estimated live weight of fish metric tons (MT) at the end of the cycle because the production cycle is not finished.	
		d. Using results from 4.6.1b and 4.6.1c, calculate energy consumption on the farm as required, reported as kilojoules/mt fish/production cycle.	d. Review the farm's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	The calculation is detailed but the current cycle has not finished yet and information is not available. The last production cycle was finished on January to May, 2016(01.01.16-31.05.16)The this indicator will be reviewed by auditor time when the cycle will be finish.	
		e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	e. Confirm that client has submitted energy use calculations to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC with information submitted at moment of the audit but the current cycle will be not finished yet. This indicator will be reviewed by auditor time when the cycle will be finished and all information will be send to ASC.	
		f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1.	f. Confirm that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the farm's energy consumption.	It was confirmed that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment and that it was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1 by Carbohidrotecnia which is an external surveyor.	

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.2 - Annual GHG Assessment
Indicator 4.6.2 requires that farms must have an annual Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment. Detailed instructions are presented in Appendix V-1 and references therein. The scope of this requirement is restricted to operational boundaries for the farm site(s) that is applying for certification. However the SAD Steering Committee encourages companies to integrate GHG accounting practices across the board in the company. Verification may be done by internal or external assessment following either the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard or ISO 14064-1 (see Appendix V-1 for more details).
Note: For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons ($HFCs$), perfluorocarbons ($PFCs$), and sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6).

4.6.2	**Indicator**: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on the farm, and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1 **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm.	a. Verify that the farm maintains records of GHG emissions.	Records available, the farm only has: records of the amount of Diesel and gasoline used.	Conforming with Observations
		b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1.	b. Confirm that calculations are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1.	The calculations are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V-1. Records are from all of 2013, 2014, 2015 so-half of 2016.	
		c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of these emissions factors.	c. Verify that the farm records all emissions factors used and their sources.	Records of all emissions factors of the farm used and their sources were verified.	
		d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO_2 gases to CO_2e equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	d. Verify that the farm records all GWPs used and their sources.	It was verified that Questions 3 Farm records all GWPs used and their sources.	
		e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year.	e. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations to ASC (Appendix VI).	GHG calculations is pending to be submitted to ASC. This indicator will be send one time to year.	
		f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually.	f. Confirm that the farm undergoes a GHG assessments annually and that the methods used comply with requirements of Appendix V-1.	Question 3 Farm has undergone a GHG assessment and the methods used comply with requirements of Appendix V-1.	

Footnote	[8l] For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons ($HFCs$), perfluorocarbons ($PFCs$), and sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6).
Footnote	[8m] GHG emissions must be recorded using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 4.6.3 - GHG Emissions of Feed
Indicator 4.6.3 requires that farms document the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) associated with any feeds used during salmon production. Farms will need to obtain this information from their feed supplier(s) and thereafter maintain a continuous record of Feed GHG emissions throughout all production cycles. This requirement takes effect on June 13, 2015 and it will apply across the entire previous production cycle. Therefore the SAD Steering Committee advises farms to inform their feed supplier(s) about this requirement long before the effective date. Specifically, the SC recommends that...
-the farm provides its feed suppliers with detailed information about the requirements including a copy of the methodology outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2;
-the farm explain what analyses must be done by feed suppliers; and
-the farm ensure that the information is available and organized as required by the farm to demonstrate compliance.
Note1: Farms may calculate GHG emissions of feed using the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) rather than using feed composition on a lot-by-lot basis.
Note2: Feed supplier's calculations must include Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 GHG emissions as specified in Appendix V, subsection 2.

4.6.3	**Indicator**: Documentation of GHG emissions of feed used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2 **Requirement**: Yes, within three years of the publication [8k] of the SAD standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015) **Applicability**: All, after June 13, 2017	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed), suppliers.	a. Verify declaration from feed supplier(s) and confirm client has declarations from all feed suppliers.	The feed supplier provided a report from Carlos Ambiente with feed GHG emissions (per kg of feed) for years 2014, 2015 and progress 2016.	Conforming
		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.	b. Verify calculations cross-checking with feed purchase and use records.	Verified with review of report from Carlos Ambiente	
		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.	c. Verify calculations.	N/A. Only one feed supplier, and this was backed by Carlos Ambiente.	
		d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	d. Confirm that the farm has submitted GHG calculations for feed to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC with records since 2014, 2015 and 2016 is pending.	

Footnote	[8n] GHG emissions from feed can be given based on the average raw material composition used to produce the salmon (by weight) and not as documentation linked to each single product used during the production cycle. Feed manufacturer is responsible for calculating GHG emissions per unit feed. Farm site then shall use that information to calculate GHG emissions for the volume of feed they used in the prior production cycle.
Footnote	[8k] Publication: Refers to the date when the final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.

Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [8l], [8]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[8l] Closed production systems that do not use nets and do not use antifoulants shall be considered exempt from standards under Criterion 4.7.				
Footnote	[8n] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 4.7.1, 4.7.3 and 4.7.4.				
4.7.1	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper-based antifoulants that nets are not cleaned [8]) or treated in situ in the marine environment **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All farms except as noted in [8o]	a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of offsite facilities, and record keeping.	a. Review procedure for completeness.	Auditor confirmed compliance by review of Environmental Permit RCA N°280, 2009 which details all actions required by the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and Environmental Impact Statement submitted by net cleaning, repairing and treatment companies to get authorization to carry out these services. The RCA document includes detailed procedures and technologies for net cleaning and treatments. External contracted services to fly & scale.	Conforming with Observation
		b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets.	b. Review documentary evidence and records for completeness, including traceability records of the nets where available.	Auditor reviewed Technical Certificate of Antifouling Composition/Technical data sheets for antifoulants used to treat the net, provided by Bayer S.A (Aqua Net-SL 100) and Cerexio (Econea SL-1000.1)	
		c. Declare to the CAA whether copper-based treatments are used on nets.	c. Verify whether copper-based treatments are used. If no, indicator 4.7.1d does not apply to the client. If yes, proceed to 4.7.1d.	The CAA was informed concerning the use of treated nets with copper-based antifoulants.	
		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.	d. Review evidence and interview farm manager to confirm that farm does not do any heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ.	There was evidence that nets are sent to the subcontractor outside the farm. Auditor interviewed people for net transport to cleaning facility. The document "Instructivo para la instalación, mantenimiento, reparaciones y retiro de redes" (Instructions for installation, replacement and removal of nets) IT-OPR-09, Version 30,2014).	
		e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	e. Confirm that the farm has informed ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted for each production cycle.	

Footnote	[8o] Unless the SAD, "copper-treated net" is defined as a net that has been treated with any copper-containing substance (such as a copper-based antifouling) during the previous 18 months, or has not undergone thorough cleaning at a land-based facility since the last treatment. Farms that use nets that have, at some point prior in their lifespan, been treated with copper may still consider nets as untreated so long as sufficient time and cleaning has elapsed as in this definition. This will allow farms to move away from use of copper without immediately having to purchase all new nets.
Footnote	[8o] Light cleaning of nets is allowed. Intent of the standard is that, for example, the high-pressure underwater washers could not be used on copper treated nets under this standard because of the risk of copper flaking off during this type of heavy or more thorough cleaning.

4.7.2	**Indicator**: For any farm that cleans nets at sea-based sites, evidence that net cleaning sites have effluent treatment [8t] **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All farms except as noted in [8t]	a. Declare to the CAA whether nets are cleaned on land.	a. Review declaration and cross-check with records from 4.7.1c. If nets are not cleaned on land, indicator 4.7.2 does not apply. If nets are cleaned on land, proceed to 4.7.2b.	The CAA was informed concerning the use of treated nets with copper-based antifoulants.	Conforming
		b. If nets are cleaned on land, obtain documentary evidence from each net cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place.	b. Review documentary evidence to confirm that each net cleaning facility has effluent treatment in place.	Environmental Permits RCA N° 280, 2009 includes evidence that farm uses physical-chemical treatments, primary sediment system and filtrations rejection, and water restoration system. Wastewater from cleaning is transferred to water treatment system of the companies that provide the net cleaning service.	
		c. If yes to 4.7b, obtain evidence that effluent treatment used at the cleaning site is an appropriate technology to capture all copper in effluents.	c. If applicable, review documentary evidence to confirm that land-based cleaning sites have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper in effluents and that they function as intended.	There are records of effluent monitoring (physical-chemical analysis) to fulfill environmental regulations "Resolucion 1555 N°7, 2016 " from the subcontractor B y B Ltda.	

Footnote	[8t] Treatment must have appropriate technologies in place to capture copper if the farm uses copper-treated nets.

Note: If the benthos throughout and immediately outside the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAA and request an exemption from Indicator 4.7.3 (see 2.1.5c).

4.7.3	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper levels in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix V-2 **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All farms except as noted in [8t]	a. Declare to the CAA whether the farm uses copper nets or copper-treated nets. (See also 4.7.1c). If "no", indicator 4.7.3 does not apply.	a. Review declaration and cross-check against declaration from 4.7.1c. Record whether indicator 4.7.3 is applicable to the client.	If has been declared by ASAC to CAA that the farm works with copper-treated nets	Conforming
		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.	b. As applicable, verify the farm tested sediment samples for copper from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE.	There was evidence that samples were taken from station according to 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.	c. Verify the measurements were taken using appropriate equipment and testing methods.	There was evidence in the Technical Report issued in June 2016 by the third party Materalab.	

4.7.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that copper levels [9d] are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight OR in instances where the Co in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration in the farm's sediment is at background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All farms except as noted in [8t] and including those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3	a. Confirm the CAA 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.	a. Document and verify applicability of 4.7.4 to client (see also 4.7.3a)	Question 3 Farm informed to the CAA by email that: has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment.	Conforming
		b. Provide evidence from measurements taken in 4.7.3b that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight.	b. Verify that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg sediment. If no, proceed to 4.7.4c.	Results from the monitoring stations were reviewed and the results are lower than 34 mg Cu/kg	
		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 V-2 (also see Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2).	c. If applicable, review evidence to confirm that farm followed Appendix V-2 for testing copper levels at reference sites.	Not applicable in this case, all results are lower than 34 mg Cu/kg	
		d. Analyze results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body.	d. As applicable, review data to confirm that copper levels fall within the range of background concentrations as measured at reference sites.	Results obtained same from stations (U-0B1, B-C,J,M,B-L, B-2, JPE-B-1, H-2, (Control U-0-L, H-1, (Control D-N-L, H-2, (Control D). Reports are from Hydrosab and are attached: Outside AZE Cu: U-0B1 Average (ug/L): 1.0 ± 0.1 (ug/kg) B-C Average (ug/L): 1.5 ± 0.4 (ug/kg) B-L Perpendicular JPE-B-1: 11.6, H-2: 14.3 Average JPE 1.5 N: ± 3.01 (ug/kg) Aguas Atacar (AGBR-) 0.81 H2: 14.1 Average (AGR) 15.95 ± 0,49 Cu (ug/kg) Control U-0,D-N-1: 15.1 - H-2: 14.7 Average (1) 5,14 ± 0,16Cu (ug/kg) - Control J-E(2)-N-0: 8,84 - N = 4,99 Average (2) 6,86 ± 4,80 Cu (ug/kg)	
		e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	e. Confirm that farm has submitted to ASC data on copper levels in sediment (Appendix VI).	Data has been sent to ASC.	

Footnote	[8d] According to testing required under 4.7.1. The standards related to testing of copper are only applicable to farms that use copper-based nets or copper-treated nets.

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 [8t]	a. Identify all biocides used by the farm in net antifouling.	a. Review list of biocides and cross-check against treatment records (see 4.7.2b) and purchase records.	There was evidence that farm used two antifoulants supplied by Bayer S.A (Desis-copron = Desis-ex colors) and Cerexio (Desis-Cupreex = Desis-ex colors)	Conforming
		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.	b. Review documentary evidence to confirm compliance.	Two companies that provided antifoulants to Los Fiordos are: Bayer S.A. (active product used: copper oxide) and Cerexio (active product used: Econea). Both products are approved according with Annex II, del Reglamento (4011/2007-EEC)	

PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER	

Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [9i]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[9j] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.6.				
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.	a. Obtain and review the farm's fish health management plan.	The farm's fish health management plan IP-Sal-01 May,2016 - Version 20 was reviewed. This includes: identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites, treatments, procedures.	Conforming
		b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [9k].	b. Verify there is evidence to show that the farm's designated veterinarian [9k] reviewed and approved the current version of the plan.	It was verified that the Fish health management plan was reviewed and the current version was approved by the designated veterinarian.	

5.1.2	**Indicator**: Site visits by a designated veterinarian [9k] at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager [9l] at least once a month **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain records of visits by the designated veterinarian [9k] and fish health managers [9l]; if schedule cannot be met, a risk assessment must be provided.	a. Review documentary evidence of site visits to confirm a minimum number of visits as outlined in 5.1.2. Or review risk assessment.	Visits by the veterinary are regularly once a month and when possible twice a month. This was included in Health logbook.	Conforming
		b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed on the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [9k] and fish health manager(s) [9l].	b. Confirm visits in 5.1.2a were performed by the farm's designated health professionals.	Was confirmed that the visits were performed by designated health professionals, farm veterinary and Fish health manager. Records were reviewed in Health logbook.	
		c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b.	c. Review evidence for qualifications of the farm's health professionals.	Qualifications (Professional Title and Grade) of the marine farm health professionals were reviewed.	

Footnote	[9k] A designated veterinarian is the professional responsible for health management on the farm who has the legal authority to diagnose disease and prescribe medication. In some countries such as Norway, a fish health biologist or other professional has equivalent professional qualifications and is equivalent to a veterinarian for purposes of these standards. This definition applies to all references to a veterinarian throughout the standards document.
Footnote	[9l] A fish health manager is someone with professional expertise in managing fish health, who may work for a farming company or for a veterinarian, but who does not necessarily have the authority to prescribe medicine.

5.1.3	**Indicator**: Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner **Requirement**: 100% [9m] **Applicability**: All	a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner.	a. Review records of mortality removals to confirm completeness and accuracy. Cross check against: 5.1.4 and calculations of escapes and unexplained loss.	Dead fish are removed every day and the system used for mortality extraction is Lift up and all information is documented in Meruriau Software. Record available is called " Registro de ensilaje" (Silage register B-PRO-29, version 3 January 2015)	Conforming
		b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities.	b. Review client submission. Inspect the farm's system for mortality removals and disposals during the on-site audit.	Mortalities are collected in a container identified by wash cages, then classified in the silage store before disposal in the silage pit and treated with acid. Disposal of the silage is done by a contractor. Fish is in labor by an external company that recycles the mortalities. This is also written in a procedure and approved by Yernopesca.	
		c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification.	c. Review the farm's justification for any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis (this situation should be a rare occurrence).	There has not been evidence on current cycle of big mortality events in the farm. Since February to July, 2016: the accumulative mortality was 1,80%	

Footnote	[9d] The SAD recognizes that not all mortality events will result in dead fish present for collection and removal. However, such situations are considered the exception rather than the norm.

Note: Farms are required to maintain mortality records from the current and two previous production cycles. For first audit, records for the current and prior production cycle are required.
It is recommended that farms maintain a complete set of records to demonstrate compliance with 5.1.7 - 5.1.6.

5.1.4	**Indicator**: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis **Requirement**: 100% [9n] **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; cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and qualifications of the individual (e.g. veterinarian [9k], fish health manager [9l]); cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and classification as 'unexplained' when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6).	a. Review records of mortalities to verify completeness and to confirm that post-mortem analyses were done by qualified individuals or labs.	The farm has a procedure called "Instructivo for Necropsy" (T-Sal-02, version 20 - December 2015), and the record called "Daily Necropsy File R-SAL-01" which includes information about: date of mortality, information required by the this criterion. Necropsies are carried out mainly by farm's technical assistants and supervised by the veterinary when he is in the farm. There was also evidence of a flow chart to guide determining mortality classification and necropsy.	Conforming
		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.	b. Review records to confirm the farm had post-mortem analysis done for each mortality event and that a statistically relevant number of fish were analyzed from each mortality event.	Question 3 Farm haven't a mortality event in the current production cycle. Mortalities are recorded and classified every day. If is necessary Los Fiordos will send samples of mortality to lab to do post-mortem analysis with an external lab.	
		c. If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive and disease is suspected or results are inconclusive over a 12 week period, ensure that fish are sent to an offsite laboratory for diagnosis and keep a record of the results (5.1.6e).	c. Review records to confirm that any inconclusive on-site diagnoses were sent to an off site laboratory for further testing.	In the current production cycle there was not occurrence of inconclusive on-site diagnoses. Question 3 Farm informed to the CAA by email: "I know that an antibiotic is supplied to fish this must be carried out after analysis by a third party laboratory in order to confirm the pathogen involved. As complementary information: Assay reports supplied by external laboratories were reviewed.	
		d. Using results from 5.1.3ev, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications.	d. Review mortality events to confirm the farm's classification was consistent with results from post-mortem analyses. Where cause was not determined verify that classification was plausible given available info.	Daily Necropsy Files were reviewed, these records are kept in the production management software Meruriau.	
		e. Provide additional evidence to show how farm records in 5.1.4a-d cover all mortalities from

		5. 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).	5. Confirm that client has submitted data on mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC	
Footnote	[103] Viral disease-related mortality count must include unspecified and unexplained mortality as it could be related to viral disease.				
5.1.6	**Indicator**: Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 5%. **Requirement**: ≤ 40% of total mortalities **Applicability**: All farms with > 5% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle	1. Calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for each of the two production cycles immediately prior to the current cycle. If the first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.	1. Review, confirm, and document whether 5.1.6 is applicable to the client. If applicable, proceed to 5.1.6b.	The cumulative mortality for current production cycle (2016) and 2.68 % being mainly assessed to poor performance quality. Unexplained mortality wasn't found at inspection.	Conforming
		2. 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.	2. Review and confirm that ≤ 40% of total mortalities were from unexplained causes for each of the two previous production cycles.	No mortalities associated to viral diseases in the current production cycle (2016). Total mortality in the production cycle of this farm is not finished.	
		3. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	3. Confirm that client has submitted data on unexplained mortality to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Note: Farms have the option to integrate their farm-specific mortality reduction program into the farm's fish health management plan (5.1.1).					
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	1a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates.	1a. Confirm that the farm used mortalities records to assemble a detailed dataset on mortality rates which covers the required timeframe (see 5.1.4).	It was confirmed that the farm used mortalities records to assemble a detailed dataset on mortality rates which covers the last and the current cycle.	Conforming
		1b. 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.	1b. Review program to confirm that targets for mortality reduction are reasonable and based on historical data.	It was confirmed that the mortality reduction program developed by the farm is reasonable and based on historical company data. The targets included a reduction of 0.5% cumulative mortalities for each cycle and if the cause of mortality is not known the veterinarian advises the company is to send the samples to vets for diagnosis and to have unexplained mortalities. The action plan covers the following topics: Periodic visit veterinary. Vaccination. Biosecurity rules. Periodic samples (necropsy, etc.) Stress reduction (changed and cleaned nets) Rest period (stop feeding)	
		2. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets.	2. Interview workers to confirm their understanding of mortalities recording, classification, and annual targets for reduction (see also 5.1.1, 5.1.3).	It was confirmed through worker interviews that they had adequate understanding of mortalities records, classification, and annual targets for reduction. Farm has monthly production meetings, and the farm is working to update farming practices and procedures.	

Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[101] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.2.1, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.10.				
Instruction to Clients and CAAs for Criterion 5.2 - Records Related to Therapeutic Treatments Indicator 5.2.1 requires that farms maintain detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use. These records maintained for compliance with 5.2.1, if all consolidated into a single place, can be used to demonstrate performance against subsequent indicators (5.2.2 through 5.2.10) under Criterion 5.2.					
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, the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing, and of 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 of treatment; -amount (g) of product used; -dosage; -no of fish treated; -the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and -the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	a. Review records of chemical and therapeutant use. Verify accuracy through cross-check with purchase orders and sales records, inventories, documentation from feed manufacturer for any in-feed treatment, and veterinary records.	No treatment in the current cycle (2016)	Conforming
		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.	b. Confirm that farm has detailed records for chemical and therapeutant use that covers the previous two production cycles.	Questre 3 Farm has records available and has not treatments and no full production cycle immediately prior 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).	c. Confirm that client has submitted therapeutant information to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC	
Footnote	[102] Chemicals used for the treatment of fish.				
5.2.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of therapeutic chemicals that include antibiotics or chemicals that are prohibited 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 prescribed, banned for use or food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in (104).	a. Review list and supporting evidence. If ASC has agreed to maintain a list of relevant therapeutants, farm can demonstrate that they have this list.	List of therapeutants and supporting evidence (FDA NOFS & WHO) were reviewed. These were specified depending on the salmon species.	Minor Non-conformity
		b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles.	c. Verify records.	Questre 3 Farm didn't has records of voluntary monitoring chemical residue. Farm should have a voluntary chemical residue testing to ensure no use of prohibited substances or treatment of the audit. The farm just has an email with dates and coordination sampling by Seriespaces.	
			c. Cross-check records of therapeutant use (5.2.1a) against the list of banned therapeutants to verify compliance with requirements.	No banned therapeutants were used	
Footnote	[102] "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance. A substance banned in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries, as defined here, cannot be used in any salmon farm certified under the SASI, regardless of country of production or destination of the product. The SASI recommends that ASC maintain a list of a banned therapeutants.				
Footnote	[104] For purposes of this standard, these countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.				
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.	a. Review documentary evidence (on-farm records, veterinary records, and prescriptions) to confirm all therapeutants were prescribed by a qualified individual. See (96) for definition of veterinarian.	No treatment in the current cycle(2016)	Conforming
		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.	b. Cross-check with results from chemical residue testing provided under 5.2.2b.	Questre 3 Farm had not treatment in the current cycle and the previous cycles were in 2014 and 2011 is not same specie and the farm was not apply to certify ASC in the previous cycles.	
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).	a. Review the farm's fish health management plan to confirm inclusion of withholding periods and interview farm staff to verify implementation.	Veterinary prescriptions including withholding periods are considered in the Veterinary Health Plan and supporting documents. As example: Florfenicol antibiotic has a withholding parameter of 350 GTA (accumulated temperature units) and Emamectin benzoate (antiparasitic treatment) 1000 GTA by therapeutic. This is a procedure from AINMAPESA in compliance with FDA regulations.	Conforming
		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.	b. Review documentation for completeness and accuracy. Compare to records of therapeutant use (5.2.1a).	Withholding periods for all treatments are established by suppliers, based on bioaborption studies which vary with water temperature.	
		c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle.	c. Review documentary evidence and, if applicable, results from chemical residue testing (5.2.2b), to confirm legal withholding periods were met for the most recent production cycle and harvest.	No treatment in the current cycle (2016).	
5.2.5	**Indicator**: Maximum farm-level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score, calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII **Requirement**: PTI score ≤ 13 **Applicability**: All	a. Using farm data for therapeutants caged (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.	a. Review the farm's calculations to verify that the PTI score was calculated correctly and that the scores are accurate. Cross-check with records of parasiticide use.	No sea lice treatment in the current cycle (2016)	Conforming
		b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score.	b. Verify that the farm level cumulative PTI score ≤ 13.	PTI is 0 !!	
		c. Submit data on farm-level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.	c. Confirm that client has submitted data on cumulative PTI score to ASC (Appendix VI).	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Note: Indicator 5.2.6 does not take effect until June 13, 2017. Nonetheless farms should start collecting data on parasiticide load beforehand in case farms have to demonstrate compliance with indicator 5.2.6 at some point in the future using data from the two previous production cycles.					
5.2.6	**Indicator**: For farms with a cumulative PTI ≤ 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load is at least 15% less than of the average of the two previous production cycles **Requirement**: Yes, within five years of the publication of the SASI standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017) **Applicability**: All farms with a cumulative PTI ≤ 6 in the most recent production cycle	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.	a. Review farm's cumulative PTI score to determine if indicator 5.2.6 is applicable.	Not Applicable until 2017	N/A
		b. Using results from 5.2.5 and the weight of fish treated (kg), calculate parasiticide load in the most recent production cycle (101).	b. Review the farm's calculation of parasiticide load to verify accuracy.	Not Applicable until 2017	
		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.	c. Review farm's calculations to verify that parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle is at least 15% less than that of the two previous cycles.	Not Applicable until 2017	
		d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI).	d. Confirm that client has submitted data on parasiticide load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.	Data has been submitted to ASC.	
Footnote	[101] Parasiticide load = Sum (kg of fish treated x PTI). Reduction in load required regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABAT can calculate reduction based on the combined parasiticide load of the consolidated sites.				
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.	a. Review purchase records and calculate total amount procured by client. Inspect storage areas to verify quantities on-site.	No treatment antibiotics in the current cycle (2016) and no evidence of the drugs in the inspection at storages or documents available in the farm.	Conforming
		b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3)	b. Review log of medication events to verify that the quantity of antibiotic applied by the client does not suggest prophylactic use.	Questre 3 Farm maintains a detailed log of veterinary visits and inspections but was not evidence of the treatments in the current cycle.	
		c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.9).	c. Verify that the total amount of antibiotics used in the current production cycle is equal to the total amount prescribed.	Questre 3 Farm had not treatment in the current cycle and the previous cycles were in 2014 and 2011 is not same specie and the farm was not apply to certify ASC in the previous cycles. All information required about all treatments or veterinarian are in the PLAN VETERINARIO.	
Footnote	[106] The designated veterinarian must certify that a pathogen or disease is present before prescribing medication.				
Note 1: Farms have the option to certify only a portion of the fish or farm site when WHO-listed (107) antibiotics have been used at the production facility (see 5.2.8d). To pursue this option, farms must request an exemption from the CAB in advance of the audit and provide sufficient records giving details on which pens were treated and traceability of those fish. Note 2: It is recommended that the farm veterinarian review the WHO list (see [107]) in detail and be aware that the list is meant to show examples of members of each class of drugs, and is not inclusive of all drugs.					
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].	a. Confirm that the farm has the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics.	Was confirmed that Questre 3 farm has the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics.	Conforming
		b. If the farm has used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit.	b. During the on-site audit, verify that no antibiotics listed as "critically important" have been used on the farm through cross-check of records for 5.2.1 and 5.2.7.	No treatment has used in the current cycle (2016)	
		c. If no farm has used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in farm-wide fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit.	c. Make note of the farm's antibiotic usage and draw schedule on-site audit until the client provides additional information as specified in 5.2.8d.	No treatment has used in the current cycle (2016)	
		d. If no to 5.2.8c, request an exemption from the CAB to verify 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.	d. Review the farm's exemption request and supporting documents to verify that the farm can satisfactorily demonstrate traceability [108] to merit an exemption.	No treatment has used in the current cycle (2016)	
Footnote	[107] The third edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/en_5.pdf				
Footnote	[108] If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.				
Note: For the purposes of indicator 5.2.9, "treatment" means a single course of medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days and be applied in one or more pens (or cages).					
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.	a. Review documents to confirm that the client maintains a record of all treatments of antibiotics. Cross-check against records of on-farm chemical & therapeutant use (5.2.1a), medication events (5.2.3a), and prescription records (5.2.3b).	No treatment has used in the current cycle (2016)	Conforming
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation.	b. Confirm that the client used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.	No treatment has used in the current cycle (2016)!	
Footnote	[109] A treatment is a single course medication given to address a specific disease issue and that may last a number of days.				
Note: Indicator 5.2.10 requires that farms must demonstrate a reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABAT can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites. Indicator 5.2.10 does not take effect until June 13, 2017. Nonetheless farms should start collecting data on antibiotic load beforehand in case farms have to demonstrate compliance with Indicator 5.2.10 at some point in the future using data from the two previous production cycles.					
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 than that of the average of the two previous production cycles **Requirement**: Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SASI 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.	a. Review results to confirm whether 5.2.10 is applicable to the client. Record the results and, if applicable, proceed to 5.2.10b.	Not applicable. the requirement is full compliance by June 13, 2017	Conforming with Observations
		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.	b. Review farm's calculations for accuracy and completeness of coverage. Cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a).	Not applicable. no treatment yet. Observation: data must be submitted at the end of the 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.	c. Review evidence to verify that farm complies with requirement.	Not applicable. the requirement is full compliance by June 13, 2017	
		d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle.	d. Confirm that client has submitted data on antibiotic load to ASC (Appendix VI) as applicable.	Data has been submitted to ASC. Observation: Data must be submitted for each production cycle	
Footnote	[110] Antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotics used (kg).				
Footnote	[111] Reduction in load required, regardless of whether production increases on the site. Farms that consolidate production across multiple sites within an ABAT can calculate reduction based on the combined antibiotic load of the consolidated sites.				
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).	a. Review the farm's procedure and confirm implementation based on relevant documentary evidence (e.g. sales records, invoices).	The farm's procedure (ariel FLOW-10) was reviewed and implementation was confirmed. Lots of sales invoices with the required information, which will be available in sea Florida webpage	Conforming with Observations
		b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production.	b. Review sales records for completeness and cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a) to verify that buyers were adequately informed about therapeutants used in production.	It was possible to see this interruption in the sales invoices (Observation). Farm has certificate for the farm name, and all information was checked.	
Footnote	[112] Buyer: The company or entity to which the farm or the producing company is directly selling its product.				

Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.3.1 - Identifying the 'Expected Effect' of Medicinal Treatment Indicator 5.3.1 requires that farms identify treatments that have not produced the expected effect. The SASI Steering Committee recognizes that the "expected effect" will vary with health condition and type of medical treatment. Therefore farms and auditors will need to review the pre- and post-treatment condition of fish in order to understand and assess the impact of treatment. Calculation for percent reduction in lice abundance The DAS ID recommends that a typical baseline for effectiveness of emamectin benzoate is a minimum of 80 percent reduction in abundance of lice on the farmed fish. To determine whether treatment has produced the expected effect, farm and auditor must review pre- and post-treatment lice counts. If the calculated percent reduction in lice is < 90% then the treatment did not produce the expected effect and a bio-assay should be performed to determine whether sea lice have developed resistance. Note: If fed-based bio-assays for determining resistance are ineffective or unavailable, the farm shall have samples analysed by an independent laboratory to determine resistance formation. The auditor shall record in the audit report why fed-based bio-assays were deemed ineffective and shall include results from the laboratory analyses of resistance formation.				
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 has two successive medicinal treatments.	a. Review farm records to confirm recording of all successive medicinal treatments.	N/A	N/A
		b. Whenever the farm sees two successive treatments, keep records showing how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.	b. If applicable, review how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment.	N/A	
		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.	c. Review farm records to confirm that bioassays were done in every case where successive treatments did not produce the expected effect. Confirm that bio-assays were performed by a qualified independent laboratory.	N/A	
		d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c.	d. Verify that farm maintains records from bio-assays (as applicable).	N/A	
5.3.2	**Indicator**: When bioassay tests determine resistance, the farm shall not use the alternative pyrethroid treatment, or an immediately 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.	a. Review evidence from bio-assay tests to determine whether indicator 5.3.2 is applicable.	N/A	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.	b. If applicable, review records to verify that the farm either used an alternative treatment that is permitted in the area of operation or she harvested all fish on site.	N/A	

Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAA Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[113] See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.				
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.	a. Review records and verify fallow periods by cross-checking during interviews with farm staff and community representatives.	In National regulation, there permission of grow out salmon is by 24 months with followed period of 3 months. In the case of the Oceanfjordsa stretch the period of growth is close 33 months. Farm has a procedure for fallow and Fallow Monitoring. The records from previous and current cycle are available: Certificate of Movement Authorization (acronym in Spanish CDM) and Sanitary Certification of Movement Involved (acronym in Spanish CSM).	Conforming
		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.	b. Review evidence to confirm there were no gaps in smolt inputs > 6 months. Inspect dates during the on-site audit to see if fish size (which may be variable) is consistent with the production of a single-year class.	It was reviewed and confirmed there were no gaps in smolt inputs > 6 months. Smolt inputs started in January 28-06, 2016 and ended in January 31th, 2016. Stocked fish were 800-850 with average weight 90 gr	
			c. Verify that the available evidence shows that salmon on the site are from a single-year class.	It was verified that salmon on the site are from a single-year class.	
Footnote	[114] Gaps of up to six months between cohorts of smolts derived from the same stripping are acceptable as long as there remains a period of time when the site is fully fallow after harvest.				
Footnote	[115] Exception is allowed for: 1) farms that have fully contained production units where there is complete separation of water between units and no sharing of filtration systems or other systems that could spread disease, or; 2) farms that have zero effluent water recirculation, a pre-entry disease screening protocol, dedicated quarantine capability and biosecurity measures for waste to ensure there is no discharge of live biological material to the natural environment (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of effluent).				
5.4.2	**Indicator**: Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, [116] the farm focuses: 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance 3. Promptly State and within the ABM 4. Promptly [116] made findings publicly available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. For mortality events tagged 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 CAA.	a. Review evidence to confirm that the farm-evaluated mortality events for statistically significant increases relative to background mortality rates (compare to farm's time-series dataset in 5.1.7a).	Not applicable. There was not a statistically significant increase over background mortality into in a monthly basis.	N/A
		b. For mortality events tagged in 5.1.4a, record whether the farm did or did not suspect pass or escape undescribed transmissible agent.	b. Determine if the farm suspected any undescribed transmissible agents associated with mortality events during the most recent production cycle. An abrupt increase in unexplained mortality should be cause for suspicion.	Not applicable. There was not a statistically significant increase over background mortality into in a monthly basis.	
		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.	c. Confirm that the farm took the correct action based on results from 5.4.2a and 5.4.2b and whether 5.4.2d is applicable to the farm.	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.	d. If applicable, verify that the farm keeps records to show how each of the required steps was completed.	Not applicable.	
		e. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about undescribed 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).	e. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about undescribed transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality as applicable.	Not applicable.	
Footnote	[116] Increased mortality: A statistically significant increase over background rate on a monthly basis.				
Footnote	[117] Primary aim of monitoring and surveillance is to investigate whether a new or adapted disease is present in the area.				
Footnote	[118] Within one month.				
Instruction to Clients for Indicator 5.4.3 - Compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code Indicator 5.4.3 requires that farms show evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (see http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171). Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code. For purposes of the ASC Salmon Standard, this means that the farm must have written procedures stating how the farm will respond to an OIE-notifiable disease on the farm ("exotic" = not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (once declared free of the pathogen); An aggressive response will involve, at a minimum, the following actions: - depopulation of the infected site; - implementation of quarantine zones (see note below (in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen; and - additional actions as required under Indicator 5.4.4. To demonstrate compliance with Indicator 5.4.3, clients have the to option to describe how farm practices are consistent with the intentions of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code by developing relevant policies and procedures and integrating them into the farm's fish health management plan. Note: The Steering Committee recognizes that establishment of quarantine zones will likely incorporate mandatory depopulation of sites close to the infected site and effect some, though not necessarily all, of the ABM.				
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.	a. Verify that farm management is aware of practices described in the most current version of the code during interviews.	Current version is available- OIE 2013	Conforming
		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.	b. Review farm policies and procedures to verify that the farm has documented how its practices are consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code and Indicator 5.4.4.	Les Fondes Regulations and Procedure of Les Fondes are based on the OIE Manual.	
		c. During the on-site inspection look for evidence that policies and procedures in 5.4.3b are implemented. Cross-check in interviews with staff.	c. During the on-site inspection look for evidence that policies and procedures in 5.4.3b are implemented.	It was verified some that policies and procedures in 5.4.3b are implemented.	
Footnote	[119] Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE-notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Quarantine zones will likely incorporate mandatory depopulation of sites close to the infected site and affect some, though not necessarily all, of the ABM. Exotic signifies not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (once declared free of the pathogen).				
Footnote	[120] OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171.				
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 called the pm(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 5.4.3c describe the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4 in response to an OIE-notifiable disease on the farm.	a. Review farm policies and procedures (see 5.4.3b) to verify that the farm has documented actions in response to an OIE-notifiable disease.	Policies and procedures were reviewed and verified. This includes response to OIE diseases. The procedure implemented by the farm is linked to a general emergency response system established by a Governmental Entity (Sernapesca). The procedure describes how to act in the case of the disease presence in the managed area (farms)	N/A
		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 is not applicable.	b. Record whether there were any OIE-notifiable diseases confirmed on the farm during the current or two previous production cycles.	There is no evidence of OIE diseases or other considered in last 3 during current cycle	
		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 called the pm(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.	c. If applicable, review documentary evidence to verify the farm's response complied with the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4.	Not applicable.	
		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).	d. Confirm that client submits data to ASC (Appendix VI) about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm (as applicable).	Not applicable.	
			e. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm, verify that notifications were made to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (122).	N/A. There is no evidence of OIE diseases or other considered in last 3 during current cycle	
Footnote	[121] At the time of publication of the final draft standards, OIE-notifiable diseases relevant to salmon aquaculture were: Epizootic haematopoietic necrosis, Infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN), Infectious salmon anemia (ISA), Viral hemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and Gyrodactylosis (Gyrodactylus salaris).				
Footnote	[122] This is in addition to any notifications to regulatory bodies required under law and the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.				
Footnote	[123] Within one month.				

PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER

6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[124] Bargain collectively: A voluntary negotiation between employers and organizations of workers in order to establish the terms and conditions of employment by means of collective bargaining agreements.			
6.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence that workers have access to trade unions [if they exist] and union representative(s) chosen by workers 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.	a. was shown, using interviews and written contracts, that workers are free to belong to a labor workers Union.	Conforming
		b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. 6.1 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."	Through interviews with workers at Questre 3 farm, it was shown that they do not have time or interest to elect a president and representatives of a current workers Union.	
		c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises.	The Human resources manager of the Fondes Group, at Melinka, certainly assured that the criteria will be fulfilled one they have shown a current workers Union.	
		d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above.	It does not exist a current workers Union.	
6.1.2	**Indicator**: Evidence that workers are free to join unions, 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.	In the headquarters of Human resources, written contracts were observed showing the right and freedom of association. The policy of the company describes the freedom to form or join an organized group of workers. (Annex 01)	Conforming
		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 6.1.1).	Workers interviewed in Questre 3 farm, said that they know about being part of a workers Union, but they are not interested in being part of one	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The employer knows about the items of the criteria, and that the employees are going to be interviewed.	
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.	The interviewed workers, confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.	Conforming
		b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers.	The employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights to all workers. Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.1.3

Footnote	[121] Child: Any person under 15 years of age. A higher age would apply if the minimum age law of an area stipulates a higher age for work or mandatory schooling. Minimum age may be 14 if the country allows it under the developing country exceptions in ILO convention 138.			
Footnote	[122] Child Labor: Any work by a child younger than the age specified in the definition of a child.			
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.	Flordos company does not have young workers between 15 and 18 years of age).	Conforming
		b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.	Flordos company does not have young workers between 15 and 18 years of age).	
		c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.	Flordos company does not have young workers between 15 and 18 years of age).	
		d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.	Flordos company does not have young workers between 15 and 18 years of age).	
		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.	Flordos company does not have young workers between 15 and 18 years of age).	
		f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance.	Flordos company does not have young workers between 15 and 18 years of age).	
Footnote	[127] Young Worker: Any worker between the age of a child, as defined above, and under the age of 18.			
Footnote	[128] Protected: Workers between 15 and 18 years of age will not be exposed to hazardous health and safety conditions, working hours shall not interfere with their education and the combined daily transportation time and school time, and work time shall not exceed 10 hours.			
Footnote	[129] Hazard: The inherent potential to cause injury or damage to a person's health (e.g., unequipped to handle heavy machinery safely, and unprotected exposure to harmful chemicals).			
Footnote	[130] Hazardous work: Work that, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of workers (e.g., heavy lifting disproportionate to a person's body size, operating heavy machinery, exposure to toxic chemicals).			

Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
6.3.1	**Indicator**: Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labor **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 labor contractors or training credit programs).	The contracts are clearly defined and understood by employees of Flordos company. All the clauses and commitments on both parts (employee and employer) at all issues applying for the criteria, are described in the contract.	Conforming
		b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.	The employees interviewed know that they are free to leave workplace and manage their own time.	
		c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents.	Employer does not withhold employees original ids. This was evidenced by workers interviewed.	
		d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer.	There is a document entitled "collective labor agreement", that shows clearly all the items about salaries. Employer does not withhold any part of workers benefits. (Annex 03)	
		e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt.	Employees are not forced to stay in job to repay debt. This was evidenced by workers interviewed.	
		f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The employer knows the items of the criteria and that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	
Footnote	[131] Forced (Compulsory) Labor: All work or service that is extracted from any person under the menace of any penalty for which a person has not offered himself/herself voluntarily or for which such work or service is demanded as a repayment of debt. "Penalty" can imply monetary sanctions, physical punishment, or the loss of rights and privileges or restriction of movement (e.g., withholding of identity documents).			
Footnote	[132] Bonded labor: When a person is forced by the employer or creditor to work to repay a financial debt to the crediting agency.			

Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
Footnote	[133] Discrimination: Any distinction, exclusion or preference that has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment. Not every distinction, exclusion or preference constitutes discrimination. For instance, a merit- or performance-based pay increase or bonus is not by itself discriminatory. Positive discrimination in favor of people from disadvantaged groups may be justified in certain circumstances.			
6.4.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti- discrimination policies, procedures and practices **Requirement**: All **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.	The employer has a written anti-discrimination policy. It was evidenced in documents at the main office of the Human resources department. (Annex 04)	Conforming
		b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints.	There is a procedure document entitled: "anti discrimination in the Flordos company"	
		c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.	The employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises. This was evidenced by the workers interviewed.	
		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.	The manager and supervisors of Quatros 1 Farm received training on diversity and non-discrimination this year. Attached register(Annex 05).	
Footnote	[134] Employers shall have written anti-discrimination policies 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.			
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.	There are no records of discrimination complaints. At the workers interview, they affirm there are no discrimination practices in the company.	Conforming
		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.	The employer knows the item of the criteria. Workers would be interview to tell whether there are acts of discrimination or not.	

Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
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.	Identification of occupational risks were observed. The practical, procedures and policies to protect employees are detailed.	Conforming
		b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.	Identification of occupational risks were observed. The practical, procedures and policies to protect employees are detailed. Employees interviewed know the basics of food health practices and first aid procedures are attached. (Annex 06,07)	
		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.	A standard list and amount of drugs was observed to provide the farm. It is specified how to use the medicine properly. (Annex 08)	
Footnote	[135] Health and safety training shall include emergency response procedures and practices.			
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).	It was observed that the employer maintains a matrix of all health and safety hazards that may occur in the activities of the Flordos company.	Conforming
		b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.	Employees could Use PPE that are appropriate to do their jobs.	
		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.	The Chef of rick analysis and safety gave courses on the subject. It was evidenced at the interview and records displayed.	
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The employer knew the items of the criteria. Workers were interviewed in health and safety practices.	
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).	Risk assessments are reviewed and updated annually. It was observed in the records. (Annex 09)	Conforming
		b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c).	Employees are trained on how to identify and avoid known hazards and risks. It was observed in the records.	
		c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.5.2 a e 6.5.2 b	
6.5.4	**Indicator**: Evidence that all health and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken to prevent recurrence **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Employer records all health and safety-related accidents.	There was no incident report of emergency response in Quatros 1 farm.	Conforming
		b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety notations and investigations.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.5.4 a	
		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.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.5.4 a	
		d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.5.4 a	
6.5.5	**Indicator**: Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance coverage for the cost of medical 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.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.5.4 a	Conforming
Note: If the farm outsources its diving operations to an independent company, the farm shall ensure that auditors have access to specified information sufficient to demonstrate compliance with indicator 6.5.6. It is the farm's responsibility to obtain copies of relevant documentation (e.g. certificates) from the dive company.				
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.	Flordos company hires an external service provider. It was evidenced the records (Tapia, Ingmar given by the Harbor master of Ushuy of the divers.	Conforming
		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.	Employer maintains evidence of diver certification. (Annex 10)	

Criterion 6.6 Wages

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
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	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.	The employer keeps a document to show the minimum wage in the country of operation. This amount is 257,500 CLP equivalent to USD 391,52	Conforming
		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.	Attached a sample of an employer record (payroll). The standard work period in the farm site is 14 days high seas (8 hours per day) and 7 days off. The record confirms that the lowest worker wage exceed the legal minimum wage. (Annex 11)	
		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.	The Company maintains documentary evidence.	
Footnote	[136] Basic wage: The wages paid for a standard working week (no more than 48 hours).			
Footnote	[137] If there is no legal minimum wage in a country, basic wages must meet the industry-standard minimum wage.			
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.	Attached a document entitled: " collective labor agreement" specifying the wage, quarterly adjustments for renewal of contract and benefits. (Annex 03)	Conforming
		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.	Employer have a table of the budget of their workers and families (national census September 2013). It also has columns with: the minimum national wage updated, the time working at the company and the basic salary depending on the type of work. (Annex 12)	
		c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers.	The workers interviewed feel comfortable with their wage, claiming it is above average.	
Footnote	[138] Basic needs wage: A wage that covers the basic needs of an individual or family, including housing, food and transport. This concept differs from a minimum wage, which is set by law and may or may not cover the basic needs of workers.			
6.6.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of transparency in wages and in rendering [139] **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.	Attached a wage record of a technical worker of Quatros 1 farm, Fulfilling the requirements of the criteria. (Annex 11)	Conforming
		b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers.	The company gave training courses for the employees. They understood clearly some points of the monthly payment report card. The workers interviewed correctly questioned about their salaries.	
		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.	All the employees have a current account card in a local Bank. Can be: "Banco Estado Chile", "BBVA, Falabella, BCI, Santander. Flordos company use the electronic payment method.	
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	The employer knows that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	
Footnote	[139] Payments shall be rendered to workers in a convenient manner.			

Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labor) including subcontracting

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
6.7.1	**Indicator**: Percentage of workers who have contracts [141] **Requirement**: 100% **Applicability**: All	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.	Employer maintains all employment contracts records. This is evidenced in the written contracts seen at the Human resources office (Annex 13 and Annex 14)	Conforming
		b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.7.1 a	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.7.1 a	
Footnote	[141] Labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes are not acceptable. This includes revolving/consecutive labor contracts to deny benefit accrual or equitable remuneration. False Apprenticeship Scheme: The practice of hiring workers under apprenticeship terms without stipulating terms of the apprenticeship or wages under contract. It is a "false" apprenticeship if its purpose is to underpay people, avoid legal obligations or employ underage workers. Labor-only contracting arrangement: The practice of hiring workers without establishing a formal employment relationship for the purpose of avoiding payment of regular wages or the provision of legally required benefits, such as health and safety protections.			
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.	The Flordos company showed the policy and the agreement to ensured that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services have socially responsible practices and risk procedures. (Annex 15)	Conforming
		b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.	It was shown the updated records data from contractors who provided services to the company at Quatros 1 Farm.	
		c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.	The employer is always monitoring the activities that involves security equipment.	

Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
6.8.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner.	There is a conflict resolution policy in Flordos company. However, they prefer to dialogue with their workers to settle any scarrelling submitted. (Annex 16)	Conforming
		b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access.	The worker cad maintaining direct verbal contact with their supperiors and human resources if any complaint or disputa arose.	
		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.	The employees interviewed said that there is no complaints on the theme of conflict resolution.	
6.8.2	**Indicator**: Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [142] within a 30-day timeframe **Requirement**: 100% **Applicability**: All	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised.	There are no records or cases about complaints and labor conflicts.	Conforming
		b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.8.2 a	
		c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 30-day timeframe.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.8.2 a	
Footnote	[142] Addressed: Acknowledged and resolved, moving through the company's process for grievances, corrective action taken when necessary.			

Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
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.	Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity. This was evidenced by workers interviewed.	Conforming
		b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors.	There are no cases of corporeal punishment, mental abuse, physical coercion, etc.	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.	The employer knows the item of the criteria. Workers would be interviewed to tell whether there are abusive disciplinary actions.	
Footnote	[144] Mental Abuse: Characterized by the intentional use of power, including verbal abuse, isolation, sexual or racial harassment, intimidation or threat of physical force.			
6.9.2	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fair/caring disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [145] **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [145].	The employer has a written policy on disciplinary measures and procedures rules (other than health or work) it is also further detailed at the paragraph six of the employee contract.	Conforming
		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.	There are no cases about the disciplinary action policy.	
Footnote	[145] If disciplinary action is required, progressive verbal and written warnings shall be engaged. The aim shall always be to improve the worker; dismissal shall be the last resort. Policies for bonuses, incentives, access to training and promotions are clearly stated and understood, and not used arbitrarily. Fines or basic wage deductions shall not be acceptable disciplinary practices.			

Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime

		Compliance criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
Note: Working hours, night work and rest periods for workers in agriculture should be in accordance with national laws and regulations or collective agreements (e.g. The Safety and Health in Agriculture Convention, 2001). Additional information can be found on the website of the International Labor Organization (www.ilo.org).				
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.	The third point mentioned at the employment contract talks about the work mode(14 works day and 7 off) detailing a total of 45 hours weekly working. The overtime is also detailed at the contract.	Conforming
		b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law.	The own records at the farm site (time sheets and payroll) showed that farm workers do not exceed international standards and additional hours are compensated.	
		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).	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 6.10.1 a	
		d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	The employer knows that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.	
Footnote	[145] In cases where local legislation on working hours and overtime exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime), the international standards will apply.			
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 interviewed knows how much was the amount paid for overtime work. The Human resources area of Flordos company Malinka did the training.	Conforming
		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).	Workers interviewed said that overtime is given on limited occasions. For example: When you have to attend a boat of raw material (fiscal fish) arriving by lunch times.	
		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.	The employer knows 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.	
Footnote	[146] Compulsory overtime is permitted if previously agreed to under a collective bargaining agreement.			
Footnote	[147] Premium rate: A rate of pay higher than the regular work week rate. Must comply with national laws/regulations and/or industry standards.			

Criterion 6.11 Education and training

		Compliance criteria	Evidence	Evaluation

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.	Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers.	Conforming
		b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees).	Attached records of workers participation in educational opportunities courses: "Management and production of fishes" dictated by the Major University. (Annex 17)	
		c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	The employer knows that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company.	

Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility

		Compliance criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
6.12.1	**Indicator**: Demonstration of company-level (CoB) 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 labor requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11.	All the Pandas company -level policies are in line with all social and labor requirements enumerated in this evaluated principle.	Conforming
		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.	All the 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).	The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covered all Pandas 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).	Quotes 1 Farm from Pandas Company provided access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above).	
Footnote	(CoB) Applies to the headquarters of the company in a region or country where the site applying for certification is located. The policy that relates to all of the company's operations in the region or country, including grow-out, smolt production and processing facilities.			

PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN

Criterion 7.1 Community engagement

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
7.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of regular and meaningful (CoB) consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All	a. The farm proactively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).	In a meeting with: Mrs. Daniela Aguilar- In charge of the culture department Molinka municipality, Ms. Lizetty Melendez- In charge of the education department Molinka municipality, Mr. Jorge Valdebenito- School Director, Mr. Pablo Navia- 2° Sergeant, Harbormaster, it was evident that Pandas Molinka has been proactively involved in lahabitat economic or social community activities and hiring local people. This people feel that Molinka has gained an strategic ally to rely on.	Conforming
		b. Consultations are meaningful. (OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.	The method used by Pandas company in the year 2015 was first a "consulting meeting" with the city council to publicize who they are, production plan, employees and partners, care for the environment, health care, and the Pandas Molinka Community relationship and complaint procedures. There has been a second "consultative meeting" with the mariscos, pelicas (called in Chile "Caradonera") and population. Community Relationship staff is thinking if they give the progress of the activities this year or it's a scheme for the 2017.	
		c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.	Since a month Pandas company leads a meeting with the social community network of Molinka. This involved: the municipality, the country service, the health care center, the school director, the Harbormaster, the public library, the Fisheries Development Institute and the NGO recycled and reused SCD - WWF. Also refer to the written evidence in the criteria 7.1.1.	
		d. Consultations include communication above, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see indicator 7.1.3).	Meeting with the local community using slideshow, include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments.	
		e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, reports) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.	Attached records and documentary evidence (Annex 18)	
		f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.	The employer knows that the local community will be interviewed to confirm the above.	
Footnote	(CoB) Regular and meaningful: Meetings shall be held at least bi-annually with elected representatives of affected communities. The agenda for the meetings should in part be set by the community representatives. Participatory Social Impact Assessment methods may be one option to consider here.			
7.1.2	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of an effective, transparent and accessible process for receiving, recording, and responding to 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.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.1.1 a	Conforming
		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).	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.1.1 b	
		c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective (based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.1.1 c	
		d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.1.1 d	
Footnote	(CoB) Effective: In order to demonstrate that the mechanism is effective, evidence of resolutions of complaints can be given.			
7.1.3	**Indicator**: Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice (CCL) at the farm during times of therapeutic treatments and has, expert 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 emamectin baths is not regarded a therapeutant)	Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. They use a visible orange flag. Also it's loaded in the web page of the company.	Conforming
		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).	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.1.1 a	
		c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1).	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.1.1 d	
		d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above.	The employer knows that the local community will be interviewed to confirm the above.	
Footnote	(CCL) Signage shall be visible to mariners and, for example, to fishermen passing by the farm.			

Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aborigINal cultures and traditional territories

		Compliance Criteria	Evidence	Evaluation
Instruction to Clients and CoAs on Criterion 7.2 - Traditional Territories of Indigenous Groups The ASC Salmon Standard requires that farms must be respectful of the traditional territories of indigenous groups. The indicators listed under Criterion 7.2 were designed to fulfill this purpose in a manner consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In many locales, the territorial boundaries of indigenous groups have a defined legal status according to local or national law. In such cases, it is straightforward to know whether a farm is operating in close proximity to indigenous people. However, when boundaries of indigenous territories are undefined or unknown, there is no simple way to establish whether the farm is operating in close proximity to indigenous groups. Here ASC provides the following guidance. The intent behind the ASC Salmon Standard is that the farm will identify all neighboring groups who are potentially negatively impacted by the farm's activities. The actual physical distance between the farm and an indigenous group is less important than understanding whether the farm is having a detrimental impact upon its neighbors. Effective community consultations are one of the best ways to identify such impacts to neighbor groups. Through a transparent process of consultation, indigenous groups who are put under "stress" by the farm will identify themselves and voice their concerns about the nature of the farm's impacts. Continued consultations between farm and neighbors should create a forum where any ISSUES can be discussed and resolved.		
7.2.1	**Indicator**: Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aborigINal people [152]	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.	There are semi-indigenous or roots aborigINal people settle at the (No Suggestions) archipelago. The PU- WWF community live in Pandas Molinka, capital of the archipelago located at the Ascencion island. They live as normal people doing fishing works. Pandas company has a reference list of the actual indigenous groups at the Aysén province.	Conforming
		b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.	Farm management demonstrates with the meetings an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.	
		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.	Pandas company consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence. (Annex 19)	
		d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above.	The lead representative of the indigenous group was advised that he may be interviewed in the ASC auditing process.	
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 proximity to indigenous or aborigINal people [152]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.2.1 a	Conforming
		b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.2.1 d	
Footnote	(152) All standards related to indigenous rights only apply where relevant, based on proximity of indigenous territories.			
7.2.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [152] 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.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.2.1 a	Conforming
		b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) Established a protocol agreement with indigenous community and this fact is documented; or 2) Continued engagement in an active process [152] to reach a protocol agreement with the indigenous community.	Meetings with PU - WWF community have been taking to know their concerns , helping in rescue workshops traditions in crafts and fishing and making handicrafts. (Annex 20)	
		c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable.	Refer to the evidence written in the criteria 7.2.1 d	
Footnote	(152) To demonstrate an active process, a farm must show ongoing efforts to communicate with indigenous communities, an understanding of key community concerns and responsiveness to key community concerns through adaptive farm management and other actions.			

Criterion 7.3 Access to resources

		Compliance Criteria		
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 [153] to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under indicator 7.3.2).	Quotes 1 Farm from Pandas Company- knows about the natural resources of the community. They have an evaluation document, with research and results, called "Access to resources ". (Annex 20)	Conforming
		b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.	There are no changes that restrict access to vital community resources.	
		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.	The employer knows that representatives from the community will be interviewed to confirm that the farm has not restricted access to vital resources.	
Footnote	(154) Vital community resources can include freshwater, land or other natural resources that communities rely on for their livelihood. If a farm site were to block, for example, a community's sole access point to a needed freshwater resource, this would be unacceptable under the Dialogue standard.			
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.	Quotes 1 Farm have no negative impact upon access to natural resources. Refer to the evidence attached in the criteria 7.3.1 a	Conforming
		b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a.	The employer knows that representatives from the community will be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2 a.	

INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION

A farm seeking certification must have documentation from all of its smolt suppliers to demonstrate compliance with the following standards. The requirements are, in general, a subset of the standards in Principles 1 through 7, focusing on the impacts that are most relevant for smolt facilities. In addition, specific standards are applied to open system (net pens), and to closed and semi-closed systems (recirculation and flow-through).

Footnote: (153) The SAD SC proposes this approach to addressing environmental and social performance during the smolt phase of production. In the medium term, the SC anticipates a system to audit smolt production facilities on site. In the meantime, farms will need to work with their smolt suppliers to generate the necessary documentation to demonstrate compliance with the standards. The documentation will be reviewed as part of the audit at the grow-out facility.

SECTION B: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT

Standards related to Principle 1

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAR Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
B 1	**Indicator**: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and water quality, including 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 V1).	a. Review the farm's list of smolt suppliers. Confirm that the client submitted to ASC information on the type of production system used by smolt suppliers (Appendix V1).	There was evidence that information concerning the smolt supplier was sent to ASC	Conforming
		b. Where legal authorization related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits.	b. Verify that client obtains copies of legal authorization from smolt suppliers (if applicable).	There was evidence of legal authorization for smolt supplier (Piscicultura Llama, RCA 139/2009)	
		c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required.	c. Verify that farm obtains records from smolt suppliers to show compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements.	Laboratory reports issued by Aquagestion according with resolution DGS 2521/2012. All reports complied with environmental requirements	
			d. Verify that farm keeps records to show how smolt suppliers comply with regulations on discharge and applicable permitting requirements related to water quality.	Laboratory reports issued by Aquagestion according with resolution DGS 2521/2012. All reports complied with environmental requirements	
B 2	**Indicator**: Compliance with labor laws and regulations **Requirement**: Yes **Applicability**: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labor laws and regulations.	a. Verify farm obtains declaration from smolt suppliers.	Statement in smolt suppliers' Social Responsibility Policy and added in Declaration signed by Sub Manager in August 2016	Conforming
		b. Keep records of supplier inspections for compliance with national labor laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation, see 1.1.3b).	b. Verify that farm obtains inspection records from suppliers (as applicable).	No evidence of inspections in the present year. Inspections by authorities to check compliance with national labor laws and codes are not mandatory in Chile.	

Standards related to Principle 2

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAR Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Note: if the smolt facility has previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact (e.g. as part of the regulatory permitting process), the farm may obtain and use such documents as evidence to demonstrate compliance with indicator B.3 as long as all components are covered.					
B 3	**Indicator**: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems. Assessment includes 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.	A. Review the assessment to confirm that it complies with all components outlined in Appendix I.	Evidence reviewed: documents "Evaluation impact procedure Llama (Piscicultura Llama)" "Biodiversidad acuática" and " Biodiversidad de fauna terrestre en piscicultura Llama" Technical reports N° 1 issued on October, 2014, N°2 issued February 2015 and N° 3 issued June 2016 by the company AQUA	Conforming
		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.	B. Review declaration.	Quotes 1 Farm interned into and the declaration signed by Sub Manager on August 2016 was reviewed.	

Instruction to Clients for Indicator B.4 - Calculating Total Phosphorus Released per Ton of Fish Produced
Farms must confirm that each of their smolt suppliers complies with the requirement of indicator B.4. This specifies the maximum amount of phosphorus that a smolt production facility can release into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period. The requirement is set at 5 kg/mt for the first three years from date of publication of the SAD Standard, and then it drops to 4 kg/mt thereafter. The calculation of total phosphorus released is made using a "mass balance" approach. Detailed instructions and formulas are given in Appendix IV-1.
If applicable, farms may take account of any physical removals of phosphorus in the form of sludge provided there is evidence to show:
- the smolt supplier has records showing the total quantity of sludge removed from site over the relevant time period;
- the appropriate determined phosphorus concentration (%P) is removed sludge by sampling and analyzing representative batches; and
- the sludge was properly disposed off site and in accordance with the farm's biosolid management plan.

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAR Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
B 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 V4-1) **Requirement**: 5 kg/mt of fish produced for the first three years from date 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.	A. Verify that farm has records for feeds used by smolt suppliers over the relevant time period.	Report with calculation of phosphorus release to the Environment in Piscicultura Llama -Chersyan included detailed information concerning: sludges, dates and amounts, from July 2015 until June 2016 (total 208.192 kg).	Conforming
		b. For all feeds used by the smolt suppliers (result from B.4a), keep records showing phosphorus content as determined by chemical analysis or based on feed supplier declaration (Appendix V4-1).	B. Verify that farm has records showing that smolt supplier determined phosphorus content in feeds.	In the payment agency by the Nutritional Sub Manager, Cristian Daniels mentioned that these data have 1.5% to 1.8% for phosphorus. Los Pandas considered 2% at moment of the calculation	
		c. Using the equation from Appendix V4-1 and results from B.4a and b, calculate the total amount of phosphorus added as feed during the last 12 months of smolt production.	C. Confirm that calculations are done according to Appendix V4-1.	Total feed supplied was 208.192 kg. (Pandera-Sera) phosphorous added was 1.1 kg/MT	
		d. Obtain from smolt suppliers records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced (formula in Appendix V4-1) during the past 12 months.	D. Verify that farm obtained from the smolt supplier all records needed to calculate the amount of biomass produced during the past 12 months.	Total biomass produced was 1.881321 kg.	
		e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from B.4d) using the formula in Appendix V4-1.	E. Confirm that calculations are done according to Appendix V4-1.	Amount of P in fish biomass was 1.724 kg (% of P in fish: 0.00214%)	
		f. If applicable, obtain records from smolt suppliers showing the total amount of P removed in sludge. Formula in Appendix V4-1) during the past 12 months.	F. As applicable, verify farm has records showing that smolt supplier determined the amount of phosphorus removed from the system as sludge.	Farm provided all dispatch guides with quantity (kilo) of sludge removed in from the system by an authorized company. Also provided the used for the calculation of phosphorus removed in sludge: 1.352 Kg	
		g. Using the formula in Appendix V4-1 and results from B.4a-f (above), calculate total phosphorus released per ton of smolt produced and verify that the smolt supplier is in compliance with requirements.	G. Review calculations to confirm that the farm's smolt supplier(s) do not exceed requirements for release of phosphorus.	The calculations confirmed the farm's smolt supplier did not exceed requirements for P released and were reviewed. All these records are attached as evidence.	

Standards related to Principle 3

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAR Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
B 5	**Indicator**: If a narrative species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard **Requirement**: Yes [137] **Applicability**: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [137]	a. Obtain written evidence showing whether the smolt supplier produces a non-native species or not. If not, indicator B.5 does not apply.	A. Verify that the farm has evidence that their smolt suppliers do not produce non-native species. If the farm can show that smolt suppliers produces only native species, then indicator B.5 does not apply.	Farm has document required by law: Sanitary Resolution Authorization N° 3.2.2.2.1.1.1.1 issued always before transferring smolt to the farm. Smolt supplier produces a non-native species.	Conforming
		b. Provide the farm with documentary evidence that the narrative species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard. (See definition of area under 3.2.1.).	B. If applicable, verify the farm has evidence from smolt suppliers confirming when the narrative species was first brought into wide commercial production in the area where production is occurring now.	Evidenced by mean of statistical data supplied by the National Fishery Service (SERNAPESCA) Since 1990	
		c. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for B.5b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish.	C. Review evidence to confirm that smolt suppliers use only 100% sterile fish.	Yes	
		d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for B.5b or B.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; 3) Barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.	D. Review evidence that the farm's smolt suppliers comply with each point noted in B.5d.	Yes	
		e. Revise evidence as described in B.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.	E. Verify that farm retains evidence of compliance by all smolt suppliers.	See above.	
Footnote	(137) Publication: Refers to the date when final standards and accompanying guidelines are completed and made publicly available. This definition of publication applies throughout this document.				
Footnote	(137) Exceptions shall be made for production systems that use 100 percent sterile fish or systems that demonstrate separation from the wild to effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained to ensure no escapes of reared specimens or biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce.				
B.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [138] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement**: 300 fish [100] **Applicability**: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [139]	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.	According to resolution 3612/2005, the farm reports fish events (contingencies, escapes, etc.) every a year to SERNAPESCA. This was checked during the audit, with Declaration 4175 signed by Sub-Manager Claudio Camilla that Piscicultura Llama has not presented fish in contingency, and statement by Sub-manager in August 2016. In addition, auditor checked daily escape check list and found no register of escapees.	Conforming
		b. Using smolt supplier records from B.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.	B. Review the farm's calculation and confirm that the smolt supplier complied with the requirement.	N/A. There have been no escapees. This was confirmed by Sernapesca in the Declaration 4175 and statement by Sub Manager (August 2016)	
		c. Inform smolt suppliers in writing that monitoring records described in B.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 [139]).	C. Confirm that the farm informs their smolt suppliers that they must maintain records for escape monitoring for > 10 years.	The farm informed the smolt supplier of these requirements by mail	
		d. If an escape episode occurs at the smolt production facility (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escape), the farm may request a new exception to the Standard [139]. 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.	D. Review the farm's request for a new exception to the Standard for an escape event at the smolt production site. Confirm no prior exceptional events were documented during the previous 10 years, or since the date of the start of the production cycle during which the farm first applied for certification. An example of an exceptional event is a combination of the farm. Events that are not considered exceptional include failures in moorings due to bad weather and boat traffic incidents due to poor marking of the smolt production facility.	N/A. There have been no escapes. This was confirmed by Sernapesca in the Declaration 4175 and statement by Sub Manager (August 2016)	
Footnote	(138) Escapees shall report all escapees, the total aggregated number of escapees per production cycle must be less than 300 fish.				
Footnote	(139) A rare exception to this standard may be made for an escape event that is clearly documented as being outside of the farm's control. Only one such exceptional episode is allowed in a 10-year period for the purposes of this standard. The 10-year period starts at the beginning of the production cycle for which the farm is applying for certification. The farmer must demonstrate that there was no reasonable way to predict the events that caused the episode. Extreme weather (e.g., 100 year storms) or accidents caused by farms located near high traffic waterways are not intended to be covered under this exception.				
B.7	**Indicator**: Accuracy [140] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish **Requirement**: 100% **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.	A. Confirm that the farm keeps records of counting accuracy for the counting technology or method used on site at stocking and harvest.	Counting is done with Biosystem Vaki Model 2000. Counting accuracy is about 99% according with the specifications of the supplier of the equipment.	Conforming
		b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is 100%.	B. Verify that farm has records showing that the accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is 100%.	It was verified that farm has records showing that the accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is > 98%.	
Footnote	(140) Accuracy shall be determined by the spec sheet for counting machines and through common estimates of error for any hand counts.				

Standards related to Principle 4

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAR Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
B.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.	A. Confirm that the farm has relevant policies on file from each smolt supplier and review those policies to verify the farm's suppliers are in compliance with the requirement.	Policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste was available in Piscicultura Llama (Chersyan). And there is a declaration by Sub-Manager Claudio Camilla on August 2016 that confirmed the policy of the company is proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste.	Conforming

Note: see instructions for indicator A.6.1.

B.9	**Indicator**: Presence of an energy use management plan for the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection J for guidance and required components of the records and assessment) **Requirement**: Yes, required if a	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year.	A. Verify that the farm obtains records for energy consumption from smolt suppliers.	Smolt supplier: Piscicultura Llama-Chersyan has records for energy consumption (electricity) and reports done by Carbonzero.	Conforming
		b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in ktOpodes (kJ) during the last year	B. Verify that the farm has reviewed the supplier's calculations for completeness and accuracy.	Was verified that the calculation was done in the report called GG Emissions Assessment for AGC developed by Carbonzero. which included total consumption in ktOpodes (kJ)	
		c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year.	C. Verify that the farm has supplier records for total weight of fish produced during the last year.	All the information of total weight of fish was recorded by Marinalva software. For 3 years: 2013, 2014 - 2015 and January to May 2016. Marinalva is a Production software used by Los Pandas company.	

	kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	d. Confirm that the smolt supplier used results from 8.3b and 8.3c to calculate energy consumption on the supplier's facility as required and that the units are reported as kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa cycle.	D. Verify that the farm has records to show that the smolt supplier's calculations are complete and accurate.	There was evidence that smolt supplier Piscicultura Llaima -Cherquenco has record of energy consumption through production cycle and were reported as kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa kilopaskal/kPa cycle, documented in the GHG report developed by Carbonfootprint.	
		e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V. E. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a e.	E. Verify that the farm has evidence that its smolt supplier(s) has undergone an energy use assessment verifying the supplier's energy consumption.	Species 7 Farm has evidence that its smolt supplier (Piscicultura Llaima -Cherquenco) has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V. E. This could be verified.	
Note: see instructions for Indicator 4.6.c.					
8.10	**Indicator:** Records of greenhouse gas (GHG) (kilo) emissions (kilo) at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment (See Appendix V. Greenhouse). **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility.	A. Verify that the farm obtains records of GHG emissions from smolt suppliers.	Data records for GHG emissions were available and all calculations were performed by an external services called Carbonfootprint.	Conforming
		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. E.	B. Verify that the farm confirms that calculations by smolt suppliers are done annually and in compliance with Appendix V. E.	Was verified that calculations were done by Carbonfootprint in compliance with requirements of Appendix V. E	
		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.	C. Verify that the farm has records from smolt suppliers for all emissions factors used and their sources.	Was verified that this calculation was evaluated by Carbonfootprint. Refer to the report : Cálculo de la Huella de Carbono de - INFORME TÉCNICO SHOREFASTORE LTD. FORDOS - August, 2016. Los Fiordos added internal control from the company including information since January to May 2016 has had reports 2014 and 2015. The supplier documents the source of the emissions factors. All sources of emission were used in the analysis: Emisiones de GEI, kgCO2e and Huella de carbon ontario, kgCO2e /smolts	Conforming
		d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO2 gases to CO2 equivalents, confirm that the smolt supplier specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source.	D. Verify that the farm has records from smolt suppliers for all GWPs used and their sources.	Was verified that this calculation was evaluated by Carbonfootprint. Refer to the report : Cálculo de la Huella de Carbono de - INFORME TÉCNICO SHOREFASTORE LTD. FORDOS - August, 2016. Los Fiordos added internal control from the company including information since January to May 2016 has had reports 2014 and 2015. The supplier documents the source of the emissions factors. All sources of emission were used in the analysis: Emisiones de GEI, kgCO2e and Huella de carbon ontario, kgCO2e /smolts	
		e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V.F at least annually.	E. Verify that the farm has evidence that smolt suppliers undergo a GHG assessment annually and that the methods used are in compliance with requirements of Appendix V. E.	This was verified and the methods used are in compliance with requirements of Appendix V. E.	
Footnote	(261) For the purposes of this standard, GHGs are defined as the six gases listed in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO2); methane (CH4); nitrous oxide (N2O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulphur hexafluoride (SF6).				
Footnote	(262) GHG emissions must be reported using recognized methods, standards and records as outlined in Appendix V.				

Standards related to Principle 5

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of fish health management plans from smolt suppliers.	Veterinary Health Plan Piscicultura Llaima -Cherquen (PLLEN-VH.05) Version 6, March 2016.	Conforming
		b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian.	B. Verify that farm has evidence that supplier's fish health management plan was approved by designated veterinarian.	The Veterinary Health Plan was approved by the farms veterinary. with evidence of this degree as veterinarian by the Universidad Austral de Chile.	
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 (160) **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.	A. Review list and the supporting analysis.	Main significant diseases (PKLIS01) are included in the Veterinary Health Plan	Conforming
		b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence.	B. Review list and the supporting analysis.	Smolt vaccination is established by Sanitary Regulation. The veterinary prescription supplied by Piscicultura Llaima-Cherquen veterinary was available.	
		c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received.	C. Verify claims has the risk from the smolt supplier(s).	Veterinary Prescription (PRV-14V-135-SPI-09-SL-SJR-04-1) includes all information regarding IHF vaccines. supplied to smolts (840-850 to Species 7 Farm)	
		d. Demonstrate, using the tools 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.	D. Cross-check lists to verify that all required vaccines were received by all batches of smolt received by the farm during the current production cycle.	Evidence in veterinary prescription (PRV) and daily vaccination report supplied by external services responsible for vaccination.	
Footnote	(263) The farm's designated veterinarian is responsible for undertaking and providing written documentation of the analysis of the diseases that pose a risk in the region and the vaccines that are effective. The veterinarian shall determine which vaccinations to use and demonstrate to the auditor that this decision is consistent with the analysis.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.13 - Testing of Smolt for Select Diseases
The farm is responsible for developing and maintaining a list of diseases of regional concern for which each smolt group should be tested. The list of diseases shall include diseases that originate in freshwater and are proven or suspected to occur in seawater (and for which seawater fish-to-fish transmission is a concern).
The designated veterinarian (in the smolt supplier) is required to evaluate, based on scientific criteria and publicly available information, which diseases should be tested for. This analysis shall include an evaluation of whether clinical disease or a pathogen carrier state in fresh water is deemed to have a negative impact on the grow-out phase, thereby disqualifying a smolt group from being transferred.
Note: A "smolt group" is defined as a population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry, and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents for each group.

8.13	**Indicator:** Percentage of smolt groups (264) 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 (as shall be supported by scientific analysis as described in the instruction above.	A. Review list. If auditor has questions about the list, request and review supporting analysis.	Lately analyzed in the farm had their Sanitary Program (Programa Sanitario) and Sanitary Plan backed up by PMV. This document must be issued by the National Fishery Service (SERNAPESCA). Assay report (DA-L-293) from Enzima laboratory	Conforming
		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).	B. Verify records show that each smolt group was tested prior to entering the water at the farm (the grow-out site).	Records confirm that each smolt group received by Species 7 farm has been tested for the diseases in the list, as is required by Chilean Sanitary Law	
Footnote	(264) A smolt group is any population that shares disease risk, including environment, husbandry and host factors that might contribute to sharing disease agents for each group. Only diseases that are proven, or suspected, on occurring in seawater (and for which seawater fish-to-fish transmission is a concern) but originating in freshwater should be on the list of diseases tested. The designated veterinarian (in the smolt farm) is required to evaluate, based on scientific criteria and publicly available information, which diseases should be tested for. This analysis shall include an evaluation of whether clinical disease or a pathogen carrier state in fresh water is deemed to have a negative impact on the grow-out phase, thereby disqualifying a smolt group from being transferred. A written analysis must be available to the certifier on demand.				
8.14	**Indicator:** Detailed information, provided by the veterinarian, on pharmaceuticals, 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 the treatment was used on, the diseases, proof of proper use, 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; name of the chemical or therapeutant; reason for use (specific disease); date(s) of treatment; amount (g/l of product used; dosage; fish/ID treated; the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.B); and the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant.	A. Review records of chemical and therapeutant use for compliance and confirm the records were signed by a qualified veterinarian.	Records of chemical and therapeutant use were reviewed for completeness and it was confirmed that the records were signed by a qualified veterinarian.	Conforming
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.(a) 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).	A. Verify list has been provided and is consistent with the list in 5.2.(a.	The list and supporting evidence were reviewed that MPS & AHEQ and the list is consistent with the list in 5.2.(a.	Conforming
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	B. Verify that the farm informed the smolt supplier.	Declaration by manager of Piscicultura Llaima-Cherquen was available, and it was verified that the farm informed the smolt supplier.	
		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.	C. Review farm's comparison to verify accuracy.	Declaration by veterinary was available and confirmed that no therapeutants from Smolt supplier with veterinary folder.	
Footnote	(265) "Banned" means proactively prohibited by a government entity because of concerns around the substance.				
Footnote	(266) For purposes of this standard, those countries are Norway, the UK, Canada, Chile, the United States, Japan and France.				
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).	A. Verify farm obtains treatment records from smolt supplier (see also 8.14A).	No treatments by smolt supplier.	Conforming
		b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle.	B. Confirm that the smolt supplier used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.	No treatments by smolt supplier.	
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).	A. Confirm that the farm provided smolt supplier with the current copy of the WHO list of antibiotics.	Farm has supplied smolt supplier with WHO List, current version was available.	Conforming
		b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17c) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification.	B. Verify that the farm informed the smolt supplier.	Declaration of Farm that informed to smolt supplier the antibiotics on the WHO list cannot be used on fish sold from 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.	C. Review farm's comparison to verify accuracy.	Species 7 Farm patients because no treatments were used at the Smolt supplier.	
Footnote	(267) The 3rd edition of the WHO list of critically and highly important antimicrobials was released in 2009 and is available at: http://www.who.int/foodborne_disease/resistance/CIA_3.pdf.				
Footnote	(268) If the antibiotic treatment is applied to only a portion of the pens on a farm site, fish from pens that did not receive treatment are still eligible for certification.				
Note: see instructions for Indicator 5.4.c regarding evidence of compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.					
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 refers the supplier how to access it from the internet).	A. Verify that farm has provided the smolt supplier with copies of (or access to) the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	It was verified that the farm has provided the smolt supplier with copies of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Conforming
		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.	B. Confirm that the farm informed its smolt supplier(s) that any supplier to an ASC-certified farm must show compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	Statement and Health management plan was done according to OIE Code. The smolt supplier (Piscicultura Llaima-Cherquenco) confirmed that 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 supplier's policies and procedures that are relevant to demonstrate compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	C. Review the smolt supplier's declaration and supporting policies and procedures to verify compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code.	It was verified that the procedures and policies comply with OIE Code.	
Footnote	(269) Compliance is defined as farm practices consistent with the intentions of the Code, to be further outlined in auditing guidance. For purposes of this standard, this includes an aggressive response to detection of an exotic OIE notifiable disease on the farm, which includes depopulating the infected site and implementation of quarantine zones in accordance with guidelines from OIE for the specific pathogen. Exotic agents not previously found in the area or had been fully eradicated (prior declared free of the pathogen).				
Footnote	(270) OIE 2011. Aquatic Animal Health Code. http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171.				

Standards related to Principle 6

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
8.19	**Indicator:** Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labor 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 labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	A. Verify that farm obtains copies of company-level policies and procedures from all of its smolt suppliers and a declaration of compliance.	It was verified that farm obtains copies of company-level policies and procedures and declaration of compliance from all of its smolt suppliers.	Conforming
		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 labor standards under 6.1 to 6.11.	B. Review supplier documents provided by the farm to verify compliance of the smolt supplier's policies and procedures with labor requirements.	Compliance of the smolt supplier's policies and procedures with labor requirements was verified	

Standards related to Principle 7

		Compliance Criteria (Required Client Actions):	Auditor Evaluation (Required CAB Actions):	Evidence	Evaluation
Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.20 - Consultation and Engagement with Community Representatives Farms must comply with Indicator 7.5.1 which requires that farms engage in regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations. Under Indicator 8.20, farms must show how each of their smolt suppliers complies with an equivalent requirement. Farms are obligated to maintain evidence that is sufficient to show their suppliers remain in full compliance. Evidence shall be documentary (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, reports) and will substantiate the following: -the smolt supplier engaged in "regular" consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually); -the consultations included a wide range of "community representatives" and organizations (see definition); -the supplier's consultations included participation by elected representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda.				
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.	A. Verify that farm obtains required information from each smolt supplier.	Los Fiordos has a procedure called "Consultas" P-SOC-Sp-01 which is related with the community. Farm must have consultations with he community twice a year (bi-annually) and must be in a formal way without negative impacts on the community. Another way to conduct this consulting is via the webpage where each person can send anonymous message to the company. Los Fiordos has a procedure called "Consultas" P-SOC-Sp-01 specifies that the company must contact the affected persons and resolve the problem in a maximum of 30 days. Los Fiordos shows very good work with the community around the smolt farms. There is evidence of having workshops with different topics to help the community (e.g.: hand craft, masonry, etc.) and with these workshop the people learn new trades or skills and have other sources of income.	Conforming
		b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements.	B. Review evidence for compliance.	Los Fiordos had documents with a presentation (pictures) where demonstrates with this evidence the attendance list and pictures related with different workshop	
8.21	**Indicator:** Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.	A. Verify that farm obtains copies of supplier's complaints procedures from each of its smolt suppliers.	It was verified that farm obtains copies of supplier complaints procedures from each of its smolt suppliers (Beach Bank community and Llaima). The contact makes directly to the webpage or go directly to the piscicultura or farm via a mailbox for the claims.	Conforming
8.22	**Indicator:** Where relevant, evidence that consultation has been undertaken 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.	A. Review evidence to determine whether Indicator 8.22 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s).	Los Fiordos has evidence through the implement of procedure P-SOC-Sp-01, version 1 (November, 2014). Evidence shows that the smolt supplier does operate in an indigenous territory.	Conforming
		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 triggerment consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence.	B. Verify that the smolt supplier complies with relevant requirements.	According to the Environmental Qualification Resolution (REA), the area referred to the local population, but till now there has no consultation in this topic. Los Fiordos has a report about indigenous groups, and there are no indigenous groups in the area. The report mentioned that discovered that CONADI or CONAMA look for the EIA, which after completion of the evaluation process, determines if the project is approved, rejected or approved with conditions. In Chile this EIA is open for public comments, indigenous people and Aboriginal they can send comments to the government and this would stop the project specially if located in indigenous land.	
8.23	**Indicator:** Where relevant, evidence that consultation has been undertaken in 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.	A. Review evidence to determine whether Indicator 8.23 is applicable to the farm's smolt supplier(s).	Los Fiordos worked with the indigenous community around the smolt farms and provided workshops with some relevant topics for them. This was confirmed by documents provided during the audit.	Conforming
		b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities.	B. Review documentary evidence to confirm that the smolt supplier has undertaken proactive consultations.	evidence was reviewed and the auditor verified that the smolt supplier has undertaken proactive consultations.	

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT

In addition to the requirements above, if the smolt is produced in an open-systems, evidence shall be provided that the following are met:

Instruction to Clients for Indicators 8.24 through 8.31 - Requirements for Smolt Produced in Open Systems
Client shall provide documentary evidence to the CAB about the production system(s) from which they source smolt.

Scope of Exemption Allowed Under Indicator 8.24:
For the first audit, farms that were stocked prior to the publication of the standard on June 12, 2012 may request an exemption, applicable for that production cycle, to the requirement under 8.24. A farm that sourced smolt that were produced in an open system (net pen) in a water body with native salmonids may request this exemption if:
1. the farm was stocked prior to June 12, 2012; and
2. the farm demonstrates through supporting evidence (e.g. purchasing agreement) that they will source smolt from a semi-closed or closed production system for their next production cycle.
If the CAB determines that the farm has fulfilled the above criteria, then an exemption may be granted and the farm may be awarded certification. However, no salmon products originating from a farm which utilizes this exemption shall be eligible to bear the ASC logo or otherwise claim to be an ASC-certified product until the farm can demonstrate that smolt were sourced in full compliance with Indicator 8.24. The CAB shall fully document the exemption in the audit report and explain how the farm has addressed any risks that may be associated with non-certified products entering into further certified chains of custody.
Native: native to the area and with a history of naturally occurring and also if intentionally stocked for recreational purposes. Areas with a combination of wild native and enhanced native populations are included.

8.24	**Indicator:** Allowance for producing or growing smolt in open 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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains relevant declarations from its smolt supplier(s).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
		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 farm.	B. Confirm that the farm obtains information on the water bodies in which its suppliers are operating net pens for smolt production.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		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.	C. Review search results and conclusions against the other lines of evidence for salmonid distribution in the region (e.g. results from 5.1.5a).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
8.25	**Indicator:** Allowance for producing or growing smolt in net pens in any water body **Requirement:** Permitted until five years from publication of the SAS standards (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Take steps to ensure that by June 13, 2017 the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens.	A. Prior to the effective date, confirm that the client understands the requirement of Indicator 8.25. After the effective date, confirm that the farm is in full compliance with the requirement.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
8.26	**Indicator:** Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body is not exceeded (see Appendix VIII-5) within the zone that is in current (171) 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	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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of assimilative capacity assessments as are relevant to the water bodies in which its smolt supplier(s) operate.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
		b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability.	B. Verify that the assessment was done by a reliable entity (e.g. government body or academic institution).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		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.	C. Verify that the assessment report is in compliance with requirements.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a).	D. Verify that the farm confirms that total biomass in the water body does not exceed carrying capacity.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		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.	E. Verify that the farm requests an updated assessment (≥ 2 years old) if there was a significant increase in nutrient inputs to the water body.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
Footnote	(271) This concentration is equivalent to the upper limit of the Mesotrophic Trophic Status classification as described in Appendix VIII-7.				
Footnote	(272) Carrying capacity is defined as the maximum number of fish that can be produced in a water body without causing unacceptable impacts on the environment.				
Footnote	(273) Total biomass is defined as the total weight of all fish in the water body.				
Footnote	(274) Significant increase in nutrient input is defined as a 25% increase in nutrient input to the water body since the completion of the study, a more recent assessment is required.				

Instruction to Clients for Indicator 8.27 and 8.28 - Monitoring TP and DO in Receiving Water for Open Smolt Systems
Farms must confirm that any smolt supplier using an open (net-pen) system is also engaged in monitoring of water quality of receiving waters. Requirements for the supplier's water quality monitoring program are presented in detail in Appendix VIII-6 and only recitated briefly here. Monitoring shall sample total phosphorus (TP) and dissolved oxygen (DO). TP is measured in water samples taken from a representative composite sample through the water column to a depth of the bottom of the cages. Samples are submitted to an accredited laboratory for analysis of TP to a method detection limit of ≤ 0.002 mg/L. DO measurements will be taken at 50 centimeters from the bottom sediment.
The required sampling regime is as follows:
-all stations are identified with GPS coordinates on a map of the farm and/or available satellite imagery;
-stations are at the limit of the farm management zone on each side of the farm, roughly 50 meters from the edge of enclosures;
-the spatial arrangement of stations is shown in the table in Appendix VIII-6;
-sampling is done at least quarterly (≥4 per 3 months)during periods without ice, including peak biomass; and
-samples are also collected at two reference stations located ~ 1-2 Km upcurrent and downcurrent from the farm.
Note: Some flexibility on the exact location and method of sampling is allowed to avoid smolt suppliers. meeting to duplicate similar sampling for their local regulatory regime.

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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains copies of the smolt supplier's monitoring records (datasets, protocols, reports).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations.	B. Review and confirm that the spatial arrangement of sampling stations complies with requirements of Appendix VIII-6.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station.	C. Review TP monitoring results.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a site-specific study.	D. Repeat comparison.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		e. Confirm that the average value for TP over the last 12 months did not exceed 20 µg/l at any of the sampling stations nor at the reference station.	E. Verify that TP ≤ 20 µg/l in the receiving water body.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
Footnote	(275) This concentration is equivalent to the upper limit of the Mesotrophic Trophic Status classification as described in Appendix VIII-7.				
Note: see instructions for Indicator 8.27.					
8.28	**Indicator:** Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimeters above bottom sediment (or all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≥ 60% **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).	A. Verify as above (see 8.27A).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
		b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months.	B. Verify that farm has copies of supplier's DO monitoring results.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation.	C. Review the supplier's monitoring results to verify compliance with requirements.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
8.29	**Indicator:** Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously (or by a regulator body if applicable).	A. Verify that farm obtains evidence from suppliers (as applicable).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
		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.	B. Review how supplier determined trophic status (as applicable).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		c. If 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.	C. Verify that the farm conducts a review of the supplier's results and conclusions regarding trophic status of the water body.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		d. Compare the above results (8.29b) to trophic status of the water body as reported for all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change.	D. Review the farm's conclusion to verify compliance with the requirement.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
8.30	**Indicator:** Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.28a or 8.29b as applicable.	A. Verify that farm has supplier's records for baseline TP concentrations in the water body.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming
		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).	B. Repeat comparison.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
		c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 20% from baseline TP concentration.	C. Repeat calculation to verify compliance with the requirement.	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	
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 Using Open Systems	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.	A. Verify that the farm obtains relevant declarations from its smolt supplier(s).	Not applicable. Salmon are not produced in an open system.	Conforming

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS

Additionally, if the smolt is produced in a closed or semi-closed system (flow through or recirculated that discharges into freshwater, evidence shall be provided that the following are met (175):

Instructions to Client for Indicators 8.32 & 8.33 - Requirement for smolts produced in open systems
Client shall provide documentary evidence to the CAB about the production system(s) from which they source smolt.
If smolt used by the farm are not produced, for part or all of the growth phase from alevin to smolt, in open (net-pen) systems, indicators 8.32 - 8.35 are applicable.
If the production system is closed or semi-closed and does not discharge into freshwater, indicators 8.32 - 8.35 are not applicable to smolt producers as per (176). For such an exemption, farms must provide documentary evidence to the CAB. Auditors shall fully document their rationale for awarding exemptions in the audit report.

Footnote	(176) Production systems that don't discharge into fresh water are exempt from these standards.				
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.	A. Verify that farm has records to show smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring at the required frequency and duration.	This requirement was verified and these records were available. Piscicultura Llaima -Cherquen conducted water quality monitoring. every three months according to the national regulations. And this is mentioned in declaration by the Asst. manager (August, 2016)	Conforming
		b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness.	B. Confirm that smolt supplier's water quality monitoring program covers sampling of all parameters given in Appendix VIII-2 (i.e. TP, TN, BOD, TSS) and this was checked in the lab reports. All records with information from this monitoring are attached.	Piscicultura Llaima -Cherquen confirmed that water quality monitoring was conducted sampling of all parameters given in Appendix VIII-2 (i.e. TP, TN, BOD, TSS) and this was checked in the lab reports. All records with information from this monitoring are attached.	
		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.	C. Confirm that client has submitted to ASC the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix for the last 12 month period.	Data has been sent to ASC	
Footnote	(177) See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.32.				
8.33	**Indicator:** Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-3) **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)	A. Verify that the farm obtains water quality monitoring records from its smolt supplier(s).	The farm obtains water quality monitoring records from its smolt supplier (Piscicultura Llaima-Cherquen) and auditor reviewed the report from Los Fiordos which includes monthly results. January - December 2015 until May 2016)	Conforming
		b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation.	B. Review the supplier's monitoring results to verify compliance with requirements.	The result from water monitoring were verified and oxygen levels comply with requirements.	
		c. If a single DO reading (or reporter) is 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-3).	C. Verify that the farm obtained evidence for enhanced DO monitoring by the smolt supplier (as applicable).	The DO parameter is over 60% in all monitoring.	
Footnote	(178) A single oxygen reading below 60 percent would require daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for at least a week demonstrating a minimum 60 percent saturation at all times.				
Footnote	(179) See Appendix VI for transparency requirements for 8.33.				
8.34	**Indicator:** Macroinvertebrate survey downstream from the farm's effluent shows macroinvertebrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macroinvertebrate surveys.	A. Verify that the farm has documentation of macroinvertebrate benthic surve

		d. Obtain records from small suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VII-2.	5. Review the farm's records from small suppliers to verify there is evidence of implementation of biosolids management as required in Appendix VII-2.	Records were obtained from small suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning, maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VII-2. The records are dispatch grades and certified by MyGLOR.	

ASC Audit Report - Traceablity / Reporte de auditoría ASC - Trazabilidad

10	Traceability Factor / Factor de Trazabilidad	Description of risk factor if present / Descripción de los factores de riesgo, si están presentes	Describe any traceability, segregation, or other systems in place to manage the risk / Describe cualquier sistema de trazabilidad, segregación u otros implementados en sitio para manejar el riesgo
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. La posibilidad de mezcla o sustitución entre producto certificado y no certificado, incluyendo producto de la misma o similar apariencia o especies,producidos dentro de la misma operación.	No Risk / No hay Riesgo	No risk of substitution of certified with noncertified product within the unit of certification as all salmon in the farm is within the scope of the ASC Salmon Standard audit. No existe riesgo de sustitución de producto certificado con producto no certificado dentro de la unidad de certificación, todo el salmón del centro de cultivo está dentro del alcance de la auditoria del Estándar ASC Salmón.
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. La posibilidad de mezcla o sustitución entre producto certificado y no certificado, incluyendo producto de la misma o similar apariencia o especies, presentes durante la producción, cosecha, transporte, almacenamiento, o actividades de procesamiento.	No Risk / No hay Riesgo	The processing facility is owned on the same company of the farm site. Farm maintains internal control of traceability and product flow with chain of custody audit. This to ensure no mixing of noncertified product or farm with other harvests or at packing. Eligible operators and point(s) of landing: Harvesting operations commence when live fish are pumped into the well boats and transported live until plant. The fish is then transported to the Planta de Proceso Exportadora Los Fiordos, located in Camino a San Antonio s/n Quellón, Chiloé, Chile. La instalación de procesamiento es propiedad de la misma empresa del centro de cultivo. Centro de cultivo Quetros 1 mantiene el control interno de la trazabilidad del producto y el flujo con la cadena de custodia de auditoría. Esto para garantizar que no se mezcla productos no certificados o con otras cosechas de otros centros de cultivos o en el embalaje. Operadores elegibles y punto (s) de desembarque: Las operaciones de cosecha se inician cuando los peces vivos se bombea en el wellboat y se transportan vivos hasta la planta. Los peces se transporta a la Planta de Proceso Exportadora Los Fiordos, ubicado en Camino a SanAntonio s / n Quellón, Chiloé, Chile.
10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products. La posibilidad de que subcontratos manipulen, transporten, almacenen o procesen productos certificados.	Low Risk / Bajo Riesgo	Harvested fish are transferred to the subcontracted into well boats and is under supervision of Quetros 1 farm manager. No other transshipment activities take place. Los peces cosechados son transferidos en wellboats subcontratados y están bajo la supervisión del administrador del centro de cultivo Quetros 1. No hay otras actividades de transbordo.
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. Cualquier otra oprotunidad donde producto certificado pudisese potencialmente mezclarse, sustituirse o perder su etiquetado con productos no certificados antes del punto donde los productos entren a cadena de custodia.	No Risk / No hay Riesgo	At no point is there an opportunity for mixing certified and non-certified fish. No hay oportunidad de mezcla de pescado certificado y no certificado.

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. Descripción detallada del flujo del producto certificado dentro de la operación y el sistema de trazabilidad asociado, que permita trazar el producto desde la unidad de certificaciín hasta su venta.	All harvests are tracked by batches assigned by the processing plant called this as Tracing Code, each tracing code is unique and all is controlled by traceability system that is robust and efficient according to Management System implemented. This Processing plant has certifications as: ISO 9001,Halal, BAP, Global Gap, BRC, ASC CoC, HACCP. Todas las cosechas son rastreadas por lotes asignados por la planta de procesamiento con un Código de Rastreo; cada código de rastreo es único y todo es controlado por el sistema de Trazabilidad que es robusto y eficiente de acuerdo a lo implementado en el Sistema de Gestión. Esta planta de procesamiento tiene como certificaciones: ISO 9001, Halal, BAP, Global Gap, BRC, CoC ASC, HACCP.
10.6	Traceablity Determination Determinación de la trazabilidad:	
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 certification, or can be eligible to carry the ASC logo / El sistema de trazabilidad y segregación en la operación son suficientes para asegurar la identificación de todos los productos cultivados por la unidad de certificación hasta su venta como producto certificado, o bien sea considerado como apto para portar el logo ASC.	The traceability and segregation systems used in the operation are sufficient to ensure that all products identified and sold as certified originate from the unit of certification. Los sistemas de trazabilidad y segregación utilizados en la operación son suficientes para asegurar que todos los productos identificados y vendidos como certificados se originen en la unidad de certificación.
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. El sistema de trazabilidad y segregación en la operación son suficientes. De manera independiente se requiere la certificación de la cadena de custodia para la operación, antes de que los productos sean vendidos como productos certificados ASC o puedan ser considerados como aptos para portar el logo ASC.	N/A.
10.6.3	The point from which chain of custody is required to begin / El punto desde el cual se requiere que la cadena de custodia comience.	The chain of custody begins at the point of transfer to the processing facility. La cadena de custodia comienza en el punto de transferencia a la planta de procesamiento.
10.6.4	Is a sepearate chain of custody certificate required for the producer? Se requiere certificado de cadena de custodia por separado del productor?	No. Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda Quetros 1 farm processes the fish in LF- Quellon plant which was certified under ASC Chain of Custody (ASC - C -00583) in 2015. No. Exportadora Los Fiordos Ltda a través de su centro cultivo Quetros 1. procesa los peces en su Planta de procesamiento - Quellón y se certificó Cadena de Custodia ASC (ASC - C -00583) en el año 2015.