

Aquaculture Stewardship Council

Farm certification

Single and Multi-Site ASC Farm Audit Checklist

Report language: English



For company: Kingfish Zeeland BV
Assessment date(s): 29-30 May 2018

Scheme documents:

ASC Seriola and Cobia Standard Version 1.0 - October 2016

ASC-Certification-and-Accreditation-Requirements-v.2.1 - August 2017

SGS Product & Process Certification



SGS Checklist Version 1, applicable from 1 May 2018

Form 3 - Public Disclosure Form

*This form shall be submitted by the CAB no less than thirty (30) working 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.*

*The information on this form shall be public * and should be posted on the ASC website within three (3) days of submission.*

This form shall be written to be readable to the stakeholders and other interested parties.

This form should be translated into local languages when appropriate

PDF 1 Public Disclosure Form

PDF 1.1 Name of CAB

PDF 1.2 Date of Submission

PDF 1.3 CAB Contact Person

PDF 1.3.1 Name of Contact Person

PDF 1.3.2 Position in the CAB's organisation

PDF 1.3.3 Mailing address

PDF 1.3.4 Email address

PDF 1.3.5 Phone number

PDF 1.3.6 Other

PDF 1.4 ASC Name of Client

PDF 1.4.1 Name of Company

PDF 1.4.2 Name of Contact Person

* Except unannounced audits, for which this form will be sent to the ASC and AAB without being published

PDF 1.4.3 Position in the client's organisation	Quality control & Certifications
PDF 1.4.4 Mailing address	Oost-Zeedijk 13 4486 PM Kats, The Netherlands
PDF 1.4.5 Email address	ceesjan.bastiaansen@kingfish-zeeland.com
PDF 1.4.6 Phone number	+31(0)113 745 461
PDF 1.4.7 Other	

PDF 1.5 Unit of Certification

PDF 1.5.1 Single Site	X
PDF 1.5.2 Multi-site	
PDF 1.5.3 Group certification	

PDF 1.6 Sites to be audited

Site Name	GPS Coordinates	Other Location Information	Planned Site Audit(s)	Date of planned audit
Kingfish Zeeland B.V.	N 51°35'52.6848 E 3°51'52.8474	N/A	29-30 May 2018	29-30 May 2018

PDF 1.7 Species and Standards

Standard	Species (scientific name) produced	Included in scope (Yes/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used	Version Number
Abalone				
Bivalve				
Freshwater Trout				
Pangasius				
Salmon				
Shrimp				
Talapia				
Seriola/Cobia	Seriola lalandi	Yes	ASC Serolia and Cobia Standard	Version 1.0 October 2016
Other				

* Except unannounced audits, for which this form will be sent to the ASC and AAB without being published

PDF 1.8 Planned Stakeholder Consultation(s) and How Stakeholders can Become Involved

Name/organisation	Relevance for this audit	How to involve this stakeholder (in-person/phone interview/input submission)	When stakeholder may be contacted	How this stakeholder will be contacted
Delta Farms Meijering	Aquaculture Industry	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
Stichting Aquacultuur Coli	Aquaculture Industry	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
Sweco	Governmental	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
Aquavalley	Industry	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
Rijkswaterstaat	Governmental	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
Good Fish Foundation (GFNGO)		In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
Zeeland Province	Governmental	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email
WWF Netherlands	NGO	In person/input submission	In advance of the audit	Email

PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed:	06/03/2018
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit:	29/05/2018
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s):	29-30/05/2018
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/Decision:	20/08/2018

PDF 1.10 Audit Team

	Column1	Name	ASC Registration Reference
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor	Cormac O'Sullivan	n/a
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts	Cormac O'Sullivan	n/a
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor	Geert Anciaux	n/a

ASC Audit Report - Opening

1 Title Page

1.1 Name of Applicant	Kingfish Zeeland BV.
1.2 Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report]	Public Certification Report
1.3 CAB name	SGS Nederland BV
1.4 Name of Lead Auditor	Cormac O'Sullivan
1.5 Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Cormac O'Sullivan, ASC Auditor, Lead / Geert Anciaux, Social Auditor / Conrad Powell, technical reviewer
1.6 Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Cees-Jan Bastiaansen, Quality Control & Certifications Manager
1.7 Date	29th and 30th May 2018

2 Table of Contents

1 Title Page
2 Table of Contents
3 Glossary
4 Summary
5 CAB Contact Information
6 Background on the Applicant
7 Scope
8 Audit Plan
10 Audit Report Traceability
11 Findings
12 Evaluation Results
13 Decision
14 Surveillance

3 Glossary

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

KFZ = Kingfish Zeeland; RAS = recirculated aquaculture system

4 Summary

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

4.1	A brief description of the scope of the audit	Ongrowing of <i>Seriola lalandi</i> in a land based recirculated aquaculture system (RAS) in Zeeland in Holland. The audit took 2 days and included all aspects of the site.
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	The facility is a RAS and is a recent construction. It involves two buildings and all associated equipment. All facilities are indoors and new. Water is abstracted from and discharged to the Oosterschelde (Eastern Scheldt). The nature of a RAS is that is best available technology using ozone and uv filtration of the water along with a series of fine filters to ensure maximum growing conditions for the fish. All feed is pelleted and supplied from an organic feed mill.
4.3	Type of unit of certification (<i>select only one type of unit of certification in the list</i>)	Land based recirculation facility
4.4	Type of audit (<i>select all the types of audit that apply in the list</i>)	Initial ASC Audit
4.5	A summary of the major findings	There were 5 minor non-conformances. See attached close-out sheet
4.6	Did the audit include harvesting activities of the principle product to be audited?	There was no harvesting viewed of the <i>Seriola</i> as they were not harvesting on the days of the audit. They are undergoing the ASC audit so they can have certification for their harvested fish. A description of the harvest methodology was reviewed and found to be acceptable. They have a process available that ensures that the fish are kept segregated and traceable from non-certified fish.

4.7 If not, provide a justification for the alternative timing.

The Applicant is aware that harvesting must be viewed during the next audit (surveillance).

4.8 The Audit determination

All non-conformities are closed out. Client certified as of 20/08/2018.

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1 CAB Name

SGS Nederland BV

5.2 CAB Mailing Address

P.O. Box 200
3200 AE Spijkensisse
The Netherlands

5.3 Email Address

asc.reports@sgs.com

5.4 Other Contact Information

Phone: +31 (0) 88 214 3271

6 Background on the Applicant

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.

See Form 3 - Public Disclosure

6.2 A description of the unit of certification (*for initial audit*) / changes, if any (*for surveillance and recertification audits*)

The scope of the audits is a land based RAS with two buildings of tanks indoors. A-Building/Site has 34 tanks and B-Building/Site has 16 tanks, This site will be used mostly for brookstock selection and growout of fingerlings. Annual production for A site is estimated at 580 MT and 20 MT for B site.

6.3 Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	BAP certified on 5th June 2018
6.4 Other certification(s) obtained before this audit	None
6.5 Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>current</u> year	600MT
6.6 <u>Actual</u> annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the <u>previous</u> year <i>(mandatory for surveillance and recertification</i>	Not Applicable as the facility is currently in its first year of production
6.7 Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification <i>(select one or more in the list)</i>	Recirculated Aquaculture System on land
6.8 Number of employees working at the unit of certification	18
7 Scope	
7.1 The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Seriola and Cobia Standard, Version 1.0 October 2016
7.2 The species produced at the applicant farm	Seriola lalandi

<p>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 these shall be clearly named.</p>	<p>The scope of the audit is grow-out of <i>Seriola</i>. From 20 grams onwards. Juveniles are purchased from a third party supplier based in Chile. Furthermore Kingfish-Zeeland B.V. has their own hatchery in place. From 1 grams fingerlings are stocked in quarantine units in both A-site (system A) and B site (System 0). From 20 grams fish are transferred to System -B (A-site) and system 1-5 (B-site). Both buildings are covered under the scope of the audit as it is envisaged that the applicant will also have the production stock in B-site</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The product from the farm will be harvested on site and then transferred to a processor, United Fish Auctions where it will under go processing and distribution. United Fish Auctions Visveiling BV, Visserijweg 1, Colijnsplaat, 4486CX, Netherlands. At this point Chain of custody will be required.</p>
<p>7.5 Description of the receiving water body(ies).</p>	<p>The receiving water body is the Oosterschelde (Eastern Scheldt) is a former estuary in the province of Zeeland, Netherlands, between Schouwen-Duiveland and Tholen on the north and Noord-Beveland and Zuid-Beveland on the south. It is also the largest national park in the Netherlands, founded in 2002. After the North Sea flood of 1953, it was decided to close off the Oosterschelde by means of a dam and barrier. The Oosterscheldekering (Eastern Scheldt Storm Surge Barrier), between Schouwen-Duiveland and Noord-Beveland, is the largest of 13 Delta Works designed to protect a large part of the Netherlands from flooding.</p>

8 Audit Plan

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 the certification decision.

Cormac O'Sullivan (ASC) and Geert Anciaux (Social) audited on site on the 29th and 30th May 2018. Report writing by Geert Anciaux was 31st May 2018. Draft report writing by Cormac O'Sullivan completed on 12th June 2018. Technical Review of the report was by Conrad Powell on 13th June 2018. Public consultation closed on July 31. After processing stakeholder feedback, the certification decision was taken by J. van Looij- van der Lelij on 20th August 2018.

8.2 Previous Audits (if applicable):

NC reference number	Standard clause reference	Closing deadline - status - closing date of each NC
---------------------	---------------------------	---

8.2.1	Initial audit	Not Applicable as this is their first audit
	Surveillance audit 1 - mm/ yyyy	
	Surveillance audit 2 - mm/ yyyy	
	Recertification audit - mm/ yyyy	
	Unannounced audit - mm/ yyyy	
	NC close-out audit - mm/ yyyy	
	Scope extension audit mm/ yyyy	

8.4 Audit plan as implemented including:

	Dates	Locations
8.4.1	Desk Reviews	21-May-18 SGS Office Ireland
8.4.2	Onsite audits	29/30-5-2018 Kingfish Zeeland Site
8.4.3	Stakeholder interviews and Community meetings	None
8.4.4	Draft report sent to client	18-Jun-18
8.4.5	Draft report sent to ASC	26-Jun-18 2nd draft 9th July 2018
8.5.5	Final report sent to Client and ASC	20-Aug-18

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

The Audit was observed by Anne Marie Kats of ASC. The employees of Kingfish Zeeland who were involved in the audit were as follows; Kees Kloet (COO); Cees-Jan Bastiaansen (Quality Control & Certifications Manager); Janneke van der Linde (Office Manager); Karin van den Braak (External Consultant); Bram Rohaan (Production Manager); Nico Vermaas (HR Manager); Staff Interviews of Kingfish Zeeland workers on site. The audit was conducted in English and VR 179 approves all ASC public documentation for Scandinavian farms to be published in English. ASC clarified that Given the fact that all Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark, Norway) are rated as “very high” (resp. position 1,3,4) in the English Proficiency Index (<http://www.ef.nl/epi/>) and the Netherlands ranks #1, it can safely be assumed that English understanding is sufficient in the Netherlands in order to understand the content of an ASC audit report.

8.8

Name of stakeholder (if permission given to make name public)	Relevance to be contacted	Date of contact	CAB responded Yes/No	Brief summary of points Raised	Use of comment by CAB	Response sent to stakeholder
ASC - L1	Scheme Owner	29/06/2018	Yes	Typo in GPS, CAP for minors missing	Yes	Yes
Willy Reiniers, Aquavally	Industry	04/07/2018	Yes	Questions regarding process + typo in name Grovisco	Yes	Yes
Good Fish Foundation	ENGO	17/07/2018	Yes	Requests for clarification and audit evidence	Yes	Yes
ASC - L2	Scheme Owner	27/07/2018	No	Typo in GPS, question on CAP for Minor 1	Yes	No

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC SERIOLA/COBIA STANDARD
 Created by the Seriola/Cobia Aquaculture Dialogue (SAD)

Risk evaluation

PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL AND LOCAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

1.1. Criteria: All applicable legal requirements and regulations where farming operation is located

Clause	Indicator	Compliance Criteria (Use as guidance for audit only)	Audit evidence 1. Write down all audit evidence for each compliance criterion (CC). Audit evidence (including evidence of conformity and nonconformity) should be recorded so that the audit can be repeated by a different audit team. 2. Replace explanatory text in the 'Audit Evidence' column as appropriate. 3. If you see any Compliance Criteria which is not listed below, please describe in the blue cells below.	Evaluation (Per indicator, select one category in the drop-down menu)	Description of NC Provide an explanation of the reason(s) for the classification of any NCs or non-applicability	Value/ Metric Provide values - if applicable for the respective Indicator
1.1.1	Indicator: Documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant local and national laws and regulations. Requirement: Yes. Applicability: All.	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws. Provide the audit team with a summary of applicable laws and permit requirements along with contact details for relevant staff. b. Maintain original (or certified copies of) lease agreements, land titles and concession permit(s) on file as applicable. c. Keep records of inspections for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation). d. Others, please describe	The Applicant has a document titled "Overview of Licences and permits KFZ, 20th November 2016". This details that due to the size of the industry in Holland, there are no separate laws / regulations specific to setting up fish farms, but they do fall under Construction/ Environment and Animals Legislation as well as any EU Regulations. The land is zoned Aquaculture Development Land. There is an Aquaculture Licence Dated 19th July 2017 from the Dutch Food Safety Authority (NVWA) and this is issued under Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality of 11 July 2008, no. TRCJZ / 2008/2015, laying down rules on aquaculture (Aquaculture Regulation) - Articles 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. The Applicant imports juveniles from Chile - an example was viewed from the last shipment in April of the EU Vet certificate and also the Chilean Health Certificate showing the list of diseases that they were screened for and cleared. There is an Environmental Assessment by Sweco (dated 12th Jan 2018) which looks at the potential impacts of the farm on the Natura 2000 site Oosterschelde and concludes that there is no further action required and minimal impact on the surrounding areas and species. There are no copies of any government reports/inspections as yet at the site.	Compliant		
1.1.2	Indicator: Documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws. Requirement: Yes. Applicability: All.	a. Provide a certificate of tax clearance or tax law conformity from local Revenue authority; OR Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CABs will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public. b. Demonstrate that the farm ensures compliance with tax laws appropriate to its size and scale. Large-scale producers should for instance use the services of a qualified and knowledgeable tax professional such as a chartered Public Accountant to manage overall compliance with taxation law. Small-scale producers should show tax receipts. c. If tax is paid by a parent company legally then the farm should present information to this effect. d. Others, please describe	(a) The farm is able to provide summary of taxes paid in the past year and compliance with all tax returns in Q1 2018 as well. (b) all taxes paid are broken in to different categories such as property tax and VAT (c) all tax returns are on site	Compliant		
1.1.3	Indicator: Documents demonstrating compliance with all labor laws and regulations. Requirement: Yes. Applicability: All.	a. Demonstrate how the farm conforms with the requirements of national and regional/local labor codes and employment law. 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). c. Others, please describe	A. The farm conforms with labor codes and employment laws B. There are no visits of any labor agency/inspection	Compliant		

1.1.4	<p>Indicator: Documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Obtain permits for discharge water where applicable.</p> <p>b. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and/or regulations as required.</p> <p>c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with waste and pollution laws/regulations.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There is a Water Permit (RWS-2016/17005) Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment - dated 25th April 2016 which permits 400m³/hr abstraction. This was issued to Zeeuwse Tong (previous owners) and carries over to KFZ as the licence holders for the site. The Applicant is in the phase of splitting the licence to 2 licences with Delta Farms (a neighbouring Rag worm farmer). The two limits on the discharge are Total N (45mg/l) and Total P (8mg/l) and volumes of 200m³/hr intake and 250 m³/hr discharge. The licence allows for the company to select 'best available' techniques when sampling. They do morning (6am - 7am) and afternoon (2pm - 3pm) once per month.</p>	Minor	<p>Clause 1.1.4c - The Applicant is monitoring Total N and Total P, but not according to the Analytical Techniques specified in the Water Permit</p>	
<p>PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION <i>Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects</i></p>						
2.1.1	<p>Indicator: TOC, sulphide, or redox levels in sediment immediately outside of Allowable Zone Effect (AZE)(1) attributable to farm operations as evidenced by control.</p> <p>Requirement: No significant change in TOC, sulphide, or redox levels in sediment at the edge of the AZE in comparison to the control site.</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in footnote 1. For farms that have yet to define an AZE, within 3 years from the publication of the Seriola and Cobia standards.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE and GPS locations of all sediment-sampling stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification for its selection to the CAB.</p> <p>OR (for farms that have yet to define an AZE and for up to 3 years from the publication of the Seriola and Cobia standards):</p> <p>Prepare a map of the farm showing GPS locations of all sediment-sampling stations.</p> <p>b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1a-g, and 2.1.2.</p> <p>c. Inform the CAB of which indicator the farm has selected for evaluating and monitoring benthic impact.</p> <p>d. Collect sediment samples using an appropriate methodology and sampling regime, following the guidance in the Seriola and Cobia Standards (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations).</p> <p>e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in surficial sediment samples taken from immediately outside the AZE as well as at an un-impacted control site far removed from the farm using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p> <p>f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) in surficial sediment samples taken from immediately outside the AZE as well as at an un-impacted control site far removed from the farm using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p> <p>g. For option #3, measure and record Total Organic Carbon (e.g. % by weight) in surficial sediment samples taken from immediately outside the AZE as well as at an un-impacted control site far removed from the farm using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method.</p> <p>h. Others, please describe</p>	<p>This clause is specifically referring to marine cage systems and the AZE under the cages. However, this facility is a newly built land based RAS and has very minimal discharge to the marine environment (maximum permitted is 250m³/hr) but is currently only discharging 50-90m³/hr. The analysis of the effluent shows that they are in compliance with the limits set on the licence which shows all discharges to the area. There is also a report titled "Emission Test for the Oosterschelde" which shows all discharges and dilution factors based on the size of the water body. This shows that for the area of discharge, there is a dilution factor of 6,500:1</p>	N/A		

2.1.2	<p>Indicator: Abundance of harmful (invasive or noxious) macrofauna immediately outside of AZE attributable to farm operations as evidenced by control.</p> <p>Requirement: No significant change in harmful macrofauna at the edge of the AZE in comparison to the control site..</p> <p>Applicability: All farms except as noted in footnote 1. For farms that have yet to define an AZE, within 3 years from the publication of the Seriola and Cobia standards.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE and GPS locations of all sediment-sampling stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification for its selection to the CAB.</p> <p>OR (for farms that have yet to define an AZE and for up to 3 years from the publication of the Seriola and Cobia standards):</p> <p>Prepare a map of the farm showing GPS locations of all sediment-sampling stations.</p> <p>b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1a-g, and 2.1.2.</p> <p>c. Inform the CAB of which indicator the farm has selected for evaluating and monitoring benthic impact.</p> <p>d. Analyze epifaunal and infaunal components of sediment samples including identification to species level and enumeration of all species, for all sampling stations.</p> <p>e. Estimate proportions of all faunal species present in sediments immediately outside the AZE and at an un-impacted control site far removed from the farm and test for significance in difference (95% C.I.) in presence of opportunistic species and species that are considered to be indicators of benthic enrichment or harm.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	See 2.1.1 - this farm is a land based RAS	N/A		
<i>Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation</i>						
2.2.1	<p>Indicator: Turbidity levels in the water column inside and outside AZE.</p> <p>Requirement: No significant change in turbidity levels in the water column at the edge of the AZE in comparison to the control site.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Devise appropriate and detailed turbidity monitoring procedure with detailed maps of sampling points and detailed methodology.</p> <p>b. Measure and record turbidity initially on a monthly basis at the edge of the Allowable Zone of Effect and at an un-impacted control site far removed from the farm.</p> <p>c. Conduct analysis of turbidity data for statistically significant difference (95% C.I.) between turbidity at the edge of the AZE and at one or more control sites far removed from any potential farm influence.</p> <p>d. Provide results of statistical analysis for initial 12 month turbidity monitoring</p> <p>e. Implement annual turbidity monitoring procedure.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	See 2.1.1 - this site is a land based RAS system	N/A		

2.2.2	<p>Indicator: Ammonia levels in the water column inside and outside AZE.</p> <p>Requirement: No significant change in ammonia levels in the water column at the edge of the AZE in comparison to the control site.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Devise appropriate and detailed ammonia monitoring procedure with detailed maps of sampling points and methodology. The monitoring action must be appropriate for size and scale of the impact and if the farm can prove low impact over a year then don't have to monitor so frequently afterwards.</p> <p>b. Measure and record ammonia initially on a monthly basis at the edge of the Allowable Zone of Effect and at an un-impacted reference (control) site far removed from the influence of a farm.</p> <p>c. Conduct analysis of ammonia data for statistically significant difference (95% C.I.) between ammonia levels at the edge of the AZE and at one or more control sites far removed from any potential farm influence.</p> <p>d. Provide results of statistical analysis for initial 12 month ammonia monitoring.</p> <p>e. Implement annual ammonia monitoring procedure.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	See 2.1.1 - this site is a land based RAS system	N/A		
Criterion 2.3 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species						
2.3.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum: a) identification of proximity to critical, sensitive or protected habitats and species, b) description of the potential impacts the farm might have on biodiversity, with a focus on affected habitats or species, and c) a description of strategies and current and future programs underway to eliminate or minimize any identified impacts the farm might have.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Collect documentation that allows an interpretation of the farms location in the context of biodiversity and ecosystems that may be at risk from under assessment farm related impacts. The monitoring action must be appropriate for size and scale of the potential impact of the farm and if the farm can prove low impact over a year then don't have to monitor so frequently afterwards.</p> <p>b. Complete a detailed risk assessment for potential impacts of the farm on critical, sensitive and protected habitats and species. Demonstrate how the farm has strategies and programmes in place that are designed to minimise or eliminate negative impacts on species and habitats.</p> <p>c. Collect independent evidence that confirms the level of interaction and/or impact of the farm on critical, sensitive or protected habitats and species. Evidence can include stakeholder submission.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	(a) The site is located on the shores of a National Park - Oosterschelde (designated 2002) and is also a Ramsar designated site - designated 4th March 1987 - site #354 (b) There is a report from Sweco (Environmental Consultants) in January 2018 which states that there is no impact identified from the operations on the National park from (1) Nature Conservation Act (2) Natura 2000 Sites Nature Conservation Act (3) Nature Networks Netherlands. (c) there were no stakeholder submissions or any further strategies to minimise impacts as there were none identified	Compliant		
2.3.2	<p>Indicator: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a legally designated protected area .</p> <p>Requirement: None (see note above).</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Provide a map showing the location of the farm relative to nearby legally protected areas (see footnote 4).</p> <p>b. If the farm is sited in a legally protected area, review the scope of applicability of Indicator 2.3.2a. (see Instructions above) to determine if the farm is allowed an exception to the requirements. If yes, inform the CAB and provide supporting evidence.</p> <p>c. Demonstrate that the farm does not conflict with or interfere with the operation or integrity of designated parks, limited use protected areas or national preservation areas.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	(a) A map of the Oosterschelde protected area is provided. (b) See 2.3.1 - the farm itself is located in an aquaculture zoned area and not in a protected area. (c) The discharge from the farm is to the National Park/Ramsar site, but an environmental consultant report from January 2018 states that there are no impacts and the farm has only recently been licenced to operate in the area as it is a new facility.	Compliant		

Criterion 2.4 Interaction with wildlife, including predators					
2.4.1	<p>Indicator: Acoustic deterrent devices allowed.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a written statement affirming that the farm's management is committed to not using acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) for control of marine pests and/or predators.</p> <p>b. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs are used on the farm (e.g. predator and pest control procedure and evidence of implementation).</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The site is located indoors and is a land based RAS system. There are none used or no requirement to use any ADD's or AHD's</p>	Compliant	
2.4.2	<p>Indicator: Number of mortalities of endangered or red-listed animals in the farm lease area and adjacent areas due to farm operations or personnel or associates.</p> <p>Requirement: 0.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Provide a list of endangered and red-listed animals occurring in the farm lease area and surrounding areas.</p> <p>b. Produce a documented record of the farm's impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. Detail species/habitats, spatial/temporal aspects, type of interaction and outcome.</p> <p>c. Establish list of predators and pests requiring control. Identify clearly the permitted mitigation/control procedures and records that must be kept.</p> <p>d. Record all mortalities, species and time of the event.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>a) There are no red-listed species in or around the farm - a review was made in pre audit (b) the Farm is a land based RAS (c) Furthermore as an indoor RAS, they do not have any issues with predators. (d) There has not been any mortalities at the site.</p>	Compliant	

<p>2.4.3</p>	<p>Indicator: Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action against a (non- endangered or non red-listed) predator: 1. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action. 2. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager. Requirement: Yes, unless human safety is immediately threatened. Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Provide a company document that sets out the procedure that must be followed prior to lethal resolution of a predator. b. Maintain a log of predator control events that allows for verification of adherence to company procedures regarding predator control. d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There are no issues with predators at the site and no mortalities. The entire farm is indoors It is company policy to use no lethal measures in the event that they do have any interactions</p>	<p>N/A</p>		
<p>2.4.4</p>	<p>Indicator: Evidence that information about any lethal incident on the farm has been: 1. Reported to the appropriate government oversight agency. 2. Made easily publicly accessible. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All</p>	<p>a. Demonstrate that details on lethal predator management events have been transmitted to appropriate/most relevant government oversight agency. b. Demonstrate that details on lethal predator management events are made available to the public. c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There has not been any incident and the applicant is aware that they must notify government and also must make any such information available for stakeholders on the company website</p>	<p>N/A</p>		
<p>2.4.5</p>	<p>Indicator: Maximum number of lethal incidents on farm over the prior two years. Requirement: For birds: 4 lethal incidents. For sharks: 2 lethal incidents. For marine mammals: 1 lethal incident. Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain log of lethal incidents for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required. b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents involving different species or groups of species (e.g. sharks, birds, marine mammals) during the previous two-year period. c. If the farm can demonstrate valid publicly available research that whatever is killed is hindering the recovery of any population then it may be exempt from the set requirement number in this indicator. d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There has not been any incident - it is an indoor land based facility and does not have any issue with predators</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		
<p>2.4.6</p>	<p>Indicator: In the event of any lethal incident, evidence that an assessment of the probability of lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences. Requirement: Yes. Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Carry out documented review of lethal incidents and revise risk assessment and procedures (see 2.3.1) if necessary / as appropriate. b. Demonstrate through revision of procedures that management of predators is continually being reviewed with a view to eliminating the need for lethal management. c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There has not been any incident - it is an indoor land based facility and does not have any issue with predators</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		

PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS

Criterion 3.1 Culture of non-native species

3.1.1	<p>Indicator: Culture of a non-native species.</p> <p>Requirement: None, unless commercial farming of the species already occurs in the region at time of the first publication of the SCAD standards, or a closed land-based production system with minimal risk of escapes and/or pest and pathogen transfer to wild populations is used.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Confirm to the CAB that the farm produces only native species OR.</p> <p>b. If non-native species, provide verifiable evidence that the species was being legally cultured commercially in the country and/or region/state prior to the publishing of the seriola and cobia standard in 2015 OR</p> <p>c. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.1.1b, provide documented evidence that the production system is closed to the natural environment and for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce (e.g. UV or other effective treatment) by treating effluent water prior to it exiting the system to the natural environment.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The facility is rearing <i>Seriola lalandi</i> which is a non-native species. (b) See c (c) However, they are a closed land based production system with recirculation rates of 98.6% - 99.4%. (1) There are 3 barriers between the fish and the discharge. All discharge is through a pump at the final stage (2) the barriers range from 40 micron screens to lamellae on sedimentation ponds and screens on pumps. A further measure is that <i>Seriola</i> will die at temperatures below 14 C and most of the year the water in the Oosterschelde is below 14 C (3) The RAS system has 40 micron screens and UV and Ozone treatment systems, so there is no chance of escape.</p>	Compliant		
<i>Criterion 3.2 Introduction of transgenic species</i>						
3.2.1	<p>Indicator: Culture of transgenic fish by the farm.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic stock.</p> <p>b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including stocking date, supplier details, and contact person(s) for stock purchases.</p> <p>c. Ensure stock purchase/origin documentation clearly identifies genetic status and whether stock is transgenic or not.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) There is a statement from their fingerling supplier that the fish are not genetically modified (non-GMO) (b) there are full details of all deliveries and all records are kept on Mercatus (Aquafarmer) (c) there is the declaration form the supplier (Acuinor) that the stock are non-GMO</p>	Compliant		

Criterion 3.3 Escapes					
3.3.1	<p>Indicator: For all fish, the operation must have an established plan related to escape management, and adhere to rigorous maintenance procedures and frequent net inspections.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan that includes a detailed farm operations risk assessment and submit it to the CAB prior to the first audit. The plan should explicitly detail what maintenance procedures are critical and important in the context of avoiding escapes, including but not limited to farm equipment maintenance and frequency of net inspections.</p> <p>b. If the farm operates an open net pen system, ensure the plan (3.3.1a): -clearly identifies the important and critical issues in the context of minimizing escape events; and -sets out clear procedures for ensuring: • net strength testing; • use of appropriate net mesh size; • net traceability; • system robustness; • predator management; • record keeping; • reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); • staff training to cover all of the above areas; and • staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies.</p> <p>c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.3.1a): -clearly identifies the important and critical issues in the context of minimizing escape events; and -sets out clear procedures for ensuring: • system robustness;- • predator management; • record keeping; • reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); • staff training to cover all of the above areas; and • staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies.</p> <p>d. Maintain records as specified in the plan.</p> <p>e. Train staff on escape prevention planning and management as per the farm's plan.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The farm is a closed based RAS and the risk of escape is minimal. However there is no documented Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan including a risk assessment provided with the specific requirements of 3.3.1c (b) This is NA as they do not operate a cage system (c) See 3.3.1.a (d) See 3.3.1.a (e) There is no training on the Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan</p>	<p>Minor</p>	<p>Clause 3.3.1.a There is no documented Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan including a risk assessment provided with the specific requirements of 3.3.1c Clause 3.3.1.c. There is no training on the Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan</p>

3.3.2	<p>Indicator: Operations will undertake and maintain detailed records on fish escapes and counting. This will include records of breaches in nets, estimates on escapes and stocked vs. recovered fish counts. Note: farms will also include technology and methodology for undertaking fish counts.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count (recovered fish), and details of escape events and possible escapes (e.g. through holes in nets).</p> <p>b. Calculate the unrecorded stock escape 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 unrecorded losses after harvest of the current cycle.</p> <p>c. Make the results from 3.3.2b available publicly. Keep records of when and where results were made public (e.g. date posted to a company website) for all production cycles.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>They are currently using a mixture of counting by hand and fish counters - the counters are Aquascan counters (a) All fish records are on Mercatus (Aquafarmer) - there is a Production Manager with overall responsibility for maintaining records (b) This is the Applicant's first audit and understands the calculation. As it is a RAS, the objective is to keep a set standing stock in all tanks, so they are constantly mixing batches. Therefore the calculation cannot be done on individual cohorts. However, the calculation can be done on a more macro level through farm data on Aquafarmer - a recent example was viewed (c) This is the first audit and so there is no calculation of recent stocks . The Applicant is aware of the requirements to publish going forward.</p>	Compliant		
3.3.3	<p>Indicator: For selectively bred stock or for non-selectively bred stock not from local sources or for wild fingerlings not from local sources more than 2 escape events of 30% (cumulative total fish not recovered) over 2 years .</p> <p>Requirement: No.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Determine whether stocks under culture are selectively bred, non-selectively bred but not from local sources or are from wild fingerlings not collected locally. If none of these apply, requirements 3.3.3 b.-d. do not apply.</p> <p>b. Where appropriate, maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees.</p> <p>c. Where appropriate, aggregate cumulative escapes (events and numbers) of all stocks in the most recent production cycle.</p> <p>d. Where appropriate, maintain the monitoring records described in 3.3.3a for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which farm is first applying for certification.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There has not been any escape event at the site. (a) Stocks are selectively bred - they are multiple generation domesticated (b) there has not been any incidents of escape (c) there has not been any incidents of escapes (d) all numbers are kept on Aquafarmer and recorded since start up. There was a deviation of 2.33% from 1st June to current date on all movements. This was using hand counts for the past year.</p>	Compliant		
3.3.4	<p>Indicator: All escape events of farmed Seriola or Cobia are reported to the pertinent regulatory agency.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Document details of reportable escape events and suspected escape events. Make available details of reportable escapes and make results from 3.3.2b available to regulatory agencies. In absence of regulatory requirement keep the data and make it available for ASC on request.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There has not been any escape event at the site. The Applicant is aware that they must report any escapes to regulators and make available to ASC upon request</p>	Compliant		
Criterion 3.4 Collection of fingerlings						
3.4.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence that purchased or collected wild fingerlings are harvested from a source fishery with a public fishery assessment, for example FishSource or is in a credible fishery improvement process (FIP) towards an ISEAL compliant fisheries sustainability certification scheme.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Provide details of source fishery from which fingerlings are taken. Provide supporting documentation including purchase orders, invoices, delivery notes etc. that attest to the origin of wild fingerlings.</p> <p>b. Provide FishSource score (www.FishSource.com) for wild fingerling fishery or evidence of MSC certification. If FishSource score or MSC certification is not available, then proceed to 3.4.1 c</p> <p>c. Demonstrate to audit team that the wild fingerling source fishery is in a credible Fisheries Improvement Programme towards an ISEAL compliant fisheries certification scheme</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The supplying site is Acuinar, which does not collect wild fingerlings as they have a domesticated supply of Seriola lalandi (b) there are no wild caught fingerlings (c) there are no wild caught fingerlings</p>	Compliant		

<p>3.4.2</p>	<p>Indicator: Traceability of wild or hatchery purchased or collected fingerlings to their source.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Provide details of hatchery or fishery from which fingerlings are obtained. Provide supporting documentation including purchase orders, transit/movement authorisations, catching vessel details, invoices, delivery notes, stocking records etc. that attest to the origin of all stock present on the farm.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The supplying hatchery sends a packing list with all deliveries. Packing Lists were viewed from recent deliveries showing numbers of fish per box. Recent deliveries were discussed with the Site Management</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		
<p>PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER</p> <p><i>Criterion 4.1 Traceability of marine raw materials in feed</i></p>						
<p>4.1.1</p>	<p>Indicator: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of fishmeal and fish oil ingredients .</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records.</p> <p>b. Inform each feed producer (and supplier) in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to production of feeds and send them a copy of the ASC Seriola and Cobia Standard.</p> <p>c. For each feed producer supplying the farm, confirm that an independent third party audit of the producer has recently been completed against an ISEAL compliant standard that includes an evaluation of feed input traceability. Obtain a copy of the most recent audit report for each feed producer.</p> <p>d. Obtain declaration from feed producers and suppliers stating that the company can assure traceability of all fishmeal and fish oil ingredients used in making seriola and cobia diets.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) Feed is supplied by Skretting and Le Gouessant, but only Le Gouessant is used for Grow-Out. For the scope of this audit which is just focussing on grow-out, is when fish are 20gms. Skretting is delivered in 20kg bags and Le Gouessant in 25kg bags and from 7mm upwards in bulk to Silos on site. Recent deliveries from Le Gouessant were viewed on Mercatus system and recent analysis of feed with a third party (b) Emails viewed from Quality Manager shows that the Applicant informed the feed mills and the corresponding information received back from the Feed Manufacturers (c) on Audit results the Applicant was able to show statements from Le Gouessant that they were IFFO RS Certified for all fishmeal feed ingredients (d) There is the Global GAP Certificate by BV which has Traceability of all ingredients. There is also a separate statement and declaration from Le Gouessant.</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		
<p><i>Criterion 4.2 Efficient and optimized diets</i></p>						
<p>4.2.1</p>	<p>Indicator:</p> <p>a) Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) and Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for Seriola (calculated using formulae in Appendix 1). Kampachi (S. rivoliana, S. dumerili), Hamachi (S. quinqueradiata).</p> <p>b) FFDRm and FFDRo Cobia (calculated using formulae in Appendix 1)</p> <p>Requirement:</p> <p>a) Kampachi: FFDRm ≤ 2.9/FFDRo ≤ 2.9 Hamachi: FFDRm ≤ 6.0/FFDRo ≤ 7.0 (now) FFDRm ≤ 4.8/FFDRo ≤ 5.0 (3 years) FFDRm ≤ 2.9 /FFDRo ≤ 2.9 (6 years)</p> <p>b) FFDRm ≤ 6.0/FFDRo ≤ 6.0 (now) FFDRm ≤ 4.0/FFDRo ≤ 4.0 (3 years) FFDRm ≤ 2.9/FFDRo ≤ 2.9 (6 years)</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used that includes information concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantities used of each formulation (kg); Percentage of fishmeal and fish oil in each formulation used; Source (fishery) of fishmeal and fish oil in each formulation used; Percentage of fishmeal and fish oil in each formulation derived from trimmings; Supporting documentation and signed declaration from feed supplier. <p>b. For FFDRm and FFDRo calculations, exclude fishmeal and/or oil derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery as per more detailed guidance in Appendix 1.</p> <p>c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix 1 .</p> <p>d. Calculate FFDRm and FFDRo using the relevant formulas in Appendix 1 .</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) All information is available on Mercatus and data is available from 1st June 2017 to 30th April 2018., the total feed used was 104,182 kgs. - 2mm and 3mm have one type of formulation (12 Ton) 5mm and 7mm have the same formulation (44 Ton) and 9mm, 11mm and 15mm (48 ton). Percentages of fishmeal and fish oil in each formulation was to hand. All fish oil was from trimmings. All sources of fishmeal were to hand by fishery source as well. (b) Calculations - all trimmings were excluded from calculations. (c) The calculated eFCR for the period was 1.2:1. (d) They have a FIFO of 1.71 and an FFDR shows as 2.17 and the FFDR = 0 as all Oil is from trimmings, which is within the metrics of the standard for Kampachi as they are rearing Seriola lalandi.</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		<p>eFCR = 1.21:1 FFDRm = 2.17 and FFDRo = 0</p>

4.2.2	<p>Indicator: Use of wet feed and moist pellets.</p> <p>Requirement: Must be sourced from the same ecosystem as the farm.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain records of wet fish and moist pellet use on the farm, where the fish content originated from and where it was caught.</p> <p>b. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No moist diets are being used.</p>	<p>N/A</p>		
Criterion 4.3 Responsible origin of marine raw materials						
4.3.1	<p>Indicator: Timeframe for at least 90% fishmeal or fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries certified under an ISEAL member's accredited certification whose primary goal is to promote ecological sustainability.</p> <p>Requirement: Within 5 years following the date of the publication of the SCAD standards.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentation that indicates the relative quantities of fishmeal and fish oil used in feed manufacture that is certified under an ISEAL member's accredited certification.</p> <p>b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under an ISEAL member standard.</p> <p>c. If audit >5years after publication of Seriola and Cobia standards, provide documentation that confirms that requirement for at least 90% fishmeal or fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries certified under an ISEAL member's accredited certification has been met.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The client is aware of the requirements and they are using a diet which has all fishmeal coming from ISEAL certified fisheries, if it is not from trimmings. So they are at 100% from IFFO certified sources. All grow-out feed is certified Organic. (b) The letter of intent is on their website (c) This is their first audit and the standard is 2016, so this clause is not applicabke as it is <5 years.</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		
4.3.2	<p>Indicator: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the fishmeal or fish oil used in feed must have a FishSource score of 6.0 or higher, plus (and) an 8 in the biomass category or show evidence of being engaged in a credible and time bound fisheries improvement project (FIP).</p> <p>Requirement: At least 80% of the fish meal and fish oil used in feed (excluding fishmeal and oil from byproducts) must meet this criteria.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentation from feed producers and/or suppliers that independently confirms the FishSource scores for at least 80% of fishmeal and fish oil used in feed manufacture. OR</p> <p>b. Where FishSource scores are not available for any particular fishmeal or fish oil ingredient/s, compile evidence that attests to the fishmeal and fish oil suppliers being engaged in a credible FIP.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) Apart from the trimmings, there is only 1 other species of fish used in fishmeal - Herring North Atlantic - This has fish source scores of >8 for individual and biomass scores (b) scores are available</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		
4.3.3	<p>Indicator: Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products or trimmings from fish species which are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species .</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Compile and maintain, consistent with 4.2.1a, a list of the fishery of origin for all fishmeal and fish oil originating from by-products and trimmings.</p> <p>b. Obtain a declaration from the feed producer and/or supplier stating that no fishmeal or fish oil originating from fish species which are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species is used to produce feed.</p> <p>c. If meal or oil originated from a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN but that species is sourced from a local stock that is not considered vulnerable, obtain documentary evidence to support a request for an exception based on regional differences in status of the relevant species/populations.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The list of all ingredients is on site and by category (b) See NC (c) There is no evidence that any species is listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN</p>	<p>Minor</p>	<p>4.3.3.b There is a declaration from the Feed Manufacturer, but on two of the sources of fish meal the certification says sustainable and no details on the species</p>	

4.3.4	<p>Indicator: Feed ingredients which come from other fish from the same genus.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Obtain from feed producers and/or suppliers declarations that the fishmeal and/or fish oil does not originate from fish of the same genus as that under cultivation.</p> <p>b. Obtain documentary evidence that feed manufacturer operates procedures to ensure that no raw material in a diet originates from the same genus as the fish for which the diet is intended. This includes all fishmeal and fish oil (including bulk fish and waste/trimmings/byproduct) that may be used.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) There is a declaration from the manufacturer that the same species is not used in feed formulations (dated 13th April 2018) (b) Under Global GAP certification, the same genus cannot be used in manufacture and a BV Global GAP Certificate which is valid to the 22nd October is on file for the Le Gouessant facility</p>	Compliant		
<i>Criterion 4.4 Responsible origin of non-marine raw materials in feed</i>						
4.4.1	<p>Indicator: Presence and evidence of traceability and a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients which comply with internationally recognized moratoriums and local laws .</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records.</p> <p>b. Inform each feed producer (and supplier) in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to traceability and responsible sourcing for feed manufacturers and/or suppliers.</p> <p>c. For each feed producer used by the farm, confirm that an independent third party audit of the producer was recently completed by a CAB against a standard that includes an evaluation of feed input traceability. Obtain a copy of the most recent audit report for each feed producer.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) All records are on Mercatus down to the batch numbers of feed delivered (b) Emails informing feed suppliers of ASC requirements were viewed (c) the BV certificate for Global GAP was viewed and also found on the Global GAP database - Traceability is a key component of the Global GAP audit program</p>	Compliant		
4.4.2	<p>Indicator: Documentation of the use of transgenic plant raw material, or raw materials derived from genetically modified plants, in the feed.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of transgenic plant raw materials and/or raw materials derived from genetically modified plants, in feed. This requirement is just about knowing that the feed includes or does not include transgenic material and then not claim the opposite.</p> <p>b. Disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic and /or genetically modified plant raw material used in feeds and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure. For first audits, farm records of initial disclosures shall pre-date the audit by > 6 months.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) The Le Gouessant facility is <1% GMO Certified and the certificate is valid from June 2017 to June 2020. This is a BV issued certificate. There is also a letter from the Supplier that there is no transgenic material in the feed.(b) There are no transgenic and/or GMO used on the facility. The applicant is aware of the requirements to report if they use any GMO's</p>	Compliant		
4.4.3	<p>Indicator: Percent of non-marine ingredients from sources certified by an ISEAL Member's certification scheme that addresses environmental and social sustainability.</p> <p>Requirement: 80% for soy and palm oil within 5 years from the date of the publication of the ASC Seriola and Cobia Standard .</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Obtain documentation that indicates the relative quantities of non-marine ingredients used in feed manufacture that is certified under an ISEAL member's accredited certification.</p> <p>b. For non-conforming farms, prepare a declaration stating the farm's intent to source feed that contains non-marine ingredients certified under an ISEAL member standard that addresses both environmental and social sustainability.</p> <p>c. If audit >5years after publication of Seriola and Cobia standards, provide documentation that confirms that requirement for at least 80% of non-marine ingredients used in feed comes from ISEAL member certifications that address both environmental and social sustainability.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) All declarations from the feed supplier on the non-marine ingredients which includes Organic Wheat Flour, Organic Wheat and Organic Soy Bean. (b) The farm is compliant (c) This is not applicable as the Standard was issued in 2016 and therefore <5 years The feed manufacturer also purchases RSPO certified palm oil</p>	Compliant		

PRINCIPLE 5: PROACTIVELY MAINTAIN THE HEALTH AND WELFARE OF CULTURED FISH AND MINIMIZE THE RISK OF DISEASE TRANSMISSION

Criterion 5.1 Transfer of pests or parasites to wild stocks

5.1.1	<p>Indicator: Commitment to participate in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme.</p> <p>Requirement: The farm participates in an ABM, where it exists, for managing disease and resistance to treatments.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme and communication around scheme availability.</p> <p>b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, for instance: - coordination of stocking; - following; - therapeutic treatments; and - information sharing.</p> <p>c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with definition of area, minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The site is a land based farm and there are no other farms in the vicinity. The clause is intended to assess impacts of open water cage farms and consequent transmission of disease. The UV and Ozone treatment of water along with no other species in the wild makes this clause not applicable. The reason it is also NA is that Kingfish cannot survive in the wild in this region due to temperature differences between the RAS and their ability to survive in temperatures below 14C which is what the Oosterschelde is for most of the year</p>	N/A		
5.1.2	<p>Indicator: A demonstrated commitment to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts of pests or parasites on wild stocks.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Retain records to show how the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups (NGOs, academics, governments) to agree on and collaborate towards areas of research to measure impacts on wild stocks, including records of requests for research support and collaboration and responses to those requests.</p> <p>b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 5.1.2a by either: - providing researchers with access to farm-level data; - granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Maintain records from research collaborations (e.g. communications with researchers) to show that the farm has supported the research activities identified in 5.1.2a.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a and b) KFZ has a lot of projects with academics and do internships with University of Applied Sciences in Zeeland. They also had Wageningen University involved in the Genetics side of their breeding program. However the clause is NA as there are no wild stocks in the region.</p>	N/A		

5.1.3	<p>Indicator: On-farm testing for ectoparasites, with test results made easily publicly available.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes, with results made easily publicly available within seven days of testing.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Prepare an annual schedule for ectoparasite testing that identifies timeframes of routine testing frequency.</p> <p>b. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for ectoparasites. If farm deviates from schedule due to weather maintain documentation of event and rationale.</p> <p>c. Document the methodology used for testing ectoparasites ('testing' includes both counting and identifying ectoparasites). The method must follow national or international norms, follows accepted minimum sample size, use random sampling, and record the species and life stage of the ectoparasite. If farm uses a closed production system and would like to use an alternate method (i.e. video), farm shall provide the CAB with details on the method and efficacy of the method.</p> <p>d. Make the testing results from 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.</p> <p>e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public.</p> <p>f. Submit test results to ASC at least once per year.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>There has been some records of metazoan parasites in Yellowtail in Australia and Japan causing issues in cage culture. However, as the facility is land based and is UV and Ozone of all incoming water, there is no risk of parasites. Furthermore there are no wild Yellow Tail in the region.</p>	N/A		
Criterion 5.2 Chemicals and treatments						
5.2.1	<p>Indicator: Use of therapeutic treatments that are banned by law under the local jurisdiction or listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization</p> <p>Requirement: Not permitted.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health.</p> <p>b. Maintain a list of therapeutants the use of which in finfish aquaculture are banned by law and also maintain a list of therapeutants the use of which in finfish aquaculture are permitted by law.</p> <p>c. If the farm has used antibiotics listed as critically important to human health and/or has used therapeutants that are banned in finfish culture to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit.</p> <p>d. If yes to 5.2.1c, request an exemption to the requirement of 5.2.1 from the CAB in order to certify only that portion of production that complies with the indicator. Prior to the audit, provide the CAB with records sufficient to establish details of treatment, which holding facilities were treated, and how the farm will ensure full traceability and separation of treated fish through and post- harvest.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) There is a link in the Veterinary Health Plan to the WHO List of antibiotics (b) See NC (c)The Applicant doesn't use any treatments and have never used Antibiotics since June 2017 to date. (d) they have never used treatments of any kind. The Applicant has a Quarantine Protocol that is contained in the FHMP.</p>	Minor	<p>Clause 5.2.1.b A list of therapeutants the use of which in finfish aquaculture are banned by law and also a list of therapeutants the use of which in finfish aquaculture are permitted by law, was not available</p>	
5.2.2	<p>Indicator: Prophylactic use of chemical antimicrobial treatments (excluding prebiotics or vaccinations).</p> <p>Requirement: Not permitted.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Maintain records for all purchases of chemical antimicrobials (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles.</p> <p>b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3).</p> <p>c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of chemical antimicrobials used during the current and preceding production cycles.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) there are no treatments at the site, so there are no purchases (b) there are no medication related events (c) there has not been any treatments at the site</p>	Compliant		

<p>5.2.3</p>	<p>Indicator: Farms have a comprehensive fish health management plan approved by the farm's designated veterinarian that includes either a) vaccination against diseases that present a risk in the region and for which an effective and commercially viable vaccine exists, or b) veterinarian-approved alternative fish health management strategies.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Ensure that documentation is available to verify that the fish health management plan includes mandatory procedures for either: i) vaccination against diseases that present a risk in the region and for which an effective and commercially viable vaccine exists; OR ii) veterinarian-approved alternative fish health management strategies.</p> <p>c. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian.</p> <p>d. Demonstrate that the farm complies with World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) regulations relating to transfer of fish/eggs/fingerlings, Specific pathogen free status and quarantine status (see http://www.oie.int/international-standard-setting/aquatic-code/access-online/).</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a and c) there is a FHMP on site that is approved by Melchior de Bruin (Vet for the Site) (b) The plan addresses vaccination - which is not required at the moment, but they review on an on-going basis. There are no vaccinations developed and there are no known diseases for which they should be vaccinated. (d) The Applicant has copies of all EU health certificates for all imported fry from Chile and records were viewed from the last 3 shipments</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		
<p>5.2.4</p>	<p>Indicator: Allowable farm level anti-parasiticide treatment not including freshwater, formaldehyde or hydrogen peroxide.</p> <p>Requirement: None .</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Identify permitted anti-parasiticides that may be applied to stock during the farming procedure in the fish health management plan. Provide Material Data Safety Sheets for all anti-parasiticide products that are used. Only freshwater, formaldehyde and hydrogen peroxide is allowed and others are banned.</p> <p>b. Make available records relating to all chemical, veterinary and therapeutant suppliers. Include Invoices, laboratory testing results as well as prescriptions and treatment records.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) There are no treatments as there are no issues with parasites in the land based system. (b) there are no treatments</p>	<p>Compliant</p>		

Criterion 5.3 Environmental welfare					
5.3.1	<p>Indicator: Weekly average percent dissolved oxygen (DO) saturation on farm, calculated in the following methodology.</p> <p>Requirement: >70% saturation .</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Exception can be granted to farms that do not conform to >70% saturation where it can be demonstrated that farm site DO readings are consistent with those of a reference site.</p>	<p>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. The ASC recognizes that it is not always safe to carry out weekly monitoring and there can be pragmatic and sensible solutions to testing. Under no circumstances should worker safety be compromised if, for example, there is bad weather.</p> <p>b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time.</p> <p>c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The farm has oxygard probes in all tanks and they are on constant monitoring 24 hours a day with alarms should oxygen in any tank go below 85%. The alarms when they go off, are attended to by staff to bring the oxygen over 85% saturation. They never go below 70% Saturation. Daily/Weekly average is always above 85% saturation. A review of probes on the day of the audit showed all to be over 100% saturation. This clause is more intended for open water cage culture and not a system where they have the ability to keep oxygen saturation at 100%. Calibration of the Oxygen system and probes was witnessed when doing the site tour.</p>	Compliant	
5.3.2	<p>Indicator: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 5.3.1 that fall under 70%.</p> <p>Requirement: <5%.</p> <p>Applicability: All farms. Exception can be granted to farms that do not conform to >70% saturation where it can be demonstrated that farm site DO readings are consistent with those of a reference site.</p>	<p>a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken that are less than 70% saturation DO.</p> <p>b. Inform CAB if the percentage of on-farm DO measurements that are less than 70% DO is greater than 5%. Provide data for previous 6 months.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>All are above 85% saturation, with most running at 100% saturation all day long - monitored in real time by an Oxygard system. The Applicant has the ability to manage Oxygen levels for all growing structures</p>	Compliant	
PRINCIPLE 6: OPERATE FARMS WITH RESPONSIBLE LABOR PRACTICES					
Criterion 6.1 Child labor) and young workers					
6.1.1	<p>Indicator: Number of incidences of child labor .</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years ; or • in countries where the legal minimum age is set higher than 15 years, in which case the legal minimum age of the country is followed. <p>If the farm operates in a country where the legal minimum ages is not 15, then the employer shall maintain documentation attesting to this fact.</p> <p>b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted at 6.1.1a).</p> <p>c. Employer must maintain personnel records that are sufficient to demonstrate conformity with requirements.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Legal minimum age is 16. No (historical) presence of workers below 16. Youngest worker is 21 years old.</p>	Compliant	
6.1.2	<p>Indicator: Percentage of young workers that are protected</p> <p>Requirement: 100%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site.</p> <p>b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs.</p> <p>c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers.</p> <p>d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours.</p> <p>e. Young workers are not exposed to hazards and do not perform hazardous work. Work on floating cages in poor weather conditions shall be considered hazardous.</p> <p>f. Others, please describe</p>	<p>No young workers in place</p>	Compliant	

Criterion 6.2 Forced, bonded or compulsory labor					
6.2.1	<p>Indicator: Number of Incidents where employers withhold any part of employee salary, property, or benefits upon termination of employment.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. It must be demonstrated that workers are free to leave the employment and workplace and that they are not subject to withholding of payments or denial of any other benefits of employment; or under any other obligations to the employer other than those are legal and contractual in nature.</p> <p>b. Conformity will be verified further through discussion with selected staff members during the on-site audit.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	No incidents	Compliant	
6.2.2	<p>Indicator: Number of incidents where employees are required to surrender original identity documents upon commencing employment (except as required for processing of legal documentation).</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. It must be demonstrated that workers are not required to surrender original identity documents except for when and for as long as it is necessary for the purpose of processing legal documentation.</p> <p>b. Conformity will be verified further through discussion with selected staff members during the on-site audit.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	Workers are not required to surrender original identity documents.	Compliant	
Criterion 6.3 Discrimination in the work environment					
6.3.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of comprehensive and pro-active antidiscrimination policies, procedures and practices including, but not limited to, discrimination in the workplace and equal access to all jobs in relation to gender, age, race, religion, creed, caste, or sexual orientation.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Demonstrate that employer has a written pro-active anti-discrimination policy in place, stating 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.</p> <p>b. Demonstrate that employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints and that these policies are understood and adhered to by staff.</p> <p>c. Demonstrate that employer proactively respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises.</p> <p>d. Demonstrate that all managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination and pro-active tolerance of diversity. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training is acceptable if proven effective.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Pro-active anti-discrimination policy 'Social & Environmental Policy' in place. The policy has been explained in detail by company management (town hall meeting) to all members of personnel. Management and non-management employee/worker interviews confirmed above.</p>	Compliant	
6.3.2	<p>Indicator: Number of confirmed incidences of discrimination.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. Records do not show evidence that the farm discriminates on grounds related to age, gender, religion, race, creed, caste, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.</p> <p>b. Interview with employees and employee 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.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Internal person of confidence is in place. No complaints received. As foreseen by the Dutch Labor Law, the "person of confidence" is an (internal or external) certified/qualified person who confidentially deals with notifications/complaints of employees regarding aggression, violence, sexual harassment, bullying, discrimination.</p>	Compliant	

6.3.3	<p>Indicator: Equality of pay, benefits and promotion opportunities for all employees independent of gender, age, race, religion, creed, caste or sexual orientation.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Include in anti-discrimination policy reference to equality of pay, benefits and promotional opportunities being independent of race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.</p> <p>b. Interview with employees and employee testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not discriminate on pay, benefits or promotional opportunities on the basis of race, caste, religion, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Social & Environmental Policy' > In anti-discrimination policy, reference is made to equality of pay, benefits and promotional opportunities being independent of race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination.</p> <p>Interviews with employees confirm that company does not discriminate.</p>	Compliant		
6.3.4	<p>employee on the basis of marital status or pregnancy or deny employee legal rights to pregnancy or maternity leave.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Check human resource records and employee files to verify grounds for dismissal or incidents of denying employee legal rights related to maternity or paternity leave.</p> <p>b. During the on-site audit, interview employees in relation to grounds for dismissal and company performance with respect to the granting of parental leave.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>HR records / employee files verified. No breach noticed.</p>	Compliant		
Criterion 6.4 Work environment health and safety						
6.4.1	<p>Indicator: Percentage of employees trained in health and safety practices, procedures and policies relevant to the job.</p> <p>Requirement: 100% for operations above five employees.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>All employees received general (and when legally required specific) H&S training. Emergency response team (BHV) receives regular emergency trainings.</p>	Compliant		
6.4.2	<p>Indicator: Safety equipment (Personal Protective Equipment, PPE) provided and maintained and in use.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards.</p> <p>b. Employees receive annual training in the proper use of PPE. For workers who participated in the initial training(s) previously an annual refreshment training may suffice, unless new PPE has been put to use.</p> <p>c. During the o-site audit, employees will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>PPE is provided to all workers for free. Employees confirmed they have received induction and annual refresh H&S trainings (regarding a.o. proper use of PPE).</p>	Compliant		
6.4.3	<p>Indicator: All health and safety related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions taken when necessary.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents.</p> <p>b. Employer records and maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety events, accidents, violations and investigations.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Interview employees in order to determine what procedures are implemented and explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken on foot of accidents or health and safety related events or concerns.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>H&S related accidents are recorded (complete H&S incident documentation incl. root cause analyses and corrective action plan). Worker interviews confirmed above.</p>	Compliant		

6.4.4	<p>Indicator: Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance (accident or injury) for 100% of worker costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Employer maintains and makes available documentation to confirm that all personnel are adequately insured to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries (if not covered under national law). Equal insurance coverage must be provided to all workers including part-time, temporary, migrant or foreign workers. Written contract of employer responsibility to cover accident costs is acceptable evidence in place of insurance.</p> <p>b. Others, please describe</p>	<p>All personnel is adequately insured via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Company Compact Polis 'Interpolis' liability insurance - Legal social insurance WAO-IVA-WIA-WGA - WGA enlarged income insurance 	Compliant		
<i>Criterion 6.5 Wages</i>						
6.5.1	<p>Indicator: Percentage of workers whose basic wage (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage.</p> <p>Requirement: 0%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>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 intention of this indicator is to protect the most vulnerable workers, other staff such as managers may be paid in kind and are not to be considered as 'workers' for the purpose of this indicator.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records). Workers will be interviewed during on-site audit to verify conformity with the above.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>"Legal minimum wage" is:</p> <p>1341,30 EUR for 21 year old worker</p> <p>1578,00 EUR for 22 year old worker or older</p>	Compliant		
6.5.2	<p>Indicator: The percentage of workers whose basic wage (before overtime and bonuses) is below the basic needs wage 5 years after adoption of the standard.</p> <p>Requirement: 0%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Auditor to calculate the basic needs wage and compare it to the farm's calculation to verify for accuracy.</p> <p>b. Provide evidence that all farm workers are paid at least the basic needs wage (before overtime and bonuses) within 5 years of publication of the seriola and cobia standard.</p> <p>c. Demonstrate basic needs wage for the country of operation. The audit team will verify accuracy of the calculation and end figure.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(This clause does not come into effect until 2021.)</p>	N/A		
6.5.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts.</p> <p>b. The method for setting wages is clearly set out and explained to workers.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>d. Workers will be interviewed to confirm conformity with the standards requirements.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Wages and benefits are clearly mentioned in contracts and salary slips. Worker interviews confirm that wages are paid on time per bank transfer.</p>	Compliant		

Criterion 6.6 Access to freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining					
6.6.1	<p>Indicator: Percentage of employees with access to trade unions, worker organizations, and/or the ability to self-organize as well as the ability to bargain collectively or access the representative(s) chosen by workers without management interference.</p> <p>Requirement: 100%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Demonstrate that all workers have the freedom to join a trade union or any legitimate workers organisation, 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.</p> <p>b. Demonstrate that workers are permitted to self-organize and/or engage in collective bargaining.</p> <p>c. During interviews with workers, verify conformity with the requirements of 6.6.1 and that workers are free to access worker chosen representatives without interference from management or agents of the company.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>This is a non-unionized facility. There are no unions active on site. There is no legal obligation to have union(s) on site. Workers are free to join a union of their choice.</p>	Compliant	
6.6.2	<p>Indicator: Incidences of members of unions or worker organizations being discriminated against.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. During interviews with workers and workers representatives, determine if there are incidents of members of unions or workers organizations being discriminated against by management.</p> <p>b. Review any stated cases of discrimination on the basis of union membership or membership of workers organisations with management to verify whether the farm is in conformity with requirements of the standard.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>This is a non-unionized facility. There are no unions active on site. There is no legal obligation to have union(s) on site. Workers are free to join a union of their choice.</p>	Compliant	
Criterion 6.7 Harassment and disciplinary practices in the working environment causing temporary or permanent physical and/or mental harm					
6.7.1	<p>Indicator: Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary Actions.</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Verify that the employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity.</p> <p>b. Allegations of corporal punishment, mental abuse, physical coercion, or verbal abuse must be fully documented in a company procedure so that these can be corroborated by auditors.</p> <p>c. During on-site audit, workers will be interviewed to determine whether there is evidence of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Employer/management does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices.</p>	Compliant	
6.7.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence of clear, fair and transparent disciplinary procedures documented and communicated to employees.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker. Maintain evidence that employees are aware of procedures and that the process is transparent.</p> <p>b. Maintain documentary audit trail for incidences of disciplinary action and outcome (incl. worker evaluation reports). Workers may be interviewed during onsite audit to determine level of conformity and that disciplinary action policy is fair and effective.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The company's 'Social & Environmental Policy' states: "it is the aim of KFZ to improve all employees by training and learning by doing". Worker interviews confirm very fair company culture of continuous learning and helping (rather than disciplinary actions).</p>	Compliant	
6.7.3	<p>Indicator: Evidence that incidences of harassment are recorded and addressed with corrective actions.</p> <p>Requirement: 100%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Employer has in place a policy in relation to harassment of workers. The policy requires a procedure to be initiated in the event of incidents of harassment by management of workers or between workers. The procedure is documented and records details, action taken, outcome and corrective actions required.</p> <p>b. During the on-site audit, interview workers with respect to harassment, policies and procedures as well as examples of harassment action and outcomes to verify level of conformance.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The company's 'Social & Environmental Policy': Internal confidence person is in place (see 6.3.2); Transparent procedure in place related how to raise, file, respond to discrimination, harassment, conflicts, etc.</p>	Compliant	

Criterion 6.8 Working hours and overtime					
6.8.1	<p>Indicator: Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours or overtime laws .</p> <p>Requirement: None.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. The employer must make available 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.</p> <p>b. Examination of a randomly selected sample of records (by the auditor) - including time sheets and payroll records show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law.</p> <p>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)</p> <p>d. Farm workers may be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Legal maximum working hours (OT included):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 hours/day • 60 hours/week • 55 hours/week (average per 4 weeks) • 48 hours/week (average per 16 weeks) <p>Working hours and OT records were available. Normal weekly working hours is 40. No regular OT.</p> <p>Highest OT of 24 hours/month for last 3 months. Average OT of 3,7 hours/month for last 3 months.</p>	Compliant	
6.8.2	<p>Indicator: Overtime is limited, voluntary , paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All farms unless exempted.</p>	<p>a. Make available payment records (e.g. pay advice) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours.</p> <p>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</p> <p>c. Workers may be interviewed to confirm that all overtime is voluntary (unless there is a collective bargaining agreement in place which specifically allows for compulsory overtime).</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	OT paid at premium of 135%.	Compliant	
Criterion 6.9 Contracts or other written employment agreements					
6.9.1	<p>Indicator: Percentage of workers who have contracts or other written employment agreements.</p> <p>Requirement: 100%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. The employer maintains a record of all employment contracts.</p> <p>b. There is no evidence for labor-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes.</p> <p>c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	Employment contracts available at HR Dept.	Compliant	
6.9.2	<p>Indicator: Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors when operating on the farm site.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible employment practices and policies.</p> <p>b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors.</p> <p>c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2.</p> <p>d. All workers on site including those indirectly employed are to be protected by the requirements of Principle 6 and the auditor can check records, observations and interviews with these workers to evaluate compliance.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The company's 'Social & Environmental Policy' states:</p> <p>"We aim a positive and LT relationship with all stakeholders, including suppliers and subs-contractors. In order to meet and control our standards, we ask our suppliers to meet with our standards on quality and sustainability (environmentally and socially) as well."</p> <p>Most important labor supplier "Jaap KOSTER" was not yet asked to meet this KFZ social standard.</p>	Minor	Interim worker supplier "Jaap KOSTER" did not showed his socially responsible employment practices and policies.
Criterion 6.10 Conflict resolution					
6.10.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p>	<p>a. The employer has a clear labor conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner, supported by a documented procedure.</p> <p>b. Workers are familiar with the company's labor conflict resolution policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have access to fair treatment of complaints.</p>	<p>The company's 'Social & Environmental Policy':</p> <p>Internal confidence person is in place (see 6.3.2);</p> <p>Transparent procedure in place related how to raise, file, respond to discrimination, harassment, conflicts, etc. (see 6.3.2)</p>	Compliant	

	<p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>c. The farm must maintain documentary evidence (e.g. complaint or grievance filings, minutes from review meetings). Workers may be interviewed during on-site audit in order to verify conformity.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>0.3.2) Worker interviews confirm the company's labor conflict resolution policy and existence of "person of confidence".</p>			
--	-----------------------------------	---	---	--	--	--

6.10.2	<p>Indicator: Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed within a 90-day timeframe.</p> <p>Requirement: 100%.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. The employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labor conflicts that are raised.</p> <p>b. The employer keeps a documentary record of follow-up and outcome, according to procedural requirements (including corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed.</p> <p>c. Workers will be interviewed to verify conformity with the procedure for dealing with grievances and that they were addressed within a 90-day timeframe.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Internal confidence person is operational (see 6.3.2). Recording system is foreseen. Currently no complaints/grievances, conflicts received.</p>	Compliant		
Criterion 6.11 Living conditions for employees accommodated on the farm						
6.11.1	<p>Indicator: Farm employees have access to clean, sanitary, safe and suitable living conditions.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Provide evidence that potable/safe drinking water is always available for workers</p> <p>b. Provide evidence that adequate sanitary facilities are available for workers</p> <p>c. Provide evidence of safe, secure and quality accommodation sufficient to withstand local conditions in the event of storms or other natural events that could endanger lives.</p> <p>d. Provide evidence that accommodation provided is suitable to workers needs (and their family's), appropriate for their gender if accommodated on site also.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>(a) Potable drinking water available. This was noticed during the auditor's plant tour. (b) there was adequate sanitary facilities (c and d) there is no living accommodation provided</p>	Compliant		
6.11.2	<p>Indicator: Existence of separate sanitary and toilet facilities for men and women; with the exception of work sites with fewer than 10 employees or where married couples are working and accommodated together.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All farms and accommodation and worksites except as permitted exclusions (6.11.2a).</p>	<p>a. Provide separate and suitable sanitary and toilet facilities are available for men and women, with the possible exception of married couples being accommodated together and at worksites that have less than 10 employees.</p> <p>b. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Separate sanitary and toilet facilities for men and women.</p>	Compliant		
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN PRACTICES						
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement						
7.1.1	<p>Indicator: Evidence of regular and meaningful consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually).</p> <p>b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations.</p> <p>c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda in advance of meetings.</p> <p>d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential human health risks of therapeutic treatments. The intention is for the farm to resolve conflicts that the farm has control / responsibility over and interviews are to be conducted in language appropriate to the community. Not to use technical language like for instance, 'therapeutants'.</p> <p>e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above.</p> <p>f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above.</p> <p>g. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The farm has regular contact with local community (more than twice a year). Several activities are organized for this local community, e.g.: - consultation of local community & authority regarding the draft urban/environmental permit - sponsoring of several local social/cultural foundations or initiatives - regular contact with local entrepreneurs</p>	Compliant		

7.1.2	<p>Indicator: Presence and evidence of an effective policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations.</p> <p>Requirement: Yes.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders).</p> <p>d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above.</p> <p>e. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The company's 'Social & Environmental Policy':</p> <p>Transparent procedure in place related how to raise, file, respond to complaints, etc. "Procedure Complaints External".</p> <p>Currently no complaints have been received yet.</p>	Compliant		
<i>Criterion 7.2 Respect for local cultures and traditional territories</i>						
7.2.1	<p>Indicator: Local groups consulted during project design and operation.</p> <p>Requirement: At least 2x per year or as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with local and/or indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b.</p> <p>b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups.</p> <p>c. Representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above consultation and engagement with local groups at planning and operational stages.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>The farm has regular contact with local community/groups; e.g. consultation of local community & authority regarding the draft urban/environmental permit.</p> <p>No indigenous groups.</p>	Compliant		

Criterion 7.3 Access to resources					
7.3.1	<p>Indicator: Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources without community approval.</p> <p>Requirement: 0.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. Resources that are considered vital to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under Indicator</p> <p>b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented.</p> <p>c. Representatives from the community may be interviewed to provide evidence of whether or not the farm has restricted access to vital resources without prior community approval.</p> <p>d. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Resources that are considered as vital to the local community (e.g. water of the protected Oosterschelde), are documented and known by the farm (via stakeholder consultation prior to the urban/environmental permit).</p>	Compliant	
7.3.2	<p>Indicator: Assessments of company's impact on access to resources.</p> <p>Requirement: At least once per year.</p> <p>Applicability: All.</p>	<p>a. There is a documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources. Can be completed as part of community consultations under 7.2.1.</p> <p>b. Representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of evidence presented in 7.3.2a.</p> <p>c. Others, please describe</p>	<p>Detailed assessment and continuous monitoring by the farm, and by the Governmental Agency (Rijkswaterstaat).</p>	Compliant	

E1. The CAB shall complete tables E2 and E3 below by providing its risk category (low, medium or high) for each threat listed and an explanation to support it in this table
 E2. The CAB shall add the list of additional threats (Annex E, E4.2.1.ii) to this table and provide its risk category and an explanation to support it to this table.

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	Related VR (#)	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions proposed by UoC and accepted by CAB	Deadline for NC close-out	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Actual date of close-out	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved	
1	1.1.4	Minor	Clause 1.1.4c - The Applicant is monitoring Total N and Total P, but not according to the Standard Techniques specified in the Water Permit	There is a Water Permit (RWS-2016/17005) Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment - dated 25th April 2016 which permits 400m3/hr abstraction. This was issued to Zeeuwse Tong (previous owners) and carries over to KFZ as the licence holders for the site. The Applicant is in the phase of splitting the licence to 2 licences with Delta Farms (a neighbouring Rag worm farmer). The two limits on the discharge are Total N (45mg/l) and Total P (8mg/l) and volumes of 200m3/hr intake and 250 m3/hr discharge. The licence allows for the company to select 'best available' techniques when sampling. They do morning (6am - 7am) and afternoon (2pm - 3pm) once per month.	30-May-18	Closed	None	A detailed monthly water monitoring program is implemented at Kingfish-Zeeland. Since e.g. soluble Phosphorus, TAN,NO2 and NO3 is measured monthly it was expected this would be sufficient. However this is not according to the Standard Techniques specified in the Water permit.	Our third party laboratory was asked to execute the Total-N and total P measurements quarterly: Total-N according to ISO/TR 11905-2 Total-P according to NEN/ISO 15681-2 Total-P could be executed according to NEN-EN-ISO 15681-2. However for total-N this laboratory is using in-house, official accredited technology. Since Aquilab-Zuid is an official accredited laboratory according to EN ISO/IEC 17025:2005 standards, total-N values analysed by Aquilab-Zuid are therefore expected not to differ from ISO/TR 11905-2.	29-Aug-18	The evidence supplied by the client on the accredited laboratory being used is acceptable and sufficient to close the non-conformance raised. Cormac O'Sullivan, 17th July 2018	17-Jul-18						
2	3.3.1	Minor	Clause 3.3.1.a There is no documented Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan including a risk assessment provided with the specific requirements of 3.3.1.c Clause 3.3.1.c. There is no training on the Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan	(a) The farm is a closed based RAS and the risk of escape is minimal. However there is no documented Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan including a risk assessment provided with the specific requirements of 3.3.1.c (b) This is NA as they do not operate a cage system (c) See 3.3.1.a (d) See 3.3.1.a (e) There is no training on the Stock Escape Prevention and Management Plan	30-May-18	Closed	None	Although it seems very unlikely fish can escape from our RAS facility, we did not have a documented Stock Escape Prevention and Management plan in place.	A Stock Escape Prevention and Management plan was added in the VHP (Chapter 5.1 page 14.). Including a schematic example of our production systems and photo's describing barriers to prevent our fish from escape.	29-Aug-18	The section added to the VHP on the Stock Escape Prevention and Management as well as the Power Point Training material which included Escape Management is sufficient given that the Applicant is operating a closed RAS. Cormac O'Sullivan 17th July 2018	17-Jul-18						
3	4.3.3	Minor	4.3.3.b There is a declaration from the Feed Manufacturer, but on two of the sources of fish meal the certification says sustainable and no details on the species	(a) The list of all ingredients is on site and by category (b) See NC (c) There is no evidence that any species is listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN	30-May-18	Closed	None	This detail of all species was overlooked in relation to the IUCN status	The Feed Manufacturer supplied a full list of all species used in the production of the fish feed demonstrating their origins and none of which are on the IUCN	29-Aug-18	The full list and origin of all species used in the fish feed demonstrates that none are listed as vulnerable on the IUCN	17-Jul-18						
4	5.2.1	Minor	Clause 5.2.1.b A list of therapeutants the use of which in finfish aquaculture are banned by law and also a list of therapeutants the use of which in finfish aquaculture are permitted by law, was not available	(a) There is a link in the Veterinary Health Plan to the WHO List of antibiotics (b) See NC (c) The Applicant doesn't use any treatments and have never used Antibiotics since June 2017 to date. (d) they have never used treatments of any kind. The Applicant has a Quarantine Protocol that is contained in the FHMP.	30-May-18	Closed	None	Kingfish-Zeeland B.V. is working with 3 fish veterinarians: Dr. Melchior de Bruijn (Avi-vet) Dr. Robin Carpentier (Veteau) Dr. Felix Scholtz (Fish-vet group) Monthly routine inspections are carried out by Robin and Felix, whereas Melchior is used to arrange medications/therapeutants and to sign official documents when needed. In our Veterinary Health Plan it is described how we would react in a case therapeutants are deemed necessary to treat our fish. However the list of therapeutants we are can use was not present during the audit.	Melchior de Bruijn has written a statement On the use of veterinary medication at Kingfish-Zeeland B.V. This includes a list first choice antibiotics, and second choice antibiotic conform (conform 2006/88/EC). Since Kingfish-Zeeland will always use therapeutants that are permitted by law only permitted therapeutants are named in the document. Only therapeutants are named that will potentially will be used when deemed necessary. When therapeutants are used this will always be done in accordance with the cascade legislation and recorded in a logfile described by the Formularium guidelines consumptive vis (page 17/20).	29-Aug-18	The evidence supplied which is statements and lists from one of the Company vets is sufficient to close the non-conformance raised. Cormac O'Sullivan, 17th July 2018	17-Jul-18						
5	6.9.2	Minor	Interim worker supplier "Jaap KOSTER" did not showed his socially responsible employment practices and policies.	The company's 'Social & Environmental Policy' states: "We aim a positive and LT relationship with all stakeholders, including suppliers and sub-contractors. In order to meet and control our standards, we ask our suppliers to meet with our standards on quality and sustainability (environmentally and socially) as well." Most important labor supplier "Jaap KOSTER" was not yet asked to meet this KFZ social standard.	30-May-18	Closed	None	By visiting the website: https://www.payforpeople.nl/wiki-nen-4400-1/ it seemed that JAAP KOSTER did comply to the NEN-4400 standards. Because Jaap Koster was not available during the audit we were not able to find this document.	To find the document the following steps need to be taken: 1. visit the website of pay-for-people and click to the SNA website link (doc 6.1): https://www.payforpeople.nl/wiki-nen-4400-1/ 2. Enter de Koster at the normering arbeid website (doc 6.2): https://www.normeringarbeid.nl/ 3. Download certificate (doc 6.3). 4. The Chamber of Commerce numbers of both the certificate match with those from Jaap Koster B.V. Both proving this certificate belongs to Jaap Koster B.V. (doc 6.4)	29-Aug-18	The evidence supplied by the Applicant, which shows that the labor supplier was indeed compliant but just not available on the date of the audit to show the information on the government website, is therefore sufficient to close the non-conformance. Cormac O'Sullivan, 17th July 2018	17-Jul-18						

ASC Audit Report - Traceability

10	Traceability Factor	Description of risk factor if present.	Describe any traceability, segregation, or other systems in place to manage the risk.
10.1	The possibility of mixing or substitution of certified and non-certified product, including product of the same or similar appearance or species, produced within the same operation.	All fish on the audited site are going to be Certified. For post harvesting, the applicant is renting a space at an Auction House (Vismijn - United Fish Auction) in Colijnsplaat for processing the fish, once they have been harvested at the Farm. Grovisco is another site that is rented by KFZ and is an old Turbot farm (RAS) that has 40MT annual capacity - this is 45 mins drive from the site that is being audited (Main Site). Kingfish from Grovisco are also processed at the same Processing facility (United Fish Auction) as the fish from the KFZ site. They are harvesting fish from both sites all year round, so there is a risk at the Packing House (Vismijn)	They have a procedure on Lot Number, which is based on the purge tanks from each site. They are in the process of developing a labelling system based on purge tanks - there are 8 purge tanks in Jorvisco and 4 purge tanks in the Main Site. The Purge Tank nomenclature allows for identification of fish based on the site they came from. This prevents substitution.
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.	During processing there is going to be fish from certified and non-certified sites. However with the purge tank Lot numbering, this ensures segregation.	The lot numbering system allows for identification of different batches of fish

<p>10.3 The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.</p>	<p>There are no subcontractors used in the process</p>	<p>NA there are no subcontractors used in the process</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No - all fish from the two sites are lot numbered. The fish from the audited site are all going to be ASC certified</p>	<p>NA</p>

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

Transport is organised from Vismijn and then distributed to customers Most of the product is sent to a fish distributor - Kotra - and taken to Yerseke and customers can pick it up. Boxed product leaving Vismijn is always in Poly boxes and on ice or on gel packs

10.6 Traceability Determination:

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

The on-farm systems are sufficient with the ability to trace all fish back to systems on the farm and to the point of when they are entered in to a 'purge' tank just before harvesting.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Not required - all the fish from the site being audited are traceable and there is no separate chain of custody required for the farm</p>
<p>10.6.3 The point from which chain of custody is required to begin.</p>	<p>Once the fish are harvested at the site, they are taken by truck by the Applicant to the Processing facility. Chain of Custody is required at the processing facility.</p>
<p>10.6.4 Is a separate chain of custody certificate required for the producer?</p>	<p>The producer does not need a chain of custody certificate, but the Processing facility will</p>

ASC Audit Report - Closing

12 Evaluation Results

12.1 A report of the results of the audit of the operation against the specific elements in the standard and guidance documents.

There was a high degree of compliance against the standard and this was evidenced by 5 minor non conformities on this their first audit. One of the non-conformances was in relation to Social clauses where a service providers was not asked to meet the social standards of KFZ. One non-conformance was in relation to feed and information from the feed manufacturer. Another was in relation to analytical techniques used for water testing not in accordance with the type specified in the licence. The non-conformance in relation to escapes (it had two sub sections) was about the specifics of an escape management plan and training for staff. There was a non-conformance in relation to specifics around approved and banned medicines lists.

12.2 A clear statement on whether or not the audited unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard(s).

They have the ability to meet the requirements of the Standard

12.3 In cases where Biodiversity Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA) or Participatory Social Impact Assessment (PSIA) is available, it shall be added in full to the audit report. IF these

NA - neither are required

13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	Yes
13.2 The Eligibility Date (if applicable)	20-Aug-18
13.3 Is a separate coc certificate required for the producer? (yes/no)	No
13.4 If a certificate has been issued this section shall include:	
13.4.1 The date of issue and date of expiry of the certificate.	20-Aug-18
13.4.2 The scope of the certificate	ASC Seriola and Cobia Standard, Version 1.0 October 2016. Point of entering CoC: Once the fish are harvested at the site, they are taken by truck by the Applicant to the Processing facility. Chain of Custody is required at the processing facility, CoC no. ASC-C-02042
13.4.3 Instructions to stakeholders that any complaints or objections to the CAB decision are to be subject to the CAB's complaints procedure. This section shall include information on where to review the procedure and where further information on complaints can be found.	All complaints and/or objections should be submitted in writing to asc.reports@sgs.com. The related procedures can be found at www.sgs.com.

14 Surveillance

14.1 Next planned Surveillance	
14.1.1 Planned date	May-19

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

Kingfish Zeeland BV
x