Aquaculture Stewardship Council Salmon Standard
2017 Re-Assessment Report

Tassal Operations Pty Ltd, Eastern Zone (MF190 Creeses Mistake)

Onsite Dates:	20 -21 June, 2017
Draft Report Release Date:	10 August, 2017
Final Report:	29 September, 2017

PDF 1 Public Disclosure Form

PDF 1.1	Name of CAB	SCS Global Services
PDF 1.2	**Date of Submission**	Friday, May 5, 2017
PDF 1.3	**CAB Contact Person**	
PDF 1.3.1	Name of Contact Person	Dr Stephen Leporati
PDF 1.3.2	Position in the CAB's organisation	Staff Auditor
PDF 1.3.3	Mailing address	7/252 St Georges Rd, North Fitzroy, Vic 3068. Australia.
PDF 1.3.4	Email address	sleporati@scsglobalservices.com
PDF 1.3.5	Phone number	+610410137707
PDF 1.3.6	Other	
PDF 1.4	**ASC Name of Client**	
PDF 1.4.1	Name of Company	Tassal Operations Pty Ltd
PDF 1.4.2	Name of Contact Person	Heidi Hansen
PDF 1.4.3	Position in the client's organisation	Environmental Certification and Sustainability Officer
PDF 1.4.4	Mailing address	Level 9, Marine Board Building 1 Franklin Wharf Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia.
PDF 1.4.5	Email address	hedi.hansen@tassal.com.au
PFD 1.4.6	Phone number	+61362449021
PDF 1.4.7	Other	

PDF 1.5 Unit of Certification

PDF 1.5.1	Single Site	Yes
PDF 1.5.2	Multi-site	No
PDF 1.5.3	Group certification	No

PDF 1.6 Sites to be audited

Site Name	GPS Coordinates	Other Location Information	Planned Site Audit(s)	Date of planned audit
MF 190 Creeses Mistake	-43.097264, 147.718508	N/A	June 20, 2017	20 - 21 June 2017

PDF 1.7 Species and Standards

Standard	Species (scientific name) produced	Included in scope (Yes/No)	ASC endorsed standard to be used	Version Number
Salmon	*Salmo salar*	Yes	ASC Salmon Standard	v1.1

* 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
BirdLife Tasmania	Non-Government environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment (DPIPWE)	Government Department	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
EPA Tas	Government regulatory body	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
WWF Australia	Non-Government environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
RSPCA	Non-governmental animal welfare stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Huon Aquaculture	Salmon farm operator.	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Petuna Aquaculture	Salmon farm operator.	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasman Council	Local Council	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.

Tasmanian Abalone Council	Commercial Fishery Association	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasmanian Rock Lobster Fisherman's Association	Commercial Fishery Association	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Seafood Training Tasmania	Community/economic stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasman District School	Local School	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasman Men's Shed	Community/economic stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Environment Tasmania	Non-Government environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasmanian Aquaculture Reform Alliance	Non-Government environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Environmental Defenders Officer	Non-Government environmental stakeholder.	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasmanian Seafood Industry Council	Peak Body	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.

Tasmanian Salmon Growers Association	Industry peak body	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Australian Workers Union	Workers Union	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Department of Parks of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment (DPIPWE) - Parks and Wildlife.	State Government regulator.	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasmanian Conservation Trust	Non-Government environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS) - University of Tasmania.	Research Institute	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Marine and Safety Tasmania (MAST)	Statutory authority	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasmanian Raptor Refuge and Wildlife Park	Non-governmental environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
NRM South / National Landcare	Non-Government environmental stakeholder	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
South-East Training Centre (Sorell)	Educational Institution	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.

Sorell Council	Local Council	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Sailing Tasmania	Peak Body	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Glamorgan Spring Bay Council	Local Council	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.
Tasmanian Association for Recreational Fishing	Peak Body	In-person and/or input submission	In advance of the audit and during community stakeholder meeting.	Email and in-person if available for the community stakeholder meeting.

PDF 1.9 Proposed Timeline

PDF 1.9.1	Contract Signed:	May 5, 2017
PDF 1.9.2	Start of audit:	June 5, 2017
PDF 1.9.3	Onsite Audit(s):	20 - 21 June 2017
PDF 1.9.4	Determination/Decision:	September 29, 2017

PDF 1.10 Audit Team

	Role	Name
PDF 1.10.1	Lead Auditor:	Dr Stephen Leporati
PDF 1.10.2	Technical Experts:	David O'Sullivan
PDF 1.10.3	Social Auditor:	Sarah Lowe

1 Title Page

1.1	Name of Applicant	Tassal Operations Pty Ltd
1.2	Report Title [e.g. Public Certification Report]	ASC Farm Report_Tassal 190 Creeses Mistake_2017_Final
1.3	CAB name	SCS Global Services
1.4	Name of Lead Auditor	Dr Stephen Leporati
1.5	Names and positions of report authors and reviewers	Dr Stephen Leporati - Lead Auditor David O'Sullivan - Technical Expert Sarah Lowe - Social Auditor Dr Sabine Daume - Technical Review Gregory Berke - Technical Review Jason Swecker - Certification Decision
1.6	Client's Contact person: Name and Title	Heidi Hansen - Environmental Certification and Sustainability Officer
1.7	Date	29 September, 2017

2 Table of Contents

Section 1: Audit Report Opening
Section 2: Non-conformity Report
Section 3: Audit Report Checklist
Section 4: Audit Report Traceability
Section 5: Audit Report Summary
Appendix 1
Appendix 2

3 Glossary

ABM = Area Based Management
AMA = Area Management Agreement
AMR = Antimicrobial Resistance
ADD = Acoustic Deterrent Device
AHD = Acoustic Harassment Device
AMBI = AZTI Marine Biotic Index
ASBA = Australian School Based Apprenticeship
ASC = Aquaculture Stewardship Council
AZE = Allowable Zone of Effect
AWU = Australian Workers Union
B-EIA = Biodiversity focused Environmental Impact Assessment
BOD = Biochemical Oxygen Demand
BQI = Benthic Quality Index
CAAHVS = Centre for Aquatic Animal Health and Vaccines
CAB = Conformity Assessment Body
CBD = Convention on Biological Diversity
CFEV = Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystem Values
CFM = Compound Manufactured Feed
DO = Dissolved Oxygen
DoE = Department of Education
DPIPWE = Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Wildlife and Environment.
EBA = Enterprise Bargaining Agreement
eFCR = Economic Feed Conversion Ratio
ENGO = Environmental Non-Government Organisation
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency
EPBC = Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act
EUL = Estimated Unexplained Loss

Terms and abbreviations that are specific to this audit report and that are not otherwise defined in the ASC glossary	FFDRm = Fishmeal Forage Dependency Ratio FFDRo = Fishoil Forage Dependency Ratio FHT = Fish Health Team FPM = Fish Performance Manager FRDC = Fisheries Research and Development Corporation FY = Financial Year GHG = Greenhouse gas GWP = Global Warming Potential HCVA = High Conservation Value Area HFCs = hydrofluorocarbons HoS = Head of Sustainability HOGG = Head on gutted HR = Human Resources IBC = Intermediate Bulk Container ICV = Integrated Conservation Values ILO = International Labour Organisation IMAS = Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies ITI = Infaunal Trophic Index IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature IUU = Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported MAST = Marine and Safety Tasmania MOPS = Marine Operations mV = millivolts NRM = Natural Resource Management NRS = National Residue Survey OHS = Occupational Health and Safety OTC = Oxytetracycline PMOV = Pilchard Orthomyxovirus PPE = Personal Protective Equipment PSIA = Participatory Social Impact Assessment RCV = Relative Conservation Values RLO = Rickettsia Like Organism RTRS = Roundtable for Responsible Soy RYCT = Royal Yacht Club Tasmania SkA = Skretting Australia SMFH = Senior Manager Fish Health SOP = Standard Operating Procedures TO = Technical Officer TSIC = Tasmanian Seafood Industry Council

4 Summary

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

4.1	A brief description of the scope of the audit	The scope of this surveillance audit against the ASC Salmon Standard v1.1 includes the following sites from Tassal's Eastern Zone: MF 190 Creeses Mistake.
4.2	A brief description of the operations of the unit of certification	A single grow out site is being evaluated for this audit as part of the Client's Eastern Zone, located off the Tasman Peninsula in south-eastern Tasmania.
4.3	Type of unit of certification	Single farm
4.4	Type of audit	Recertification

4.5	A summary of the major findings	The re-assessment audit addressed four existing non-conformities and identified two new majors, ten minors and two observation. The following is a breakdown of these findings. Four existing non-conformities from the previous surveillance audit were addressed, as follows: 5.1.1 was closed out for the fish health management plan; 2.5.6 was closed out for birds, but a new non-conformity has been identified for seals; 2.5.7 the lack of a risk assessment was closed out, however a new incident without opportunity to enact the findings from a risk assessment has instigated a new minor non-conformity; 3.4.1 the Client has not quantified escapes through holds in nets turning this previously minor non-conformity into a major. This non-conformity has been closed out. New findings from the re-assessment audit, include one major non-conformity for impacts on stream health at the Saltas hatchery, which was closed out. Related to this non-conformity is a minor for failing to implement a plan to address environmental impacts at the hatcheries. Further minors were given for i) failure to use appropriate vessel navigational marks which lead to a collision, ii) maximum viral disease-related mortality, iii) dead fish disposal procedures, iv) roll-out of anti-discrimination training, v) effectiveness of community consultation and vi) community complaints procedures. An observation was given for misreporting (over reporting) wildlife mortalities on the companies website and delayed reporting to the Audit Team for a workplace incident involving a telehandler. Post Draft Report non-conformities were identified during July 2017 under 1.1.1 for a collision incident with the towing of a pipe and 2.5.7 & 2.5.6 when two seals perished in the false bottom of one of the pens. The major non-conformity for the collision has been closed out and the minor non-conformities for the seal deaths have been given extensions to determine if mitigation measures are appropriate. Interpretation response was received by SCS from ASC on 28 September allowing SCS to make determination on extending NC17 and finalizing Certification Decision.
4.6	The Audit determination	The Audit Team recommends re-certification upon the closing out of all major non-conformities.

5 CAB Contact Information

5.1	CAB Name	SCS Global Services
5.2	CAB Mailing Address	2000 Powell Street, Suite 600 Emeryville, CA 94608, United States
5.3	Email Address	jswecker@scsglobalservices.com
5.4	Other Contact Information	+1 (510) 452-8000

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.	The certificate (ASC-F-SCS-004) for the Eastern Zone was issued on the 18 September 2014 and is valid until 17 September 2017.
6.2	A description of the unit of certification (*for initial audit)* / changes, if any (*for surveillance and recertification audits)*	Tassal Group Ltd, founded in 1986, is an ASX 300 public company listed on the Australian Securities Exchange. Tassal is the largest salmon aquaculture company in Australia, employing over 1,200 people. A vertically integrated company, Tassal operates three salmon hatcheries, four processing facilities, one retail outlets and marine farms in four zones throughout the state of Tasmania. Tassal is producing salmon predominately for the Australian market, and has a retail presence in over 3,357 outlets around Australia. Tassal farms Atlantic Salmon (Salmo salar) in open net cage farming systems that are polar circles with 120 m or 168 m circumferences, and maximum stocking densities of 15 kg/m³.
6.3	Other certifications currently held by the unit of certification	The site has the following certifications: AS 4801, OHS AS 18001:2007. At the related processing facilities, Tassal also has other certifications such as ISO 9001:2008, HACCP, Halal and Kosher.
6.4	Other certification(s) obtained before this audit	This site was first ASC certified in 2014, with successful surveillance audits during 2015 and 2016.
6.5	Estimated annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the current year	Commercially sensitive information submitted to ASC separately.
6.6	Actual annual production volumes of the unit of certification of the previous year *(mandatory for surveillance and recertification audits)*	See 6.5
6.7	Production system(s) employed within the unit of certification *(select one or more in the list)*	pen
6.8	Number of employees working at the unit of certification	48

7 Scope

7.1	The Standard(s) against which the audit was conducted, including version number	ASC Salmon Standard V1.1
7.2	The species produced at the applicant farm	Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*)
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.	The scope of this audit covers the single growout site MF190 Cresses Mistake at Nubeena on the Tasman Peninsula. This site is considered as part of the Client's Eastern Zone. The pens and barges located on the grow-out site are serviced from a works hub at Nubeena. The Audit Team will also visit the Client's Head Office in Hobart Tasmania to interview staff on issues relevant to the Eastern Zone.
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.	N/A
7.5	Description of the receiving water body(ies).	The farm site is located in Wedge Bay south-eastern Tasmania near Nubeena off the Tasman Peninsula. Wedge Bay is partially sheltered from prevailing westerlies and is connected to the larger Storm Bay.

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.

See 1.5 above.
Audit completed: 22 June 2017
Report writing: 22 June to 14 August, 2017
Report Review: 12 - 28 September, 2017
Certification Decision: 29 September, 2017

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 - 09/2014	NCF1	1.1.1	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF2	2.2.4	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF3	2.3.1	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF4	2.5.5	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF5	2.5.6	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF6	4.3.2	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF7	5.1.2	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF8	5.1.6	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF9	7.1.1d	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF10	7.1.3	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF11	7.2.2	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
	NCF12	8.33	12 months from final report - closed - August 2015
Surveillance audit 1 - 12/2015	NCF1	5.1.5	12 months from final report - closed - December 2016
	NCF2	7.1.1a,c,e	12 months from final report - closed - December 2016
Surveillance audit 2 - 12/2016	NCF1	2.5.6	12 months from final report - open
	NCF2	2.5.7	12 months from final report - open
	NCF3	3.4.1	12 months from final report - open
	NCF4	5.1.1	12 months from final report - open
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	7 - 19 June 2017	SCS Offices Melbourne, Victoria
8.4.2 Onsite audits	20 - 21 June 2017	Eastern Zone farm site, Tasmania
8.4.3 Stakeholder interviews and Community meetings	20 June 2017	Nubeena, Tasmania
8.4.4 Draft report sent to client	31 July 2017	
8.4.5 Draft report sent to ASC	10 August 2017	
8.5.5 Final report sent to Client and ASC	29 September 2017	

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.	**Tassal** Head of Sustainability Senior Manager Fish Health Senior Manager Breeding and Research Regional Manager Zone Manager Fish Performance Manager - Operations Senior Manager Freshwater Systems Team Leader Human Resources Manager Senior Environmental Officer Environmental Officer Wildlife Officer Environmental Certification & Sustainability Officer Feeder 1 Feeder 2 Net Cleaner Works Crew 1 Works Crew 2 Works Crew 3 Works Crew 4 Diver 1 Diver 2 Diver 3 **Aquenal** Managing Director **EPA** Senior Manager 1 Senior Manager 2 **DPIPWE** Senior Manage 1 Senior Manager 2

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

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

Note: if no stakeholder comments were received, please describe what outreach activities have taken place here.	The Social Auditor set up the community consultations on the social media platform Eventbrite with full information about the process and the opportunity to make a submissions. The community consultation announcement was then promoted and forwarded to key people in the community, who were identified in the stakeholder list. Further recommendations were provided from the local Tasman Council and Eco Village. The local Nubeena School Principal placed posters about the consultation around the school, along with notification in the school newsletter and their Facebook page. The Eco Village disseminated posters, the Community Centre at Nubeena put posters up and placed notification in their Newsletter. The opportunity to be involved was also promoted through Facebook and Neighbours of Fishfarms (NOFF). Unfortunately the deadline for the local council monthly newsletter was missed. Notes and responses for the community consultation have been provided in Appendix 2 of this report. No stakeholder submissions were received during the public comment draft report period.

Estimated annual production volume of the farm site (MF190) has been omitted from the report for confidentiality reasons. The information was submitted to ASC separately.

AUDIT MANUAL - ASC Salmon Standard						
Scope: species belonging to the genus Salmo and Oncorhynchus						
PRINCIPLE 1: COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAWS AND LOCAL REGULATIONS						
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with all applicable local and national legal requirements and regulations						
		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	**AUDIT EVIDENCE** Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	**EVALUTAION**	**DESCRIPTION OF FINDING** Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	**VALUE/METRIC** If applicable for the respective Indicator.
1.1.1	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with local and national regulations and requirements on land and water use **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain digital or hard copies of applicable land and water use laws. b. Maintain original (or legalised copies of) lease agreements, land titles, or concession permit on file as applicable. c. Keep records of inspections for compliance with national and local laws and regulations (if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation). d. Obtain permits and maps showing that the farm does not conflict with national preservation areas. e. Others, please describe	**A** • The Client maintains copies of all appropriate laws in physical form on site, at head office and electronically on their server. In addition, access to any alterations to relevant state legislation can be accessed online via www.thelaw.tas.gov.au. **B** • Copies of a current marine farming licence for MF190 under the Living Marine Resources Management Act 1995 has been provided to the Auditor. Other relevant documentation provided included: a marine farming lease agreement until 2029, a cartographic survey results, navigation requirements, plus a copy of the title for the badger cove land base and crown lease. • During 2014, approval was given to the Client by the State Government to alter the configuration of the site. As part of the approval the client hired independent environmental consultants Aquenal to conduct a baseline environmental assessment of the altered site. In 2015 following the baseline assessment an annual video assessment was not required. The Client conducted video surveys in 2016, which was approved by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) (See 2.1.1). • In October 2015 the State Government granted the Client permission to use the feed barge "Evolution" on the site between the hours of sunrise and sunset. Further to this, in September 2016 approval was given to use existing lighting on the feed barge during sunset to sunrise. On both occasions the Marine Farming Licence was adjusted accordingly. **C** •Email confirmation of compliance with the position of moorings, buoys, navigational markers and equipment has been provided by a Senior Management Officer for the Marine Farming Branch at the Department of Primary Industries Parks Water and Environment (DPIPWE). • An up to date schedule of Vessels by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) has been provided. • A letter from the EPA confirming that the Client's annual benthic environmental monitoring has satisfied their lease conditions has been provided to the auditor as evidence of compliance. The Client also supplied proof of correspondence with the EPA that compliance determinations are now presented in an email rather than a formal letter signed off by the director. • The Client informed the audit team that the site was inspected by WorkSafe Tasmania following an incident when a telehandler rolled over and off the road at the Nubeena Works Hub. • On the 15th of April the Client was issue an infringement notice by Marine and Safety Tasmania (MAST) for failing to display a day mark on a vessel that was towing a long length of pipe. This failure to display the appropriate day mark or mark the pipe in anyway resulted in a recreational vessel colliding with the pipe. The infringement notice was issued under section 5 of the Marine and Safety (Collision) By Laws 2007. The Client was issued a fine for this incidence, which has been paid. This infringement constitutes a minor non-conformity. **D** • DPIPWE have developed and implemented a "Tasman Peninsula and Norfolk Bay Marine Farming Development Plan (Nov 2005)", which demonstrates that the farm site does not conflict with any national preservation areas.	Minor	Failure to display appropriate markings when towing pipeline at sea lead to a collision with a recreational vessel.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
1.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all tax laws **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of tax payments to appropriate authorities (e.g. land use tax, water use tax, revenue tax). Note that CABs will not disclose confidential tax information unless client is required to or chooses to make it public. b. Maintain copies of tax laws for jurisdiction(s) where company operates. c. Register with national or local authorities as an “aquaculture activity". d. Others, please describe	**A** The Client's annual report details records of tax payments to the Australian Tax Office in accordance with the Corporations Act 2001. An independent Auditor's report on the financial details is included in the annual report. **B** The annual report demonstrates an appropriate level of knowledge of tax requirements for the size of the Client's operations. The annual report is a publicly available document and has been assessed by an independent financial auditor. **C** The independent financial auditors report describes the Client's compliance with the relevant legislative requirements. The Client has provided a current copy of their marine farming licence for the site from the Tasmanian Government.	Compliant		
1.1.3	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with all relevant national and local labour laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain copies of national labour codes and laws applicable to farm (scope is restricted to the farm sites within the unit certification.) b. Keep records of farm inspections for compliance with national labour laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation). c. Others, please describe	A. A copy of the Fair Work Information Statement as issued by the Fair Work Ombudsman has been provided to the Auditor. This statement specifies the central legislation for labour laws in Australia, worker minimal entitlements and employment standards. The Auditor has also been provided with a copy of the Tassal Marine Operations Enterprise Agreement 2015, along with signed approval of the agreement in accordance with the Fair Work Act 2009 by the Commissioner of the Fair Work Commission. The Client also has a Conditions of Employment Policy (IMS-P1047) that states all relevant policies and legislation, plus related company procedures and agreements. All of these documents are provided to employees at induction and comply with relevant national and local labour laws. B. On the 22 January 2017 a incident occurred where a JCB Telehandler was rolled on-site and pulled down a low voltage powerline. This incident resulted in an incident investigation report (WHFS-F100) (see 6.5.4 for further details), which detailed the sequence of events, major findings and proposed control measures. The also had the telehandler inspected by AssetSafe in accordance with AS2550 19 and the Plant Code of Practice, which confirmed that the equipment was in good repair and safe to use on the 19 April 2017. The Client also provided the Auditor with documentation stating that all actions identified in the AssetSafe report have been attended to.	Compliant		
1.1.4	**Indicator:** Presence of documents demonstrating compliance with regulations and permits concerning water quality impacts **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain permits for water quality impacts where applicable. b. Compile list of and comply with all discharge laws or regulations. c. Maintain records of monitoring and compliance with discharge laws and regulations as required. d. Others, please describe	A. The Client has obtained all applicable permits and undertaken appropriate baseline and water quality monitoring requirements. Copies of receipts from the DPIPWE relating to survey and research monitoring submissions have been provided to the Auditor. B. A service agreement between the Client and an external contractor for the removal of sullage has been provided to the Auditor. C. Client currently removes all waste water from the feed barges for onshore processing, and do not release blood water as a product of harvesting in to the marine environment. These procedures are in compliance with licence conditions 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
PRINCIPLE 2: CONSERVE NATURAL HABITAT, LOCAL BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION						
Criterion 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects [1]						
2.1.1	Indicator: Redox potential or [2] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE) [3], following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 Requirement: Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) or Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare a map of the farm showing boundary of AZE (30 m) and GPS locations of all sediment collections stations. If the farm uses a site-specific AZE, provide justification [3] to the CAB. b. If benthos throughout the full AZE is hard bottom, provide evidence to the CAB and request an exemption from 2.1.1c-f, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard. d. Collect sediment samples in accordance with the methodology in Appendix I-1 (i.e. at the time of peak cage biomass and at all required stations). e. For option #1, measure and record redox potential (mV) in sediment samples using an appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. f. For option #2, measure and record sulphide concentration (uM) using appropriate, nationally or internationally recognized testing method. g. Submit test results to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once for each production cycle. If site has hard bottom and cannot complete tests, report this to ASC. h. Others, please describe	A. A map of the lease boundary and the environmental monitoring report showing dive locations have been provided. B. A baseline environmental assessment for the farm site was conducted by independent consultant Aquenal during 2014, which confirmed that the benthos under the farm is sediment. C. A variance request (VR) No (24)_20140320 (See Appendix 1) for the Client's operations in South-eastern Tasmania has been granted by the ASC, which states: " To address this criteria (2.1.1), Tassal propose to continue using the researched and approved visual assessment methodology under Schedule 3V of the Marine Farming Licence to replace chemical proxies such as redox and sulphide, which presents itself as spontaneous outgassing of sediments without or upon disturbance." In accordance with this VR the Client has supplied the Auditor with email correspondence from a Senior Manager at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) dated 9th December 2016 stating that "EPA Tasmania is satisfied that the requirements of the video survey schedule attached to the licence for this marine farming lease have been met and that the management strategies outlined in the report are appropriate". The 2017 annual assessment is due later in the year. As mentioned in 1.1.1 an annual video survey was not conducted 2015 due to a base line survey conducted 2014 for the re-configuration of the site. This baseline survey has been provided, along with the annual video assessments for the original farm configuration for 2012 and 2013. During both of these years the farm site was deemed compliant with their licence conditions by the then regulatory body the DPIPWE (note: responsibility transferred to the EPA in 2016). D - G: N/A	Compliant		
2.1.2	Indicator: Faunal index score indicating good [4] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 Requirement: AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI [5]) score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25 Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Prepare map showing AZE (30 m or site specific) and sediment collections stations (see 2.1.1). b. Inform SCS whether farm chose option #1, 2, 3, #4 to demonstrate compliance with requirement. c. Collect sediment samples in accordance with Appendix I-1 (see 2.1.1). d. For option #1, measure, calculate and record AZTI Marine Biotic Index [5] score of sediment samples using the required method. e. For option #2, measure, calculate and record Shannon-Wiener Index score of sediment samples using the required method. f. For option #3, measure, calculate and record Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score of sediment samples using the required method. g. For option #4, measure, calculate and record Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score of sediment samples using the required method. h. Retain documentary evidence to show how scores were obtained. If samples were analyzed and index calculated by an independent laboratory, obtain copies of results. i. Submit faunal index scores to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle.	A. A variance request No (24)_20140320 for the Client's operations in Tasmania has been granted by the ASC, which states: "The indices referred to by the ASC are fairly commonplace in benthic faunal evaluations, and are a core component of sediment quality assessments in Europe and the Americas; however Australia and Tasmania specifically are not a complete fit. The similarities and differences in the local Tasmanian ecology compared with overseas systems, are well recognised, as are the differences between Northern and Southern Hemisphere systems. As a result it has been highlighted that many of the biotic indices metrics derived in northern context do not readily translate to Australian context. " As a result of this variance visual survey's have been used as a substitute for infaunal sampling on the farm site. B - I: N/A	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
2.1.3	**Indicator:** Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1 **Requirement**: ≥ 2 highly abundant [6] taxa that are not pollution indicator species **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Document appropriate sediment sample collection as for 2.1.1a and 2.1.1c, or exemption as per 2.1.1b. b. For sediment samples taken within the AZE, determine abundance and taxonomic composition of macrofauna using an appropriate testing method. c. Identify all highly abundant taxa [6] and specify which ones (if any) are pollution indicator species. d. Retain documentary evidence to show how taxa were identified and how counts were obtained. If samples were analyzed by an independent lab, obtain copies of results. e. Submit counts of macrofaunal taxa to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	A. A variance request No (24)_20140320 for the Client's operations in Tasmania has been granted by the ASC, which states: "Tassal's farms in the SE region of Tasmania in the Huon River and D'Entrecasteaux Channel Marine Farm Development Plan Areas have been well studied as per Tasmanian (Southern Hemisphere) systems. Tassal propose the possibility of ASC recognising that there is enough infauna data from previous studies (the majority of them conducted in this specific region) to assess benthic impacts using visual means rather than faunal indices. Under Schedule 3B of the Marine Farming Licence Tassal is required by law to investigate benthic infauna (see 2.1.2). B- E: N/A	Compliant		
2.1.4	Indicator: Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible [7] modelling system Requirement: Yes, within three years of the publication [8] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015) Applicability: All farms except as noted in [1]	a. Undertake an analysis to determine the site-specific AZE and depositional pattern before 3 years have passed since publication of the Standard on June 13, 2012. b. Maintain records to show how the analysis (in 2.1.4a) is robust and credible based on modelling using a multi-parameter approach [7]. c. Maintain records to show that modelling results for the site-specific AZE have been verified with > 6 months of monitoring data. d. Others, please describe	A. A variance request No (24)_20140320 for the Client's operations in Tasmania has been granted by the ASC, which states: "The AZE is 35 metres and this distance was defined by the regulators (Marine Farming Branch) based on multiple lines of evidence from the international and local research. This 35 m AZE has been in place for over 15 years as a part of the licence conditions. Monitoring since then by research bodies and farms has provided the government with evidence that a 35 m AZE is a suitable distance for this particular farming environment. B & C: N/A	Compliant		
Criterion 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation [12]						
2.2.1	**Indicator**: Weekly average percent saturation [13] of dissolved oxygen (DO) [14] on farm, calculated following methodology in Appendix I-4 **Requirement:** ≥ 70% [15] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [15]	a. Monitor and record on-farm percent saturation of DO at a minimum of twice daily using a calibrated oxygen meter or equivalent method. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months. b. Provide a written justification for any missed samples or deviations in sampling time. c. Calculate weekly average percent saturation based on data. d. If any weekly average DO values are < 70%, or approaching that level, monitor and record DO at a reference site and compare to on-farm levels (see Instructions). e. Arrange for auditor to witness DO monitoring and calibration while on site. f. Submit results from monitoring of average weekly DO as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year. g. Others, please describe	A. The Client has provided more than 6 months of dissolved oxygen records (October 2016 to June 2017). The Environmental sampling procedure (MO - 115) for measuring dissolved oxygen is compliant with the requirements outlined in Appendix I-4. Dissolved oxygen measurements are taken daily at depths of 5, 10 and 15 m, with the weekly average from the 5 m data. DO is monitored constantly in each pen and recorded before and after each feed. Copies of feed sheets have been provided as evidence that procedures are being followed. B. No missed samples or deviations have been identified. C. Weekly average percent saturation data has been provided by the Client. D. All DO values were above 80%. E. Dissolved Oxygen monitoring procedures were observed on board the feed barge at the farm site. Both feed attendants who conduct dissolved oxygen measurements, independently verified that DO measurements from the barge are only taken once per day before the start of the morning shift. This is not directly aligned with the methodology described in Appendix I-4 which asks for	Compliant		All DO values >80%.

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
2.2.2	**Indicator**: Maximum percentage of weekly samples from 2.2.1 that fall under 2 mg/litre DO **Requirement:** 5% **Applicability:** All	a. Calculate the percentage of on-farm samples taken for 2.2.1a that fall under 2 mg/l DO. b. Submit results from 2.2.2a as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year. c. Others, please describe	A. None of the farm samples taken fell below 2 mg/l DO. B. The Client has submitted the appropriate dissolved oxygen data to the ASC.	Compliant		All values > 2 mg/litre DO.
2.2.3	Indicator: For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets [16], demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently [17] classified as having “good” or “very good” water quality [18] Requirement: Yes [19] Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Inform the CAB whether relevant targets and classification systems are applicable in the jurisdiction. If applicable, proceed to "2.2.3.b". If not applicable, take action as required under 2.2.4 b. Compile a summary of relevant national or regional water quality targets and classifications, identifying the third-party responsible for the analysis and classification. c. Identify the most recent classification of water quality for the area in which the farm operates. d. Others, please describe	A. A variance request No (24)_20140320 for the Client's operations in Tasmania has been granted by the ASC, which states: "The Tasmanian Salmon farming industry have had a SE (South East of Tasmania) Broadscale Environmental Monitoring Program (BEMP) which was implemented in 2009 in association with a State regulated Nitrogen Cap. The BEMP has undergone a third party scientific review by the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Sciences (IMAS). The review has shown that at current levels of industry production, which are capped under regulation, the ecosystem has the capacity to assimilate the inputs from salmon farms. The BEMP was developed from an ecological model which generated water quality triggers and compliance against these triggers and is government-mandated within Tassal`s jurisdiction". B. N/A C. N/A	Compliant		
2.2.4	Indicator: For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous [20] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5 Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [19]	a. Develop, implement, and document a weekly monitoring plan for N, NH4, NO3, total P, and ortho-P in compliance with Appendix I-5, testing a minimum of once weekly in both locations. For first audits, farm records must cover ≥ 6 months. b. Calibrate all equipment according to the manufacturer's recommendations. c. Submit data on N and P to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. d. Others, please describe	A. The approved variance detailed in 2.2.3 makes this requirement redundant. B. N/A C. N/A	Compliant		
2.2.5	**Indicator**: Demonstration of calculation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD [21]) of the farm on a production cycle basis **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Collect data throughout the course of the production cycle and calculate BOD according to formula in the instruction box. b. Submit calculated BOD as per Appendix VI to ASC for each production cycle. c. Others, please describe	A. The BOD has been calculated in accordance with the equation in footnote 22 of the ASC Salmon Standard. B. The Client has submitted the calculated BOD to the ASC.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
2.2.6	Indicator: Appropriate controls are in place that maintain good culture and hygienic conditions on the farm which extends to all chemicals, including veterinary drugs, thereby ensuring that adverse impacts on environmental quality are minimised. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Document control systems in good culture and hygiene that includes all appropriate elements. b. Apply the systems ensuring that staff are aware, qualified and trained to properly implement them.	A - The Client has a Dangerous Goods & Hazardous Substances (WHS-110) procedure in place that outlines safety standards, definitions, responsibilities. The procedure is linked to by a Dangerous Goods/Hazardous Substances/Risk Assessment form (WHS-F142) that is used by staff to assess and categorise goods and substances so the appropriate handling and storage are used. A copy of a recent filled out (April 2017) site inspection form (WHS-F136) has been provided, demonstrating that the appropriate procedures are being adhered to. The Auditor has also been provided with a copy of the Client's dangerous goods register which details all chemicals in use and hazard classification. B - The on-site audit and conversations with a wide range of staff members in differing roles, has demonstrated to the Auditor that staff are appropriately qualified, trained, aware and committed to the maintenance of good culture and hygienic conditions throughout the farm.	Compliant		
Criterion 2.3 Nutrient release from production						
2.3.1	**Indicator**: Percentage of fines [22] in the feed at point of entry to the farm [23] (calculated following methodology in Appendix I-2) **Requirement:** < 1% by weight of the feed **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [23]	a. Determine and document a schedule and location for quarterly testing of feed. If testing prior to delivery to farm site, document rationale behind not testing on site. b. If using a sieving machine, calibrate equipment according to manufacturer's recommendations. c. Conduct test according to detailed methodology in Appendix I-2 and record results for the pooled sample for each quarter. For first audits, farms must have test results from the last 3 months. d. Others, please describe	A - The Client has a task break down procedure for the quarterly calculation of percent fines in feed (MO-374), which is aligned with the requirements of the Standard. The percentage of fines in the feed at point of entry to the farm has been calculated in accordance with the standard is <1%. A declaration from the feed supplier has also been provided stating that they endeavour to adhere to the ASC standard. The Client has also provided quarterly testing of percentage of fines at different points (i.e. bulk store, selector and spinner). In the third quarter of 2016 the percentage of fines at the spinner were >1%, which resulted in the issuing of an observation during the 2016 surveillance audit. Feed testing for the fourth quarter of 2016 and first quarter of 2017 revealed percentage fines <1% at the spinner on both occasions. These results demonstrate that the issue detailed in the observation from the 2016 surveillance report has been addressed. B - Manual sieving of feed is conducted. N/A C - The auditor was walked through the procedure for sieving feed samples by the feed manager who is the person responsible for and conducts these tests. The procedure described to the auditor was aligned with the calculation methodology described in Appendix I-2. However, areas for improvement identified by the auditor would be to have a feed sample at hand to demonstrate the process, and the procedure (MO-374) stored with the measurement equipment. Since the last audit the quarterly testing during December 2016 and April 2017 have revealed percentage of fines <1%, this is in compliance with the Standard. It should also be noted that sampling takes place at the silo based on the barge, the selector and the spinner to enable the feeder to identify any equipment based breakage of feed. This is a above and beyond the conditions of the Standard, which only has sampling at the feed shed upon receiving of feed lots as a requirement. Such practices demonstrate a strong understanding of identifying and minimising dust production.	Compliant		All percentage of fines in the feed were <1% of the weight of the feed.

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 2.4 Interaction with critical or sensitive habitats and species						
2.4.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains at a minimum the components outlined in Appendix I-3 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Perform (or contract to have performed) a documented assessment of the farm's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3. b. If the assessment (2.4.1a) identifies potential impact(s) of the farm on biodiversity or nearby critical, sensitive or protected habitats or species, prepare plan to address those potential impacts. c. Keep records to show how the farm implements plan(s) from 2.4.1b to minimize potential impacts to critical or sensitive habitats and species. d. Others, please describe	A. The Client has and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which compiles with all the components outlined in the standard. B. The EIS was initially conducted during 2013, however, it is considered a live document from which the Client uses to base their environmental decisions. The EIS is amended on occasion when alterations to lease arrangements are required. C. During 2014 a re-configuration of the lease site was approved, thus requiring an amendment to the EIS. The amended EIS has been provided to the auditor and adheres to the requirements of the Standard. The Client has also confirmed that when any potential impacts on biodiversity are identified they contact and confer with state and federal agencies, and typically hire external consultant Aquenal to conduct research. The Auditor met with the Managing Director of Aquenal who provided confirmation of this and summaries of the research/monitoring they are currently conducting in the Eastern and wider zones for the Client. Aquenal also has a working relationship with IMAS, whom they share some research responsibilities with for the Client directly and the larger salmon industry.	Compliant		
2.4.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for the farm to be sited in a protected area [24] or High Conservation Value Areas [25] (HCVAs) **Requirement:** None [26] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [26]	a. Provide a map showing the location of the farm relative to nearby protected areas or High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) as defined above (see also 1.1.1a). b. If the farm is <u>not</u> sited in a protected area or High Conservation Value Area as defined above, prepare a declaration attesting to this fact. In this case, the <u>requirements of 2.4.2c-d do not apply</u>. c. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA, review the scope of applicability of Indicator 2.4.2 (see Instructions above) to determine if your farm is allowed an exception to the requirements. If yes, inform the CAB which exception (#1, #2, or #3) is allowed and provide <u>supporting evidence</u>. d. If the farm is sited in a protected area or HCVA and the exceptions provided for Indicator 2.4.2 <u>do not apply</u>, then the farm does not comply with the requirement and is ineligible for ASC certification. e. Others, please describe	A. The "Marine Farming Development Plan 2005" compiled by DPIPWE confirms that the farm is not situated in a protected area or HCVA. B. The Client has provided a declaration stating that their operations do not occur in protected areas or HCVA. C. N/A D. N/A	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 2.5 Interaction with wildlife, including predators [27]						
2.5.1	Indicator: Number of days in the production cycle when acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) were used Requirement: 0, within three years of the date of publication [28] of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2015) Applicability: All	a. Prepare a written statement affirming that the farm's management is committed to eliminate all usage of acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) or acoustic harassment devices (AHDs) by June 13, 2015. b. Compile documentary evidence to show that no ADDs or AHDs were used by the farm after June 13, 2015 (applicable only after the specified date). - d. Others, please describe	A. The Client has provided a written statement declaring that they don't use and are committed to not using ADDs and AHDs. B. A "Wildlife Interaction Recording and Reporting Procedure" (Document: ES - 113) has been developed, which is aligned with the standard. C. No evidence of ADDs or AHDs were observed or suspected at the farm site. Discussions with the Client's wildlife officer demonstrated that they were well aware that ADDs and AHDs cannot be used.	Compliant		
2.5.2	**Indicator**: Prior to the achievement of 2.5.1, if ADDs or AHDs are used, maximum percentage of days [29] in the production cycle that the devices are operational **Requirement:** ≤ 40% **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2015	a. Maintain a log for the use of any ADDs or AHDs on farm that includes recording the number of days (24-hour cycles) during which the devices were used. b. Calculate the percentage of days in the production cycle that the devices were operational in the most recent complete production cycle. - d. Submit data on number of days that ADDs/AHDs were used to the ASC as per Appendix VI. Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). e. Others, please describe	A. This indicator has not been scored due to ADD or AHDs not being used on the farm site. B. N/A C. N/A D. N/A	Compliant		
2.5.3	**Indicator**: Number of mortalities [30] of endangered or red-listed [31] marine mammals or birds on the farm **Requirement:** 0 (zero) **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a list of all predator control devices and their locations. b. Maintain a record of all predator incidents. c. Maintain a record of all mortalities of marine mammals and birds on the farm identifying the species, date, and apparent cause of death. d. Maintain an up-to-date list of endangered or red-listed marine mammals and birds in the area (see 2.4.1) - f. Others, please describe	*A.* The Client has provided a site map of where predator (seal) control devices are located at the site office. B. The Client has a wildlife interaction recording and reporting procedure (ES-113) in place and has provided a list of bird and seal interactions including: birds released alive, birds accidentally killed, seals accidentally killed and seals humanely destroyed. C. Discussions with feed, works, wildlife and management staff throughout the on-site audit confirmed that no endangered or red-listed mammals or birds have died on the farm since the last audit. D. An updated list of IUCN species has been provided to the Auditor, it is consistent with the EIS provided in 2.4.1.	Compliant		Zero endangered or red-listed marine mammals or birds have died on the farm.

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
2.5.4	Indicator: Evidence that the following steps were taken prior to lethal action [32] against a predator: 1. All other avenues were pursued prior to using lethal action 2. Approval was given from a senior manager above the farm manager 3. Explicit permission was granted to take lethal action against the specific animal from the relevant regulatory authority Requirement: Yes [33] Applicability: All except cases where human safety is endangered as noted in [33]	a. Provide a list of all lethal actions that the farm took against predators during the previous 12-month period. Note: "lethal action" is an action taken to deliberately kill an animal, including marine mammals and birds. b. For each lethal action identified in 2.5.4a, keep record of the following: 1) a rationale showing how the farm pursued all other reasonable avenues prior to using lethal action; 2) approval from a senior manager above the farm manager of the lethal action; 3) where applicable, explicit permission was granted by the relevant regulatory authority to take lethal action against the animal. c. Provide documentary evidence that steps 1-3 above (in 2.5.4b) were taken prior to killing the animal. If human safety was endangered and urgent action necessary, provide documentary evidence as outlined in [33]. d. Others, please describe	A. The Client's records indicate that there weren't any deliberate mortalities of seals, birds or any other predator. B. N/A C. N/A	Compliant		
2.5.5	**Indicator**: Evidence that information about any lethal incidents [35] on the farm has been made easily publicly available [34] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. For all lethal actions (see 2.5.4), keep records showing that the farm made the information available within 30 days of occurrence. b. Ensure that information about all lethal actions listed in 2.5.5a are made easily publicly available (e.g. on a website). c. Others, please describe	*A.* The Client has a wildlife interaction recording and reporting procedure (ES - 113), which has a focus on making such information publicly available. B. The Client has provided screen shots of their sustainability dashboard reporting for wildlife interactions for the past three months. An observation was given for this criteria during the last surveillance audit due to there not being apparent information about the duration in which a lethal incident should remain on the webpage. Re-appraisal of this observation from the same Auditor has convinced them that current reporting procedures are sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Standard. The basis of this is that the month of the incident is recorded and a 30 day reporting period requirement is detailed in the description of the reporting mechanism on the web page. A minor mistake was made by the Client in November 2016, where it was accidentally reported that a mortality event of 10 birds occurred during the. Proof that this was a mistake was provided by allowing the Auditor to see the fishtalk farm management file which labelled this as birds released alive. It should be noted that over the two year reporting period 400 birds have been released alive from the pens, demonstrating a very low mortality rate. Given that the sustainability dashboard is the first point of access for public information on wildlife interactions at the farm sites an observation has been given for misreporting.	Compliant	OBSERVATION - Misreporting of bird mortality information on the Client's sustainability dashboard.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
2.5.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of lethal incidents [35] on the farm over the prior two years **Requirement:** < 9 lethal incidents [36], with no more than two of the incidents being marine mammals **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain log of lethal incidents (see 2.5.4a) for a minimum of two years. For first audit, > 6 months of data are required. b. Calculate the total number of lethal incidents and the number of incidents involving marine mammals during the previous two year period. c. Send ASC the farm's data for all lethal incidents [35] of any species other than the salmon being farmed (e.g. lethal incidents involving predators such as birds or marine mammals). Data must be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). d. Others, please describe	A. Two years of lethal incident information has been provided. B. A minor non-conformity was identified during the last audit due to 11 birds being killed over the past two years. The current audit is still within that two year period. However, these mortalities occurred on two specific occasions (10 in November 2015, 1 in October 2016) and none have occurred since the last surveillance audit (October 2016). Discussions with a wide variety of staff throughout out the farms site confirmed the Client's claim that bird numbers have decreased significantly and that there haven't been any mortalities. The reason for this change has been attributed to i) the changing of the spread pattern from the feed spinners, ii) new nets, iii) staff attending to caught birds immediately, iv) having a dedicated wildlife officer at the farm site. This minor non-conformity is closed out. In regards to seals, at the time of the on-site audit there hasn't been a seal mortality since the last audit. Where the last mortality that occurred was in June 2016, when a seal was sedated in a pen with a dart, asphyxiated on the salmon it was eating and drowned. Interviews with staff confirmed this was the case. Following the onsite audit the Client informed the audit team of two seal deaths occurring in July 2017 during the drafting of the audit report. The seals died when they got into the false bottom of the pen, couldn't find their way out and drowned. The false bottom of the pen is designed to keep predators away from the central area where fish mortalities accumulate. These two additional mortalities put the Client in exceedance of the requirements of the Standard. Given that the two seal deaths occurred after the onsite audit, yet before the release of the public comment draft report, the Auditor believes that these mortalities are within scope of the current audit, however, to give the Client sufficient time to address this issue the Client has sought an extension from the current 90 time deadline. A minor rather than a major non-conformance was issued for this compliance criteria on the basis that it was an isolated incident with no prior precedence of seals being caught in the false bottoms of pens, at any of the Client's sites across Tasmania. Further to this, the Auditor has factored in the extensive size of the local seal population and the pressure it exerts on the pens. This pressure has led to the Client shifting from monofilament to Keiko to K-grid netting, the implementation of seal fences and a variety of other methods to prevent seals from breaching the pens in order to protect the stock whilst also considering seal welfare. **Update:** Client has provided the Auditor with delivery and rollout schedule for new k-grid, double collar pens with a smaller false base. The reduced maximum distance between the false base and the fish net from 2000 mm to 500 mm should make it highly unlikely for a seal to fit into the false bottom even if they bight a hole in the net. The k-grid nets are anticipated to be rolled out at MF190 by March 2018. C. The Client has submitted lethal incident data to the ASC.	Minor	The death of two seals after the on-site audit brings the total number of seal deaths above the requirements of the Standard to three in two years.	The two year running total for bird mortalities is 12, with 10 occurring during a single storm incident in November 2015. Three seals have died during the same period.

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
2.5.7	**Indicator: In the event of a lethal incident, evidence that an assessment of the risk of lethal incident(s) has been undertaken and demonstration of concrete steps taken by the farm to reduce the risk of future incidences** **Requirement: Yes** **Applicability: All**	a. Keep records showing that the farm undertakes an assessment of risk following each lethal incident and how those risk assessments are used to identify concrete steps the farm takes to reduce the risk of future incidents. b. Provide documentary evidence that the farm implements those steps identified in 2.5.7a to reduce the risk of future lethal incidents. c. Others, please describe	A. A minor non-conformity was identified during the last surveillance audit for the Client failing to conduct a risk assessment following a lethal incident. At the time of the on-site audit a lethal incident had not occurred since the last audit in the Eastern Zone. During the drafting of the report two seals perished when they got trapped in the false bottom net of one of the pens. A condensed risk register (WHS-F128) was filled out following the incident. The risk register follows the risk assessment procedure, matrix and definitions clearly described in the Client's WHS Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment and Control Procedure (WHS-100). Five risks were assessed, including: the specific hazard of a seal drowning in the false bottom of a net, the existing controls i) regular inspection of the nets, ii) breaking strain of the fish containment net, iii) installation of a false base and proposed controls iv) 14 day inspections of the false base and v) instillation of a escape gate for seals in the false base. The Client filled out a dead seal report form, which describes the time, place and incident that occurred. This form was submitted to the responsible government agency DPIPWE. The delivery of a sufficient risk assessment as closed out this minor non-conformity. Due to the mortality occurring after the on-site audit the Client is still therefore in the process of implementing the proposed risk minimisation strategies for seals getting trapped in the false bottoms of the nets. Therefore, to provide sufficient time to address this issue, the Client has sought an extension from the current 90 working day deadline. This non-conformity differs from the previous non-conformity which focused on the absence of a risk assessment.	Minor	Implementation of actions to reduce future risks of lethal incidents.	
PRINCIPLE 3: PROTECT THE HEALTH AND GENETIC INTEGRITY OF WILD POPULATIONS						
Criterion 3.1 Introduced or amplified parasites and pathogens [38,39]						
3.1.1	Indicator: Participation in an Area-Based Management (ABM) scheme for managing disease and resistance to treatments that includes coordination of stocking, fallowing, therapeutic treatments and information-sharing. Detailed requirements are in Appendix II-1. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Keep record of farm's participation in an ABM scheme. b. Submit to the CAB a description of how the ABM (3.1.1a) coordinates management of disease and resistance to treatments, including: - coordination of stocking; - fallowing; - therapeutic treatments; and - information sharing. c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate the ABM's compliance with all requirements in Appendix II-1, including definition of area, minimum % participation in the scheme, components, and coordination requirements. d. Submit dates of fallowing period(s) as per Appendix VI to ASC at least once per year. e. Others, please describe	A. No other salmon farming company is operating in the vicinity of this site. The closest sites are operated by another company in Storm Bay. Hence, there is no need for an ABM agreement. B. N/A C. N/A D. The Client has submitted fallowing period information to the ASC.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
3.1.2	Indicator: A demonstrated commitment [40] to collaborate with NGOs, academics and governments on areas of mutually agreed research to measure possible impacts on wild stocks Requirement: Yes Applicability: All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Retain records to show how the farm and/or its operating company has communicated with external groups (NGOs, academics, governments) to agree on and collaborate towards areas of research to measure impacts on wild stocks, including records of requests for research support and collaboration and responses to those requests. b. Provide non-financial support to research activities in 3.1.2a by either: - providing researchers with access to farm-level data; - granting researchers direct access to farm sites; or - facilitating research activities in some equivalent way. c. When the farm and/or its operating company denies a request to collaborate on a research project, ensure that there is a written justification for rejecting the proposal. d. Maintain records from research collaborations (e.g. communications with researchers) to show that the farm has supported the research activities identified in 3.1.2a. e. Others, please describe	**A.** The Atlantic Salmon is an introduced species, there aren't any naturally occurring wild stocks of this species in Tasmania. However, interpreting this criteria beyond salmonids, the following reports and publications involve collaboration between salmon growers and researchers at CSIRO and TAFI/IMAS on possible impacts on wild fish stocks: • Do exotic salmonids feed on native fauna after escaping from aquaculture cages in Tasmania, Australia? K. Abrantes, J. Lyle, P. Nichols, and J. Semmens, Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 68: 1539–1551 (2011). • Can Biochemical Methods Determine If Salmonids Feed And Thrive After Escaping from Aquaculture Cages? A Pilot Study, K. Abrantes, J. Semmens, J. Lyle & P. Nichols, August 2010, NRM Cradle Coast Project. • Evaluation of practices on salmon farms to mitigate escapes and ecological impacts. J. Lyle and S. Frijlink, November 2013. • Monitoring Escapees in Macquarie Harbour: a collaborative study between the salmon industry (TSGA) and the Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute (TAFI) By M. Steer and J. Lyle, TAFI Internal Report (draft only, presumably 2003), 9p. The Client's Environmental Certification and Sustainability Officer has met with Dr Jeremy Lyle from the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS) at the University of Tasmania (UTas) to arrange for the in kind and financial support of a PhD project looking into the potential of escaped salmon setting up populations. **B**. The projects listed in 3.1.2 a include both financial and non-financial support for research. Non-financial support includes giving researchers access to farm sites and to farm-level data. **C**. There is no evidence to suggest that the Client has refused to collaborate with academics, governments or NGOs. The Auditor's discussions with government and university staff indicate that the Client is generally proactive in this area. **D**. Records from research collaborations confirm that Tassal supports research activities.	Compliant		
3.1.3	**Indicator**: Establishment and annual review of a maximum sea lice load for the entire ABM and for the individual farm as outlined in Appendix II-2 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Keep records to show that a maximum sea lice load has been set for: - the entire ABM; and - the individual farm. b. Maintain evidence that the established maximum sea lice load (3.1.3a) is reviewed annually as outlined in Appendix II-2, incorporating feedback from the monitoring of wild salmon where applicable (See 3.1.6). c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the ABM has set (3.1.3a) and annually reviewed (3.1.3.b) maximum sea lice load in compliance with requirements in Appendix II-2. d. Submit the maximum sea lice load for the ABM to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. e. Others, please describe	A. N/A Sea lice are not a persistent issue in the Tasmanian salmon industry. B. N/A C.N/A D.N/A	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
3.1.4	**Indicator**: Frequent [41] on-farm testing for sea lice, with test results made easily publicly available [42] within seven days of testing **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Prepare an annual schedule for testing sea lice that identifies timeframes of routine testing frequency (at a minimum, monthly) and for high-frequency testing (weekly) due to sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. during and immediately prior to outmigration of juveniles). b. Maintain records of results of on-farm testing for sea lice. If farm deviates from schedule due to weather [41] maintain documentation of event and rationale. c. Document the methodology used for testing sea lice ('testing' includes both counting and identifying sea lice). The method must follow national or international norms, follows accepted minimum sample size, use random sampling, and record the species and life-stage of the sea lice. If farm uses a closed production system and would like to use an alternate method (i.e. video), farm shall provide the CAB with details on the method and efficacy of the method. d. Make the testing results from 3.1.4b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within seven days of testing. If requested, provide stakeholders access to hardcopies of test results. e. Keep records of when and where test results were made public. f. Submit test results to ASC (Appendix VI) at least once per year. g. Others, please describe	A. N/A Sea lice are not a persistent issue in the Tasmanian salmon industry. B. N/A C.N/A D.N/A	N/A		
3.1.5	Indicator: In areas with wild salmonids [43], evidence of data [44] and the farm's understanding of that data, around salmonid migration routes, migration timing and stock productivity in major waterways within 50 kilometres of the farm Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Identify all salmonid species that naturally occur within 75 km of the farm through literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. If the farm is not in an area with wild salmonids, then 3.1.5b and c do not apply. b. For species listed in 3.1.5a, compile best available information on migration routes, migration timing (range of months for juvenile outmigration and returning salmon), life history timing for coastal resident salmonids, and stock productivity over time in major waterways within 50 km of the farm. c. From data in 3.1.5b, identify any sensitive periods for wild salmonids (e.g. periods of outmigration of juveniles) within 50 km of the farm. - e. Others, please describe	A. N/A There aren't any naturally occurring salmonid species within 75 km of the farm. B. N/A C. N/A D. N/A	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
3.1.6	Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, monitoring of sea lice levels on wild out-migrating salmon juveniles or on coastal sea trout or Artic char, with results made publicly available. See requirements in Appendix III-1. Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.6 does not apply. b. Keep records to show the farm participates in monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids. c. Provide the CAB access to documentation which is sufficient for the auditor to evaluate whether the methodology used for monitoring of sea lice on wild salmonids is in compliance with the requirements in Appendix III-1. d. Make the results from 3.1.6b easily publicly available (e.g. posted to the company's website) within eight weeks of completion of monitoring. e. Submit to ASC the results from monitoring of sea lice levels on wild salmonids as per Appendix VI. f. Others, please describe	A. N/A There aren't any naturally occurring salmonid species within 75 km of the farm. B. N/A C. N/A D. N/A	N/A		
3.1.7	Indicator: In areas of wild salmonids, maximum on-farm lice levels during sensitive periods for wild fish [45]. See detailed requirements in Appendix II, subsection 2. Requirement: 0.1 mature female lice per farmed fish Applicability: All farms operating in areas with wild salmonids except farms that release no water as noted in [38]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm operates in an area of wild salmonids. If not, then Indicator 3.1.7 does not apply. b. Establish the sensitive periods [45] of wild salmonids in the area where the farm operates. Sensitive periods for migrating salmonids is during juvenile outmigration and approximately one month before. c. Maintain detailed records of monitoring on-farm lice levels (see 3.1.4) during sensitive periods as per Appendix II-2. d. Provide the CAB with evidence there is a 'feedback loop' between the targets for on-farm lice levels and the results of monitoring of lice levels on wild salmonids (Appendix II-2). e. Others, please describe	A. N/A There aren't any naturally occurring salmonid species within 75 km of the farm. B. N/A C. N/A D. N/A	N/A		
Criterion 3.2 Introduction of non-native species						
3.2.1	**Indicator**: If a non-native species is being produced, demonstration that the species was widely commercially produced in the area by the date of publication of the SAD standard **Requirement:** Yes [47] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [47]	a. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.1 does not apply. b. Provide documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard (i.e. before June 13, 2012). c. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish that includes details on accuracy of sterility effectiveness. d. If the farm cannot provide evidence for 3.2.1b or 3.2.1c, provide documented evidence that the production system is closed to the natural environment and for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce [47]; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material [47] that might survive and subsequently reproduce (e.g. UV or other effective treatment of any effluent water exiting the system to the natural environment).	A. The Client produces a non-native species, Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*). B. Salmonid farming has been underway for more than 30 years in Tasmania (http://www.tsga.com.au/history/). The Client has been farming Atlantic salmon since the mid 1980's. C. N/A D N/A	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
3.2.2	Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, evidence of scientific research [48] completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction and these results submitted to ASC for review [49] Requirement: Yes, within five years of publication of the SAD standard [50,51] Applicability: All	a. Inform the ASC of the species in production (Appendix VI). b. Inform the CAB if the farm produces a non-native species. If not, then Indicator 3.2.2 does not apply. c. If yes to 3.2.2b, provide evidence of scientific research completed within the past five years that investigates the risk of establishment of the species within the farm's jurisdiction. Alternatively, the farm may request an exemption to 3.2.2c (see below). d. If applicable, submit to the CAB a request for exemption that shows how the farm meets all three conditions specified in instruction box above. e. Submit evidence from 3.2.2c to ASC for review. f. Others, please describe	A. The farm has informed ASC that the species being produced is Atlantic salmon. The MF Licences (refer 1.1.1) specify Atlantic salmon as the approved species for farming and state net specifications etc. relating to fish containment and environmental monitoring. B. Only Atlantic Salmon are farmed at the site within the scope of this audit. C. Naturally recruiting populations of Atlantic salmon have not been reported in Tasmania waters. Recent scientific research investigating the risk of establishment of the species from Tasmanian marine farms includes: • M. Steer and J. Lyle (2003). Monitoring Escapees in Macquarie Harbour: a collaborative study between the salmon industry (TSGA) and the Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute (TAFI); • K. Abrantes, J. Lyle, P. Nichols, and J. Semmens, (2011) Do exotic salmonids feed on native fauna after escaping from aquaculture cages in Tasmania, Australia? Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 68:1539–1551; • K. Abrantes, J Semmens, J Lyle & P Nichols. (2010). Can Biochemical Methods Determine If Salmonids Feed And Thrive After Escaping from Aquaculture Cages? Final Report for NRM Cradle Coast Project CCCPR24006, 55p. • J.M. Lyle and S. Frijlink, (2013). Evaluation of practices on salmon farms to mitigate escapes and ecological impacts. IMAS report to Tassal Operations Pty Ltd. The Client has also discussed to commission further research on estimating escapees and associated risk with improved infrastructure, increased seal predation will also be investigated in the future D. N/A E.N/A	Compliant		
3.2.3	**Indicator**: Use of non-native species for sea lice control for on-farm management purposes **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Inform the CAB if the farm uses fish (e.g. cleaner fish or wrasse) for the control of sea lice. b. Maintain records (e.g. invoices) to show the species name and origin of all fish used by the farm for purposes of sea lice control. c. Collect documentary evidence or first hand accounts as evidence that the species used is not non-native to the region. d. Others, please describe	A. N/A sea lice are not a persistent issue in the Tasmanian Salmon industry.	N/A		
Criterion 3.3 Introduction of transgenic species						
3.3.1	**Indicator**: Use of transgenic [53] salmon by the farm **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a declaration stating that the farm does not use transgenic salmon. b. Maintain records for the origin of all cultured stocks including the supplier name, address and contact person(s) for stock purchases. c. Ensure purchase documents confirm that the culture stock is not transgenic. d. Others, please describe	A. A declaration was prepared by Tassal and provided by the company vet for this audit. Previously a declaration was also prepared by a geneticist from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) working with the salmon industry in Tasmania. B. Veterinary health certificates from each hatchery that supplied smolt for relevant year class have been provided. These certificates were signed by the same vet that signed the declaration that no transgenic fish are being cultured in Tasmanian salmon industry. C. The Auditor does not suspect that transgenic fish are being cultured.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 3.4 Escapes [55]						
3.4.1	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [56] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 [57] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [57]	a. Maintain monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees. b. Aggregate cumulative escapes in the most recent production cycle. c. Maintain the monitoring records described in 3.4.1a for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [57]).	**A**. The Auditor has been provided with correspondence from a Senior Manager at the DPIPWE's Marine Farming Branch, confirming that there hasn't been any reports of fish escapes from MF190. The Client's escape log lists the last significant escape occurring in December 2007 for this site. A minor non-conformity was issued for this criteria during the 2016 surveillance, regarding the recording of predator incidences and holes in nets discovered during net inspections being recorded. Currently, all losses due to predators are expected to result in mortalities (predation) rather than escapes. The Client has not attempted to estimate the quantity of fish that may escape through holes caused by seal damage. An explanation for this is that nets cannot be set in the region to capture escaped fish. Discussion with Dr Jeremy Lyle from IMAS have primarily focused on the potential for escaped fish to establish themselves. Although this research is relevant, it doesn't answer the question of estimating how many fish may escape from holes in a salmon pen. Hence the non-conformity remains open and has been upgraded to a Major non-conformity. **Update:** The Client has proposed a staged approach to closing out this major non-conformity as follows: 1) Provide contextual evidence to support Tassal's position, where video footage has been provided to the Auditor showing seals engaging with holes in nets and fish behaviour. 2) Operational response - site management. When a seal is found in a pen, the net is inspected and any holes are repaired by divers immediately. Employees complete MO-F364 In Pen Seal Breach Form – Eastern Zone. This internal document contains a section titled 'Potential for fish escape'. If the response to this is 'possible', the pen will be counted at the next handling event. If the count shows a variance this would be reported to the Environment and Sustainability department for recording of possible escape event and reporting to the Marine Farming Branch (MFB) of DPIPWE if it constituted a significant escape (>500 fish). The Eastern Zone have implemented seven day dive coverage so that if there are any incidents of seal attacks, divers are present and can respond faster than an on call dive team. 3) Wildlife exclusion technologies (K-grid). All cage netting is heavily weighted to tension the netting to provide protection against seal predation. The above water surface portion of each cage is covered by a net with a high tensile mesh size of less than 115 mm to prevent seals entering cages. The implementation of K-Grid nets across MF 190 is the key preventative action for this non-conformance. To date K-Grids have been 100% successful. Full implementation is expected to be complete by March 2018. K-Grid netting is made of a high tenacity knotless stiffened polyester mesh. K-Grids have proven successful to date with zero seals or sharks breaching the nets. 4) Escape prevention and response. This includes: i) a diving regime to routinely monitor net integrity, sub-surface inspections for holes, conditions of mooring lines and cage infrastructure, ii) daily inspections of bird netting, iii) stock transactions only to occur in weather conditions that do not present an unacceptable risk of fish escapes and iv) staff training. 5) Ongoing research. Tassal has engaged the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Science, University of Tasmania, to conduct a project looking at fish behaviour and movement through various sized holes in fish nets. This project is being facilitated by Tassal's Senior Manager – Breeding & Research and is currently being discussed internally at IMAS to determine an option for developing a student project. The video footage provided showed that the salmon do not generally engage with seal sized holes in a net, this is non-conclusive, but corresponds with the accounts of multiple divers and net	Major	The number of escapes that may occur due to holes in the pen netting as a result of seal predation has not been quantified.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		d. If an escape episode occurs (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [57]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the farm could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode.	cleaners interviewed at Tassal lease sites around Tasmania. The operational response should generally assist in minimising the potential for fish to escape from holes caused by seals and assist in determining if significant quantities of escaped fish occur. The Client has provided copies of dive report forms, which record the identification, size and the mending of holes caused by seals. Farm staff have informed the auditor that holes caused by seals are easily identifiable compared to those caused by sharks, which are considerably larger. All staff interviewed have stated that they haven't seen a shark (primarily seven-gill sharks) bite a hole in a pen for at least a few years. The records provided and interviews with staff indicate that holes are identified and mended as quickly as possible. The introduction of k-grid pens throughout MF190 should remove any threat of seals biting holes in the nets. The Auditor's discussions with staff across all roles in each zone, have confirmed that there haven't been any incidents of seals biting holes in k-grid netting. The escape prevention and response described by the Client is typical net management and is something that will require consistent diligence for it to be effective. The quantification of fish that may escape from holes in nets is planned to be addressed in the proposed research with IMAS. The Auditor accepts that determining potential escapes through holes is not a simple exercise, given the scale of operations. The preliminary research objectives and available expertise at IMAS should adequately address this issue, although it will require an appropriate research period. Given that the Client, is actively checking nets, mending them immediately, is in the process of changing all nets to ones seals haven't been able to bite holes in and has instigated research to address this, it is the Auditor's view that this non-conformity should be closed (13 September 2017). It should be noted that follow up evidence of research activities and K-grid net deployment will be monitored during future audits.			
		f. Others, please describe	**B**. No escapes were recorded during the production cycle. **C**. Records of predator incidences and holes in nets discovered during net inspections are recorded. However no escapes were reported. The last event reported at the farm site was in 2007 **D**. No requests have been made or escapes reported. **E**. The Client has provided escape data to the ASC.			

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
3.4.2	**Indicator**: Accuracy [58] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating stocking and harvest numbers **Requirement:** ≥ 98% **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of accuracy of the counting technology used by the farm at times of stocking and harvest. Records include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts. b. If counting takes place off site (e.g. pre-smolt vaccination count), obtain and maintain documents from the supplier showing the accuracy of the counting method used (as above). c. During audits, arrange for the auditor to witness calibration of counting machines (if used by the farm). - e. Submit counting technology accuracy to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). f. Others, please describe	A. The Client has provided the product specifications for the Aquascan CSE3150 scanning unit, which claims an accuracy of 98-100% for counting fish. B. Counts are undertaken at the hatcheries (see principle 8) and during stocking. Therefore this criteria is N/A. C. Harvest was not occurring during the audit, hence the vessel from which counts are made was not present and calibration of counting machines could not be witnessed. The Auditor's have witnessed harvest at two other audits at the Client's Western and Southern Zone within the last six months. The harvest at the eastern Zone is conducted by the same vessel, crew, equipment, methods, protocols and reporting measures as those zones where harvest was witnessed. E. The Client has provided the ASC with the specifications for the AquaScan fish counters used, including a claimed counting accuracy of 98-100%.	Compliant		
3.4.3	**Indicator**: Estimated unexplained loss [59] of farmed salmon is made publicly available **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain detailed records for mortalities, stocking count, harvest count, and escapes (as per 3.4.1). b. Calculate the estimated unexplained loss as described in the instructions (above) for the most recent full production cycle. For first audit, farm must demonstrate understanding of calculation and the requirement to disclose EUL after harvest of the current cycle. c. Make the results from 3.4.3b available publicly. Keep records of when and where results were made public (e.g. date posted to a company website) for all production cycles. d. Submit estimated unexplained loss to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. - f. Others, please describe	A. Mortalities are regularly collected and categorised by potential cause of death by divers. Other information, like water samples to determine phytoplankton species and jellyfish, oxygen levels and water temperature plus other environmental data, is collected to correlate mortalities to any event. The Client has recently re-appraised the quantity of fish that can be consumed by a seal from 30 kg per seal to 50 kg per seal. This change was implemented by the Client's veterinarian and is based on autopsies and observations. Further explanation for higher EUL at the Eastern Zone compared to other sites may be potentially due to the more exposed nature of the this site where divers lose opportunity to remove mortalities due to weather. Hence the longer potential residency time of dead fish increases the likelihood of seals sucking the mortalities through the nets and fish breaking apart and falling through the net. B. The Client has provided the totals used in the calculation of EUL and a declaration that the calculations have been made in accordance with Standard. All aspects appear correct to the Auditor. EUL for the 15YC is reported as 7%. C. The Client posts their EUL on the sustainability dashboard of their website. As part of this reporting the Client has also provided the following explanation "High EUL of Eastern Zone 15YC caused by under estimating impact of intense seal pressure. Records of predator incidences and holes in nets discovered during net inspections are recorded daily. Currently, all losses due to predators are expected to result in mortalities (predation). D. The Client has submitted their estimated unexplained loss information to the ASC.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
3.4.4	Indicator: Evidence of escape prevention planning and related employee training, including: net strength testing; appropriate net mesh size; net traceability; system robustness; predator management; record keeping and reporting of risk events (e.g., holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors, reporting and follow up of escape events); and worker training on escape prevention and counting technologies Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Prepare an Escape Prevention Plan and submit it to the CAB before the first audit. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document as long as it addresses all required elements of Indicator 3.4.4. b. If the farm operates an open (net pen) system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - net strength testing; - appropriate net mesh size; - net traceability; - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. c. If the farm operates a closed system, ensure the plan (3.4.4a) covers the following areas: - system robustness; - predator management; - record keeping; - reporting risk events (e.g. holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors); - planning of staff training to cover all of the above areas; and - planning of staff training on escape prevention and counting technologies. d. Maintain records as specified in the plan. e. Train staff on escape prevention planning as per the farm's plan. - g. Others, please describe	A. The Client has an Escape Prevention and Response Protocol (MO 146) in place for the farm site. This protocol is also coupled with an Escape Prevention Checklist Procedure (ES-108) B. The Escape Prevention and Response Protocol contains reference to applicable legislation. At the farm site Emergency Response Escape Kits are kept on the feed barge and well labelled. The Fish Talk database, which inventories fish numbers & losses (including escapes) is used by the Client to identify and analyse escapes. Fishtalk also covers net inventory (including net strength testing & net traceability), checking of nets (including appropriate net mesh size), procedures for deploying nets & weighting systems (including system robustness & predator management), jump fences, checking nets after stocking (including record keeping) & reporting risk events such as holes, infrastructure issues, handling errors), net breaking strengths, weighting of nets, daily farm checks, Escape Response Plan and Escape response Flow. The reporting methods are used to identify potential trends in pen failures that could lead to escapes. C. N/A D. The Escape Prevention and Response Protocol has been signed off and implemented. E. Staff are put through quarterly emergency drills which are recorded on dedicated forms (WHS-F143) that list the names of participants and a debrief of the exercise. The latest of these (14 April 2017) for fish escapes, has been provided.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
PRINCIPLE 4: USE RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 4.1 Traceability of raw materials in feed						
4.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of traceability, demonstrated by the feed producer, of feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed [62]. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain detailed records of all feed suppliers and purchases including contact information and purchase and delivery records. b. Inform each feed supplier in writing of ASC requirements pertaining to production of salmon feeds and send them a copy of the ASC Salmon Standard. c. For each feed producer used by the farm, confirm that an audit of the producer was recently done by an audit firm or CAB against an ASC-acknowledged certification scheme. Obtain a copy of the most recent audit report for each feed producer. d. For each feed producer, determine whether the farm will use method #1 or method #2 (see Instructions above) to show compliance of feed producers. Inform the CAB in writing. e. Obtain declaration from feed supplier(s) stating that the company can assure traceability of all feed ingredients that make up more than 1% of the feed to a level of detail required by the ASC Salmon Standard [62]. - g. Others, please describe	Tassal purchase feed from Skretting only. Records of purchases including contact information and delivery records by De Bruyns (taken by Ebenezer direct to feed barges), sighted weekly updates on June 2017 Feed Delivery spreadsheet includes SkA lot number, types, destination (feed barge, e.g. Evolution), amounts, date of delivery) were viewed on site (entered on Fish Talk by FT Leader at least weekly). Reconciliation undertaken end of month with Skretting Invoices, e.g.. May17 includes some deviations. Tassal's letter (8/01/2014) Feed Supplier Notification Letter - Skretting Australia states that for indicator 4.3.1b Tassal intends to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in 4.3.1a of the attached ASC Salmon Standard; and for indicator 4.4.2b Tassal intends to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS or equivalent. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they have been informed about the ASC requirements and have received a copy of the updated version 1.1 ASC Standard (Apr17). Skretting is ASC Salmon Standard Principle 4 certified (SGS expires 31/05/18) and Global G.A.P. certified (SGS #4052852637961 expires 26/06/2017); this audit scope includes traceability (CFM13.1). The most recent audit report (completed 28/05/2017) has not been forwarded by Skretting; the auditor is aware that one Minor Must Non-conformance was raised for clause 15.1.1; this was closed 22/05/2017 and the Certification Body should soon release the final report to SkA so that certification could proceed. Skretting also has an electronic traceability system (Nutrace) that has been explained to the audit team during previous audits. The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter – SCS Global (17/01/2017) states "that Tassal use Method #2 (mass balance). This declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020." SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they can only demonstrate predictability in attempting to fulfil the standard when using method #2 Mass Balance, and they will base their response on Method #2. The 2-page procedure Mass Balance – Skretting's approach (Appendix 7) describes their process. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they can document the inclusion of ingredients for the products fed to a completed production cycle. Marine ingredients & soy can be traced to country of origin. Skretting has an electronic traceability system which is described in their internal quality SOP Nutrace tracking and tracing: Purpose and responsibility including support (DMS-00028 R1 3/03/2015). Skretting's traceability system is part of the internal food safety quality program called Nutrace which is described in the SOP Nutrace check list for Skretting (DMS-00241 R1 3/03/2015). The Global G.A.P. Compound Manufactured Feed (CFM) Standard (v2.1) CFM clause 13.1 covers traceability. A review of the two 3rd party certification Audits of Skretting (ASC Principle 4 and Global G.A.P. Compound Manufactured Food standards) shows conformity with traceability requirements. The cross check confirms required Skretting continue to maintain adequate and effective levels of traceability.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 4.2 Use of wild fish for feed [63]						
4.2.1	**Indicator**: Fishmeal Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRm) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1) **Requirement:** < 1.35 **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used including: - Quantities used of each formulation (kg); - Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation used; - Source (fishery) of fishmeal in each formulation used; - Percentage of fishmeal in each formulation derived from trimmings; and - Supporting documentation and signed declaration from feed supplier. b. For FFDRm calculation, exclude fishmeal derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery. c. Calculate eFCR using formula in Appendix IV-1 (use this calculation also in 4.2.2 option #1). d. Calculate FFDRm using formulas in Appendix IV-1. e. Submit FFDRm to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	A. Records of purchases including Skretting contact information and delivery records were viewed on site. The inventory is maintained on FishTalk and includes all the required information of the feed purchased in each FY, including quantities of the various formulations. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they can declare the % inclusion and quantity of all fishmeal (reduction and trimmings sources) used in feed fed to an ASC-compliant farming site for a complete production cycle. This data can be used to calculate the FFDRm. Skretting can declare the fishery origin of all fishmeal (reduction and trimmings sources), based on purchases made in the previous calendar year. Volume of feed sold per month to farming site for the assessment production cycle is provided to Skretting by the Farming Company, along with the eFCR to complete the FFDRm calculation. Compliance documents reviewed include FFDRm and FFDRo calculation for 15YC (Appendix 4) and Origin of marine ingredients for CY16 (Appendix 5). B. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states fishmeal from trimmings were not included in the calculation. Reviewed copy of Skretting's Appendix 4 - Eastern Zone 15YC FFDR declaration to calculate FFDRm. As part of the FFDR declaration and calculation procedure, Skretting Australia requests information from ASC certified farming sites on the volume (kg) of each product fed per month and eFCR for the whole production cycle. Therefore, Skretting Australia relies on site to determine the eFCR. C, Calculation of eFCR was complicated due to movement of fish from one lease to another. SkA discussions with the client developed an acceptable method of calculating eFCR for Eastern Zone (includes smolt leases) = for 15YC the avg. eFCR was 1.4. D. Calculations have been conducted correctly for Eastern Zone of FFDRm = 0.27 which is below the <1.20 amended requirement. E. The Client has submitted FFDRm data to the ASC.	Compliant		FFDRm = 0.27
4.2.2	Indicator: Fish Oil Forage Fish Dependency Ratio (FFDRo) for grow-out (calculated using formulas in Appendix IV- 1), OR Maximum amount of EPA and DHA from direct marine sources [64] (calculated according to Appendix IV-2) Requirement: FFDRo < 2.95 or (EPA + DHA) < 30 g/kg feed Applicability: All	a. Maintain a detailed inventory of the feed used as specified in 4.2.1a. b. For FFDRo and EPA+DHA calculations (either option #1 or option #2), exclude fish oil derived from rendering of seafood by-products (e.g. the "trimmings" from a human consumption fishery. c. Inform the CAB whether the farm chose option #1 or option #2 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Standard. d. For option #1, calculate FFDRo using formulas in Appendix IV-1 and using the eFCR calculated under 4.2.1c. e. For option #2, calculate amount of EPA + DHA using formulas in Appendix IV-2. f. Submit FFDRo or EPA & DHA to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. g. Others, please describe	A. The feed records referred to in 4.2.1A are verified as complete. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they can declare the % inclusion and quantity of all fishmeal (reduction and trimmings sources) used in feed fed to an ASC-compliant farming site for a complete production cycle. This data can be used to calculate the FFDRo. Skretting can declare the fishery origin of all fish oil (reduction and trimmings sources), based on purchases made in the previous calendar year. Volume of feed sold per month to farming site for the assessment production cycle is provided to Skretting by the Farming Company, along with the eFCR to complete the FFDRo calculation. Compliance documents reviewed include FFDRm and FFDRo calculation for 15YC (Appendix 4) and Origin of marine ingredients CY2016 (Appendix 5). B. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states fish oil from trimmings were not included in the calculation. C. The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter – SCS Global (17/01/2017) states that Tassal use option #1. This declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they calculate values according to option #1. D. Calculations have been conducted correctly for Eastern Zone of FFDRo = 1.81 which is below the amended requirement that FFDRo < 2.52. E. N/A F. The Client has submitted FFDRo data to the ASC.	Compliant		FFDRo = 1.81

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 4.3 Source of marine raw materials						
4.3.1	Indicator: Timeframe for all fishmeal and fish oil used in feed to come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries Requirement: < 5 years after the date of publication [67] of the SAD standards (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers purchases of fishmeal and fish oil to fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in 4.3.1a c. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, use feed inventory and feed supplier declarations in 4.2.1a to develop a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients. d. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that fishmeal and fish oil used in feed come from fisheries [65] certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member [66] and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries. e. Others, please describe	The audit was undertaken after June 13, 2017 so the full requirements were assessed. A. Tassal supports responsible feed sourcing as per the IMS-P1084 Responsible Sourcing Policy (15/01/2014, Issue #1 1p). B. Tassal's letter (8/01/2014) Feed Supplier Notification Letter - Skretting Australia states that for indicator 4.3.1b Tassal intends to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in 4.3.1a of the attached ASC Salmon Standard; and 4.4.2b Tassal intends to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS or equivalent. C. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states they will ensure compliance in accordance with the Interim Solution for Marine ingredients (http://www.asc-aqua.org/upload/ASC Feed - Interim Solution Marine Ingredients_FINAL_20161213.pdf). D. Skretting has recently been re-assessed as meeting the requirements of ASC salmon standard Principle 4 for feed from SGS (Certificate AU15/4663 expires 31/05/2018); they have maintained this annual certification since 2015.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
4.3.2	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, the FishSource score [68] for the fishery(ies) from which all marine raw material in feed is derived **Requirement:** All individual scores ≥ 6, and biomass score ≥ 8 **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2017	a. Record FishSource score for each species from which fishmeal or fish oil was derived and used as a feed ingredient (all species listed in 4.2.1a). b. Confirm that each individual score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 8. c. If the species is not on the website it means that a FishSource assessment is not available. Client can then take one or both of the following actions: 1. Contact FishSource via Sustainable Fisheries Partnerships to identify the species as a priority for assessment. 2. Contract a qualified independent third party to conduct the assessment using the FishSource methodology and provide the assessment and details on the third party qualifications to the CAB for review.	A minor non-conformance was raised during the 2015 surveillance audit for 4.3.2b and this was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence. The evidence below confirms the 2015 minor non-conformance for 4.3.2A-D continues to be appropriately addressed. A. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states Compliance of species is assured via their annual Marine Assessment Report by Dr Sarah Irvine, FishListic (Marine Fisheries Scientist & Consultant, Appendix 6). This report discloses the FishSource scores of species likely to be purchased for the year. On 13 December 2016, the Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) launched an Interim Solution for the marine raw material used in feed. This Interim Solution replaces the current set of requirements for marine raw material in the ASC Farm Standards. As such, Skretting will comply with the requirements outlined in the Interim Feed Solution (http://www.asc-aqua.org/upload/ASC Feed - Interim Solution Marine Ingredients_FINAL_20161213.pdf). The 2017 Marine Assessment Reports assessments were adjusted as per the changes in requirements. The 16-page 2017 Independent Marine Assessment Report (15/01/17) details the outcomes of 53 fish scores/assessments for 43 species and stocks. The report includes assessments on both Trimming (x18) and Reduction (x24) Sources of the fish species sourced by Skretting Australia, plus potential sources, for use as fishmeal and fish oil, and whether they meet the requirements of the ASC Salmon Standard. Any new species scores are assessed by FishListic throughout the year if required, for example Appendix 1: FishSource assessment of South African Anchovy, Sardine, Red-eye Round Herring and Cape Horse Mackerel (10p) and Appendix 2: MSC Risk Based assessment of Javelin fish and Rat-tails taken in MSC Hoki fishery July 2016 (7page). Based on their mass balance approach (Method #2), Skretting purchase sufficient volumes of compliant fish meal and fish oil to cover the volume of feed sold to their ASC certified customers (refer 2-page Appendix 7 for a more detailed explanation). An Annual declaration of the volume of ASC compliant ingredients is declared in the Origin of Source Fishery for FM and FO (App 5). Skretting use the mass balance approach; their 2-page procedure Mass Balance – Skretting's approach (Appendix 7) describes their process. Skretting have declared they purchase sufficient volumes of compliant fish meal and fish oil to cover the volume of feed sold to their ASC certified customers. The summary document Origin of marine ingredients CY2016 calculates that for purchases Jan-Dec 2016, 68% of fish meal and 28% of fish oil were ASC compliant (based on Mass Balance). B. The 2017 Marine Assessment Reports identifies the sources not meeting the ASC criteria (each individual FS score ≥ 6 and the biomass score is ≥ 6) that had been (or could be) included into the diets for the 2017 production cycle include: Yellowfin Tuna Thunnus albacares sourced from Indian Ocean, Anchovy Engraulis ringens from Southern Peru/ Chilean units XV-I-II and Chilean units V-X, Indian Anchovy Encrasicholina & Stolephorus spp. from India FAO 51, Japanese Anchovy Engraulis japonicus sourced from China FAO 61; Sardine Strangomera bentincki from Chilean units V-X, Sardinella longiceps from India FAO 51, 4 Mackerel reduction species (Chile & Indian specified fisheries) and seven other reduction species (northern hemisphere fisheries). There are 23 compliant trimming fish species/fisheries and 11 reduction species/fisheries compliant. Skretting use the mass balance approach. Skretting have declaration they purchase sufficient volumes of compliant fish meal and fish oil to cover the volume of feed sold to their ASC certified customers. The summary document Origin of marine ingredients 2016 calculates that for purchases Jan-Dec 2016, 68% of fish meal and 28% of fish oil were ASC compliant (based on Mass	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		-	purchases Jan-Dec 2016, 68% of fish meal and 28% of fish oil were ASC compliant (based on Mass Balance). Skretting have issued Tassal with quarterly 'ASC Feed Certificate' invoice which demonstrates the volume of ASC compliant feed Skretting sold to them in the previous quarter. The four quarterly Invoices for Eastern Zone for 2016/17 have been reviewed; these specify lot number & total amount of feeds (kg) with the annotation: "ASC Feed Certificates represent the amount of feed that has been requested by your company to be in compliance with criteria 4.3.2 (source of marine raw materials) of the ASC Standard using principle 2 (mass balance). This invoice can be used in addition to the general information provided by Skretting to demonstrate this amount of feed is in compliance with the feed related criteria of the ASC Standard." C. Information and reports are routinely provided by SkA, includes: - Appendix 6 –Independent Marine Assessment Report 2017 (15/01/17 16p), these annual assessments have been conducted by the contractor FishListic since Jan14. - FishListic has also provided two additional assessments - Appendix 1: FishSource assessment of South African Anchovy, Sardine, Red-eye Round Herring and Cape Horse Mackerel (10p) and Appendix 2: MSC Risk Based assessment of Javelin fish and Rat-tails taken in MSC Hoki fishery July 2016 (7page). These assessments were done in accordance with the FishSource methodology and by a suitably qualified person, Dr Irvine's qualification are documented on http://fishlistic.com/about/team-bios/. D. Tassal & SkA acknowledged that if the species does not have a FishSource score then the fish feed does not comply with the requirement.			
		e. Others, please describe				
4.3.3	**Indicator**: Prior to achieving 4.3.1, demonstration of third-party verified chain of custody and traceability for the batches of fishmeal and fish oil which are in compliance with 4.3.2. **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All, until June 13, 2017	a. Obtain from the feed supplier documentary evidence that the origin of all fishmeal and fish oil used in the feed is traceable via a third-party verified chain of custody or traceability program.	A. Skretting has maintained annual Global G.A.P. certification for Compound Manufactured Feeds (certification #4052852637961) since 2014 from SGS Australia. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states that the Global G.A.P. CFM standard (v2.1), control point 15.3 states: "Is the origin of species of wild captured fish used to produce fishmeal and fish oil traceable with regards to: a. The species of origin, b. The country of origin. Is the producer able to demonstrate that the list of species used to produce fishmeal and fish oil does not contain species classified as critically endangered or endangered in the IUCN Red List at the time of purchase?" Maintenance of the Global G.A.P. certification proves this for Skretting B. The SkA ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p notes the evidence is assessed during the annual Global GAP certification for Compound Manufactured Feeds (refer 4.3.3a). Further assessment is conducted as part of the annual Nutrace system certification (refer 4.1.1). This includes all species used as per 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a.	Compliant		
		b. Ensure evidence covers all the species used (as consistent with 4.3.2a, 4.2.1a, and 4.2.2a).				
		c. Others, please describe				

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
4.3.4	Indicator: Feed containing fishmeal and/or fish oil originating from by-products [69] or trimmings from IUU [70] catch or from fish species that are categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71] Requirement: None [72] Applicability: All except as noted in [72]	a. Compile and maintain, consistent with 4.2.1a and 4.2.2a, a list of the fishery of origin for all fishmeal and fish oil originating from by-products and trimmings. b. Obtain a declaration from the feed supplier stating that no fishmeal or fish oil originating from IUU catch was used to produce the feed. c. Obtain from the feed supplier declaration that the meal or oil did not originate from a species categorized as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species [71] and explaining how they are able to demonstrate this (i.e. through other certification scheme or through their independent audit). d. If meal or oil originated from a species listed as "vulnerable" by IUCN, obtain documentary evidence to support the exception as outlined in [72]. e. Others, please describe	A. The SkA QA declaration (All v7) states "Fish meal and fish oil used in our aquaculture feeds are not derived from any of the same species that we provide feeds for." A list of the fishery of origin for all fishmeal and fish oil originating from by-products and trimmings has been provided for Tassal. for CY2015 (Origin of Source Fishery for FM and FO) and CY2016 (Origin of Marine Ingredients), based on purchased raw materials that are available in Skretting's internal system, i.e. feeds made at the beginning or end of purchasing year may not include species in this list due to lead times of purchased marine raw materials sometimes being 3 months from purchase to delivery of goods. The 2016 annual purchasing period is most relevant because it includes most species used to produce feed for the 15YC. The 2016 document calculates that for purchases Jan-Dec 2016, 68% of fish meal and 28% of fish oil were ASC compliant (based on Mass Balance). B. As per the Skretting SOP Nutreco Supplier Code of Conduct (MDMS-00039 R1 10/02/2015) each supplier of marine raw materials purchased by Skretting must sign the Nutreco Sustainable Procurement Policy for Marine Products (V2010) which has the statement "The fishery and the production of fishmeal and oil must be compliant with the laws and regulations of the country of production or regional laws related to fisheries. The catch processed must not originate from any fisheries that are Illegal, unregulated or unreported (IUU)." The Marine Vendor Policy states that the fishmeal and fish oil must not originate from species classified as endangered or critically endangered. Therefore, any new marine ingredients purchased now requires the supplier to fill in a new marine origin declaration stating that the species in the meal or oil did not originate from any "No species from the UN endangered species lists (CITES) or that classified as Critically Endangered in the IUCN Red Lists are caught, landed or processed by the supplier." C. In the 3rd party Audit Reports provided by Skretting the auditor states completed and signed declarations were sighted during the 2016 SGS audit for ASC and for Global G.A.P.; likewise, these were provided for the 2017 SGS, the final report has not yet been provided by SGS to Skretting. Compliance of species is assured via their annual Marine assessment report by Dr Sarah Irvine, FishListic (Marine Fisheries Scientist & Consultant). The Irvine (2017) report states that IUCN regional assessment needs updating as the Yellowfin tuna stocks from the Indian Ocean stock is overfished and all regional MSC pre-assessments of this stock suggest that this species is at high risk. Skretting does not source yellowfin tuna from Indian Ocean stocks this was confirmed with purchasing records and through Skretting's Global G.A.P. traceability audit." D. N/A – there are no exceptions.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
4.3.5	**Indicator:** Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for marine ingredients that includes a commitment to continuous improvement of source fisheries **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Request a link to a public policy from the feed manufacturer stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers purchases of fishmeal and fish oil to fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries and committing to continuous improvement of source fisheries. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing fishmeal and fish oil originating from fisheries certified under the type of certification scheme noted in indicator 4.3.1. c. Compile a list of the origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients in all feed.	A. Details are posted under the sustainability->ingredients banner on the SkA website: http://www.skretting.com/en-AU/sustainability/ingredients/ This details sustainable sourcing + partnerships that assist in responsible sourcing of Fishmeal and Fish oil. The website stated "Based on spend, over 90% of our suppliers have signed off on their agreement to comply with the Code, and it is mandatory for all new suppliers to sign. Supplier sustainability audits are performed, with an extra focus on countries and ingredients that have been identified as 'high risk'". Under the heading Sustainable partnerships, SkA also state "Cooperation between value chain partners (business, government, science and NGOs) is a prerequisite to successfully addressing the sustainability challenges of our industry. Nutreco participates in various sustainable partnerships such as the Round Table on Responsible Soy, the ProTerra Network, the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, the Aquaculture Stewardship Council and the International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Responsible Supply Standard." Skretting also have a section in FAQs that addresses marine ingredients sourcing and the system/ regulation in place to ensure responsible sourcing: http://www.skretting.com/en-AU/faqs/is-fish-feed-sustainable/ B. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include Tassal's letter (8/01/2014) Feed Supplier Notification Letter - Skretting Australia. C. The origin of all fish products used as feed ingredients in all feed is well documented in the CY2016 Origin of Source Fishery for FM and FO (Appendix 5).	Compliant		
Criterion 4.4 Source of non-marine raw materials in feed						
4.4.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a responsible sourcing policy for the feed manufacturer for feed ingredients that comply with recognized crop moratoriums [75] and local laws [76] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Compile and maintain a list of all feed suppliers with contact information. (See also 4.1.1a) b. Obtain from each feed manufacturer a copy of the manufacturer's responsible sourcing policy for feed ingredients showing how the company complies with recognized crop moratoriums and local laws. c. Confirm that third party audits of feed suppliers (4.1.1c) show evidence that supplier's responsible sourcing policies are implemented. d. Others, please describe	A. Since 2012 Skretting Australia (SkA) have been Tassal's only feed supplier and they are in the Tassal Approved Supplier System. Records including contact information were viewed on site - Skretting, delivery by De Bruyns. Includes end of month reconciliation of SkA invoices and feeds use/stocked at MF 190, small deviations/corrections. B. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states that they have a responsible sourcing policy that applies to non-marine feed ingredients. For their suppliers of plant raw materials, Skretting has a general vendor policy that all their suppliers have signed. This policy outlines that the vendor must abide by the laws and regulations of the country or region that governs their business activities. Skretting also have a specific responsible sourcing vendor policy for the purchase of soya. Soy protein concentrate from Brazil is the only soy raw material that Skretting Australia purchases, and the supplier has signed their specific soy vendor policy. ASC have confirmed that only country of origin is required from soy suppliers regarding region grown. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states that they are audited annually against the requirements in Principal 4 of the Salmon Farm standard by SGS - Certificate AU15/4663 expires 31/05/18. Signed vendor policies were reviewed during that audit. C. Skretting is ASC Salmon Standard Principle 4 certified (SGS expires 31/05/18) and Global G.A.P. certified (SGS #4052852637961 expires 26/06/2017); this audit scope includes traceability (CFM13.1). The most recent audit report (completed 28/05/2017) has not been forwarded by Skretting; the auditor is aware that one Minor Must Non-conformance was raised for clause 15.1.1; this was closed 22/05/2017 and the Certification Body should soon release the final report to SkA so that certification could proceed. Skretting also has an electronic traceability system (Nutrace) that has been explained to the audit team during previous audits.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
4.4.2	Indicator: Percentage of soya or soya-derived ingredients in the feed that are certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77] Requirement: 100%, within five years of the publication [78] of the SAD standards Applicability: All, after June 13, 2017	a. Prepare a policy stating the company's support of efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent. b. Prepare a letter stating the farm's intent to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS (or equivalent) c. Notify feed suppliers of the farm's intent (4.4.2b). d. Obtain and maintain declaration from feed supplier(s) detailing the origin of soya in the feed. e. Starting on or before June 13, 2017, provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent [77] f. Others, please describe	The audit was undertaken after June 13, 2017 so the full requirements were assessed. A. Tassal's Responsible Sourcing Policy (IMS-P1084 Issue 1, 8/01/2014 1p) states "Tassal supports efforts to shift feed manufacturers purchases of fishmeal and fish oil to fisheries certified under a scheme that is an ISEAL member or an equivalent approved scheme and has guidelines that specifically promote responsible environmental management of small pelagic fisheries. Tassal supports efforts to shift feed manufacturers' purchases of soya to soya certified under the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent". B. Tassal's letter (8/01/2014) Feed Supplier Notification Letter - Skretting Australia included a copy of the Salmon Standard and the Feed Supplier Notification Letter (1p) stating as per the ASC criterion 4.4.2b Tassal intends to source feed containing soya certified under the RTRS or equivalent. C. Refer B. above. D. SkA have stated that starting on or before June 13, 2017, they will provide evidence that soya used in feed is certified by the Roundtable for Responsible Soy (RTRS) or equivalent. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states that Skretting uses soy concentrate originating from Brazil. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states that since 2016, 100% of soy purchased has been ProTerra certified (#BR46431 13/12/16); http://www.proterrafoundation.org/index.php/standard/leading-principles" The 2017 Global G.A.P. auditor sighted 8 containers/seal numbers for the 2016 shipments of more than 200 tonnes of soy protein concentrate. The Traceability Certificate of Compliance states the soybeans originated from the Mina Gerais and Mato Grosso regions of Brazil and the soy protein concentrate was non-GMO. E. Refer D. above.	Compliant		100% of soy purchased by the Client's feed supplier is ProTerra certified.
4.4.3	Indicator: Evidence of disclosure to the buyer [79] of the salmon of inclusion of transgenic [80] plant raw material, or raw materials derived from transgenic plants, in the feed Requirement: Yes, for each individual raw material containing > 1% transgenic content [81] Applicability: All	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the content of soya and other plant raw materials in feed and whether it is transgenic. b. Disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure. For first audits, farm records of disclosures must cover > 6 months. c. Inform ASC whether feed contains transgenic ingredients (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. d. Others, please describe	A. SkA's ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 20p) states that they have a non-GMO Policy, which is documented on page 3 of the updated Quality Assurance Declaration (DH 31.12.01 v7). This states that "Our policy on genetically modified organisms is to purchase our ingredients on a GMO-free basis. Since Jan. 2000 in accordance with Australian regulation (Food Standards Australia New Zealand Code) SkA has maintained a 'GMO DNA free' status for their aquaculture feeds. Our vegetable raw materials are purchased as non-GMO and supplier certifications are documented." B. Except for soy and wheat gluten, all vegetable raw materials were purchased Australian sources. The Brazilian soy supplier/manufacturer Sementes Selecta S/A declaration includes a Non-GMO certificate (SGS DO Brazil Ltda Certificate #14092503B4) declaring that the ingredient does not contain >1% inclusion of transgenic material. The Certificate states that the 184.8MT of soybean meal loaded in the vessel's hold (5-6/09/2014) is 99.1% Non-GM. Tassal has acknowledged its responsibility to disclose to the buyer(s) a list of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed and maintain documentary evidence of this disclosure for > 6 months. They have noted the info from Skretting regarding soy protein and potential GMOs states it is less than 1% so they are complying. C. The Client has informed the ASC that feeds used do not contain transgenic ingredients so they don't need to disclosure any GMO use to the salmon buyer.	Compliant		The Client's feed supplier has provided a non-GMO certificate declaring that ingredients do not contain >1% transgenic material.

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 4.5 Non-biological waste from production						
4.5.1	**Indicator**: Presence and evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible [83] treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a policy stating the farm's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the farm's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation. b. Prepare a declaration that the farm does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean. c. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of.	A. Tassal's commitment to responsible treatment on non-biological waste is documented in IMS-P1002 Environmental Policy (09/01/13, Issue #3) and IMS-P1091 Marine Debris - Feed Pipe Policy 4/02/2015 Issue #1). B. Tassal declaration (21/01/2017) signed by HoS states that "Tassal does not dump non-biological waste into the ocean. Tassal has not received any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal during the past 12 months. Unless otherwise advised, this declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020." Site and vessel inspections confirmed that all boats and barges have wheelie bins provided which are emptied into Oldhams skip bin at Nubeena land base; staff are trained and understand the importance in using bins provided and segregation of wastes. Also take cardboard, Veolia waste oil only 31/12/2016 Oldams Rubbish Collection Service Inv 4469 for 9/1/2/2016 two bins 17m3 & 12 m3 Waste management is discussed on p42 of the 2016 Sustainability Report states "Tassal is committed to finding innovative ways to minimise and manage the waste that we create through continuous improvement and the prevention of pollution. We have developed a waste management framework to ensure that our activities and services comply with all applicable environmental standards." Sections include Marine Operations Waste Management, Envorinex, Net Slab Waste Management, Freshwater Operations Waste Management, Processing Waste Management, Nutrient Recovery from Sludge and Fish Biomass and Packaging. Both 2016 waste control programs have been actioned – a. Begin feedpipe recycling program to reduce plastics waste going to landfill, and b. Investigate potential recycling and reuse opportunities for waste feed pipe. 2017 Environmental Goals and Targets includes a project to Improve recycling and reuse of waste across Salmon marine sites – this will include implementation of a net, rope and high-density polyethylene recycling program across all marine sites to reduce waste going to landfill and to find reuse opportunities. Email from Environmental Certification & Sustainability Officer (20/06/2017) "In line with Tassal's commitment to reduce plastics waste, local polymer company Envorinex collected approximately 102,000 kg of waste Salmon pen pipe and stanchions along with feed pipe from our sites. Of this total, 67,815 kg was recycled into pellets and the remaining will be processed in the next reporting year. 35,487 kg of the pellets were sold to a manufacturer in Melbourne that extrudes sheet high density polyethylene (HDPE). The remaining pellets were used by Envorinex to manufacture spacers which are used between steel beams, fire extinguisher brackets, fence posts and permeable pavers. All plastic is recycled back into pellets and used to remanufacture new products. The issue is covered at farms in the MO-130 Marine Operations Waste Management Plan (12/12/2016, Issue #3). A WH& S policy & Procedure Employee Sign Off Register (WHS-F-102) for initials AL Fish Performance Manager signed between 16/02/2016 and 3/02/2017 – Operations including MO-130 MO-110 Control of Antibiotic Residue in harvest Fish, draft Mass Mortality Response Plan , MO-108 Calibrations of oxygen/temp equipment, MO-115 Environmental Sampling, MO-116 Farm Disease Management & Biosecurity Protocol, MO-135 Perform Stock Transaction, MO-146 Escape Prevention, MO-150 Tassal Year Class Split Standards, MO-175 Fish Health Management Plan – South east, MO-274 Grading fish , MO-430 Mortality Rate Trigger Response Protocol, MO-447 Fish handling Procedure, MO-450 Fish Anaesthesia Protocol using Aqui-S, TB-109 Grading Fish – Manual Grading Stations. Tassal have conducted farm level workshops at each of their marine sites to improve site ownership and understanding of the issue including causes and impacts of marine debris. Farm level waste mitigation plans continue to be implemented and their Adopt a Shoreline Clean Up regime has remained in place. Eastern Zone Shoreline clean-up reports available for November 2016, April, May 2017; reviewed Shoreline Cleanup Form for 30/05/2017 – 3 staff over 6 hrs collected 1m3 – 40% Tassal, 60% Public. Map shows four beaches were cleaned. Photos provided of the rubbish collected. The 2-page Eastern Zone Waste Flow Chart includes non-biological waste disposal in the East Waste Depot/Tip (landfill), what liquids are treated (sewage Peninsula Pumping & bilge water Veolia Q1) and recycling including oil, batteries (Oldhams) but not feedbags (none). Evidence of responsible waste disposal was observed during site inspection, including recycling bins and	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		d. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm.	Responsible waste disposal was observed during site inspection, including recycling bins and general wastes/landfill collection bins. The Veolia consolidated report Q1 FY2017 (Jul-Sep16) and Q2 FY2017 (Oct-Dec16) reviewed confirm items taken for recycling including cardboard/paper and comingled waste separated from general waste (landfill). C. & D. Site Inspection confirmed storage of all feed bags and waste rope for collection and recycling, collection of oils and filters and chemical containers. Recycling/reuse hoppers and bins sighted at Nubeena landbase includes chemical containers (waste station), ropes, pipes (chipping Envorinex), batteries (Tas Fire Services), scrap metal and waste oils.			
		e. Others, please describe				
4.5.2	**Indicator**: Evidence that non-biological waste (including net pens) from grow-out site is either disposed of properly or recycled **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Provide a description of the most common production waste materials and how the farm ensures these waste materials are properly disposed of. (see also 4.5.1c)	A. Refer to 4.5.1 C&D above. Email Senior Manager – Environment (14/10/2016) outlining progress in MOPs recycling and issues their preferred supplier. New contract with George Town based Environex. This service is rapidly increasing in scope and is currently covering Cage pipe, Feed pipe, Bird stands, Stanchions, Rope – all types unsegregated, Feed bags (through De Bruyns), Mono nets, Bird nets, Nylon nets & Plastic Buoys. Tassal are also doing trials with Liner bags from factory's and chemical drums, AF nets, Spring Bay Seafoods & Plastic IBCs. Email (24/10/2016) from Environmental Officer to marine sites re: recycling program lists Poly feed pipe, Stanchions, Buoys (HDPE only), Feed bags and Rope. Evidence of recycling sighted at the Eastern Zone landbase includes cage for cardboard & paper, bins for four types of metals, piles of pipes for chipping, bin of batteries, waste oil box, bin for used oil cartridges, and bags and bins of ropes. C. The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter (17/01/2017) states "Tassal have had no infractions or fines for improper waste disposal have been received during the previous 12 months. Unless otherwise advised, this declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020." D. Veolia consolidated report Q1 FY2017, Veolia consolidated report Q2 FY2017 - these records confirm proper waste disposal and recycling consistent with Tassal's policy.	Compliant		
		b. Provide a description of the types of waste materials that are recycled by the farm. (See also 4.5.1d)				
		c. Inform the CAB of any infractions or fines for improper waste disposal received during the previous 12 months and corrective actions taken..				
		d. Maintain records of disposal of waste materials including old nets and cage equipment.				
		e. Others, please describe				
			Criterion 4.6 Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions on farms [84]			
	Indicator: Presence of an energy use assessment verifying the energy consumption on the farm and representing the whole life cycle at sea, as outlined in Appendix V- 1	a. Maintain records for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) on the farm throughout each production cycle.	A. There continues to be improvements in collection & analysis of data and reporting on GHG. The Conversion Tool EZ is in use; it includes tabs for Conversion of Fuel Volume to Energy, Electricity to Energy, Energy Use, CO2e- Emissions and Emissions. Records of energy consumption & GHG emission are collected over a financial year (FY) and published annually for all the Tassal business units (Admin, hatcheries, farms, processing, vessels, transport), including each farming zone, for example the Tassal Eastern Zone Energy Use and GHG Assessment FY2016 (5p) report with sections including Introduction, Inventory Boundaries, Results (energy use, GHG Emissions) and References. B. Calculations were undertaken correctly and stated in the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment) with tabs data from relevant suppliers of electricity & fuel, hatchery biomass, MOPs biomass and Biomass produced. Assumptions made which are relevant for 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 8.9 and 8.10 include: 1. Production cycle data requested for much of ASC criterion refers to the most recently completed year class – for this report data from 16YC is used (the production cycle for a YC can range from 15-22 months, assume average 18 months) 2. Tassal			
		b. Calculate the farm's total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last production cycle.				
		c. Calculate the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last production cycle.				

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
4.6.1	~~sea, as outlined in Appendix V-1~~ Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle Applicability: All	d. Using results from 4.6.1b and 4.6.1c, calculate energy consumption on the farm as required, reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle. e. Submit results of energy use calculations (4.6.1d) to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Ensure that the farm has undergone an energy use assessment that was done in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. g. Others, please describe	~~production cycle for a YC can range from 15-22 months, assume average 18 months~~); 2. Tassal energy and GHG calculations for their reporting (e.g. Annual Sustainability report, etc.) is for financial year – for this report data is from FY16 which covers much of the 15YC production cycle, 3. Individual lease data for energy & GHG is not able to be determined, however, the data is broken down separately for each of the 3 hatcheries (Eastern Zone includes the two growout leases and 2 smolt leases). C. The Tassal database FishTalk was used to generate the total production data for the FY16. The required raw data is from the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment. Cross-check confirmed data matches and is from the same dataset (FishTalk). Accuracy of calculations were confirmed. D. A review of the Annual GHG Assessments confirms they are conducted with methods complying with requirements of Appendix V-1. Results stated in Tassal Eastern Zone Energy Use and GHG Assessment FY2016 (5p) report, raw data is from the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment) E. The Client has submitted energy use calculations to the ASC.	Compliant		
4.6.2	**Indicator**: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [85]) emissions [86] on farm and evidence of an annual GHG assessment, as outlined in Appendix V-1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of greenhouse gas emissions on the farm. b. At least annually, calculate all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1. c. For GHG calculations, select the emission factors which are best suited to the farm's operation. Document the source of those emissions factors. d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO_2 gases to CO_2 equivalents, specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source. e. Submit results of GHG calculations (4.6.2d) to ASC as per Appendix VI at least once per year. f. Ensure that the farm undergoes a GHG assessment as outlined in Appendix V-1 at least annually. g. Others, please describe	A.+B. Records of energy consumption& GHG emission are collected over a financial year (FY) and published annually for all the Tassal business units (Admin, hatcheries, farms, processing, vessels, transport), including each farming zone, for example the Tassal Eastern Zone Energy Use and GHG Assessment FY2016 (5p) report with sections including Introduction, Inventory Boundaries, Results (energy use, GHG Emissions) and References; C. Calculations were undertaken correctly and stated in the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment) with tabs data from relevant suppliers of electricity & fuel, hatchery biomass, MOPs biomass and Biomass produced. Assumptions made which are relevant 4.6.2 are described in 4.6.1B above. D. Tassal database FishTalk was used to generate the total production data for the FY16. The required raw data is from the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment). Cross-check confirmed data matches and is from the same dataset (FishTalk). Accuracy of calculations were confirmed and all GWPs used, sources provided. E. The Client has submitted GHG calculations to the ASC. F. Annual GHG Assessments are conducted with methods complying with requirements of Appendix V-1. Results stated in Tassal Eastern Zone Energy Use and GHG Assessment FY2016 (5p) report, raw data is from the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment).	Compliant		
4.6.3	Indicator: Documentation of GHG emissions of the feed [87] used during the previous production cycle, as outlined in Appendix V, subsection 2 Requirement: Yes, within three years of the publication [88] of the SAD standards (i.e. by June 13, 2015) Applicability: All, after June 13, 2015	a. Obtain from feed supplier(s) a declaration detailing the GHG emissions of the feed (per kg feed). b. Multiply the GHG emissions per unit feed by the total amount of feed from each supplier used in the most recent completed production cycle. c. If client has more than one feed supplier, calculate the total sum of emissions from feed by summing the GHG emissions of feed from each supplier. d. Submit GHG emissions of feed to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. e. Others, please describe	A.&B. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - Skretting Appendix 11 - ASC LCA 2015 data; - ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC; and - Skretting LCA declaration_2016. The Client only has one feed supplier – Skretting Australia (SkA). SkA's ASC Life Cycle Assessment declaration 2016 (V1) includes all the ingredient used for 2016 feeds (Jan-Dec); these include marine proteins, land-animal proteins, vegetable proteins, marine oils, land-animal oils, vegetable oils and carbohydrate. Results are: - Carbon in feed production (kg CO2e/kg) = 0.05 - Carbon footprint of feed ingredients (kg CO2e/kg) = 6.65 Total carbon footprint of feed (kg CO2e/kg) = 6.70 This is slightly higher than figures for CY2015 (SkA's Appendix 11) => 0.06, 6.46 = 6.51 kg CO2e/kg C. The calculations are confirmed to be undertaken as per Appendix VI. D. The Client has submitted to the ASC GHG calculations for feed for CY2016.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 4.7 Non-therapeutic chemical inputs [89,90]						
4.7.1	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper-treated nets [91], evidence that nets are not cleaned [92] or treated in situ in the marine environment **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Prepare a farm procedure for net cleaning and treatment that describes techniques, technologies, use of off-site facilities, and record keeping. b. Maintain records of antifoulants and other chemical treatments used on nets. c. Declare to the CAB whether copper-based treatments are used on nets. d. If copper-based treatments are used, maintain documentary evidence (see 4.7.1b) that farm policy and practice does not allow for heavy cleaning of copper-treated nets in situ. e. Inform ASC whether copper antifoulants are used on farm (yes or no) as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	N/A - The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter (17/01/2017) states that "nets are not cleaned on-land. This declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020."	N/A		
4.7.2	**Indicator**: For any farm that cleans nets at on-land sites, evidence that net-cleaning sites have effluent treatment [93] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Declare to the CAB whether nets are cleaned on-land. b. If nets are cleaned on-land, obtain documentary evidence from each net-cleaning facility that effluent treatment is in place. c. If yes to 4.7.2b, obtain evidence that effluent treatment used at the cleaning site is an appropriate technology to capture of copper in effluents. d. Others, please describe	N/A - The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter (17/01/2017) states that "nets are not cleaned on-land. This declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020."	N/A		
4.7.3	**Indicator**: For farms that use copper nets or copper-treated nets, evidence of testing for copper level in the sediment outside of the AZE, following methodology in Appendix I-1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Declare to the CAB whether the farm uses copper nets or copper-treated nets. (See also 4.7.1c). If "no", Indicator 4.7.3 does not apply. b. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, measure and record copper in sediment samples from the reference stations specified in 2.1.1d and 2.1.2c which lie outside the AZE. c. If "yes" in 4.7.3a, maintain records of testing methods, equipment, and laboratories used to test copper level in sediments from 4.7.3b. d. Others, please describe	N/A - The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter (17/01/2017) states that "nets are not cleaned on-land. This declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020."	N/A		
4.7.4	Indicator: Evidence that copper levels [94] are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight OR in instances where the Cu in the sediment exceeds 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, demonstration that the Cu concentration falls within the range of background concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body Requirement: Yes Applicability: All farms except as noted in [89] and excluding those farms shown to be exempt from Indicator 4.7.3	a. Inform the CAB whether: 1) farm is exempt from Indicator 4.7.4 (as per 4.7.3a), or 2) Farm has conducted testing of copper levels in sediment. b. Provide evidence from measurements taken in 4.7.3b that copper levels are < 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight. c. If copper levels in 4.7.4b are ≥ 34 mg Cu/kg dry sediment weight, provide evidence the farm tested copper levels in sediments from reference sites as described in Appendix I-1 (also see Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). d. Analyze results from 4.7.4c to show the background copper concentrations as measured at three reference sites in the water body. e. Submit data on copper levels in sediments to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. f. Others, please describe	N/A - The Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter (17/01/2017) states that the farm is exempt from indicator 4.7.4. This declaration is valid for the 2017-2019 certification period and will be reviewed at the next ASC full assessment in 2020. No biocides are used in net antifouling by Tassal.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
4.7.5	**Indicator**: Evidence that the type of biocides used in net antifouling are approved according to legislation in the European Union, or the United States, or Australia **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [89]	a. Identify all biocides used by the farm in net antifouling. b. Compile documentary evidence to show that each chemical used in 4.7.5a is approved according to legislation in one or more of the following jurisdictions: the European Union, the United States, or Australia. c. Others, please describe	N/A - Tassal's Principle 4 CAB Notification Letter (signed by HoS 17/01/2017) for the 2017-2019 certification period states that the farms are exempt from this indicator as no biocides are used in net antifouling by Tassal.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
PRINCIPLE 5: MANAGE DISEASE AND PARASITES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
Criterion 5.1 Survival and health of farmed fish [95]						
5.1.1	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a fish health management plan that incorporates components related to identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites. This plan may be part of a more comprehensive farm planning document. b. Ensure that the farm's current fish health management plan was reviewed and approved by the farm's designated veterinarian [96]. c. Others, please describe	A. A minor non-conformance for 5.1.1a+b was raised during the 2016 surveillance audit and was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence. The 15YC had a second year of high losses to POMV, possible related to stress; low incidents of TSRV virus were also found during passive surveillance, no need for further sampling. For current 17YC there have been no major signs of virus of disease issues. The MO-152 Fish Health Management Plan – Macquarie Harbour and the MO-175 Fish Health Management Plan - South East Region have been combined into the expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p). This major review was led by the Senior Fish Health Manager (SMFH) with the Zone Managers. It was revised with Zero Harm Intent as documented in the IMS-P1090 Zero Harm for Fish Animal Welfare Policy ((Issue # 2, 28/09/2015 1p). According to the SMFH it details the 'gold standards' for all fish health & biosecurity activities and procedures. It includes a new Section 15 for Pilchard Orthomyxovirus (POMV); this virus is also referenced in Section 12 Fish Health Incident Reporting and Emergencies. The FHMP is augmented by the new 35-page MO-501 Salmon Disease Guide which covers all endemic and exotic diseases for Salmon in Tasmania. It contains a high number of photos, diagrams, descriptions, clinical signs and other information to assist in classifying diseases and other causes of mortalities. Water proof copies have been provided to all divers and all Technical Officers (TOs). It will also be used for all divers and TOs during the refresher training course scheduled for August. This training is supported by annual refresher by Seafood Training Tasmania (STT) completed for 12 Eastern Zone employees on 30/08/16. The focus is on normal vs. abnormal behaviour and appearance, taking and preserving samples for laboratory analysis. Unchanged documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - ES-F104 Fish Health Incident Report (06/01/16, I#1 2p) - IMS-106 Integrated Incident Reporting & Investigation Procedure (29/01/16, I#7 19p) for Fish Health, WHS & Quality. - The MO-430 Mortality Rate Trigger Response Procedure (09/01/15, Issue #1 1p) is set at >0.1% daily mortality per pen. In Eastern Zone mortality is expected to be higher in summer around splitting & bathing, higher environmental stress. IMS-106 states that on first discovery of any fish health or escape issue, actions must be put into place immediately to minimise the impact of spread. All Fish Health related incidents as defined in the definitions tables for each category are to be recorded on incident report ES-F104 form and forwarded to the Fish Health - Field Officer & Technical Officer within the required time frame. Incident reports are to be fully completed by the Team Leader in consultation with the worker involved. Incidents are to be investigated by Site Management and controls implemented that prevent re-occurrence, these are to be closed off and signed by Management on completion. All incidents are to be investigated by Site Management and the completed preliminary investigation report (WHS-F100) forwarded to the Senior Manager Fish Health for further investigation and/or recommendations. B. On Q-Pulse, the Electronic document system, the changes made by Vet identified as CR36.38 20/06/2017 includes a request to release new documentation, this is the electronic signature in Review Change Requests for this revised document. This evidence confirms the 2016 minor non-conformance has been appropriately addressed.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.1.2	**Indicator**: Site visits by a designated veterinarian [96] at least four times a year, and by a fish health manager [97] at least once a month **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of visits by the designated veterinarian [96] and fish health managers [97]. If schedule cannot be met, a risk assessment must be provided. b. Maintain a current list of personnel who are employed as the farm's designated veterinarian(s) [96] and fish health manager(s) [97]. c. Maintain records of the qualifications of persons identified in 5.1.2b. d. Others, please describe	A. Review documentary evidence of site visits to confirm a minimum number of visits as outlined in 5.1.2. Or review risk assessment. B. Confirm visits in 5.1.2a were performed by the farm's designated health professionals. C. Review evidence for qualifications of the farm's health professionals. A. A minor non-conformance for 5.1.2a was raised during the 2015 surveillance audit and was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence. The Senior Manager of Fish Health (company veterinarian) visits each farm approximately every 2-3 months and her site visit schedule for 2016/2017 was sighted. Records of visits are in the spreadsheet CH- vet visits to sites from 2014-current – confirms that visits occur more than quarterly (>15 in 2016, 3 to date in 2017). B. The SMFH also has a team of other fish health specialists and full-time trained technical health reps at each site - Site Technical Officers (TOs). Since 2016 the on-farm management structure has been changed to include the Fish Performance Manager – Operations and the Fish Performance Manager – Technical. At the Eastern Zone, the managers involved in fish health include Eastern Zone Manager, Eastern Zone Technical Officer, Technical Officer Assistant , Fish Performance Manager, Technical, Fish Performance Manager, and the a Technical Officer Assistant. C. Other documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - Designated Veterinarian Position description (# ENVI8 V2) and Letter of Offer for Senior Manager – Fish Health (21/07/14, start 8/09/2014); - Position description for Fish Health Field Officer - Position description for Technical Officers (HUOTSO V1 Jan14 3p) - Position description for Fish Performance Manager – Technical (Aug15, 3p) - CVs and other information also on HR files - The veterinarian's curriculum vitae. - Fish Health Field Officer site visits (Tasman) - Senior Manager Fish Health (company veterinarian) site visits spreadsheet (log). This evidence confirms the 2015 minor non-conformance continues to be appropriately addressed.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.1.3	**Indicator**: Percentage of dead fish removed and disposed of in a responsible manner **Requirement:** 100% [98] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of mortality removals to show that dead fish are removed regularly and disposed of in a responsible manner. b. Collect documentation to show that disposal methods are in line with practices recommended by fish health managers and/or relevant legal authorities. c. For any exceptional mortality event where dead fish were not collected for post-mortem analysis, keep a written justification. d. Others, please describe	A. Reviewed the AQUAVETPLAN (Version 2.0, 2015 203p) which contains a series of technical response plans that describe the proposed Australian approach to aquatic animal disease incursions. One of the 3 Operational Procedures Manuals Disposal discusses responsible disposal and outlines plan for implementation (the other 2 cover Destruction & Decontamination). The complete series of AQUAVETPLAN documents is available on the internet (www.agriculture.gov.au/animal-plant-health/aquatic/aquavetplan). Based on these Federal Government's recommendations, Tassal has developed its own procedures including: - revised and expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p); and - MO-200 Stock, Net Inspection and Mort Retrieval (05/10/2016, Issue #16). Morts are collected by divers at least 2x per week and stored in special fish bins with lids and lined with double plastic bags; and then held in a refrigerated container. Tassal uses "FishTalk" to record removals based on the mortalities recorded by divers and farm staff. The completed 1-page Mortality Report Sheet (MO-F230, Issue #6) are held on site – eight completed report sheets (12/0617 to 17/06/2017) were viewed. A cross check of data in 5.1.4 confirms no escapes for 15YC, and that most losses to POMV, seals (seal assessment [eaten] strikes or take from pens) and Environmental. B. Site inspection confirmed that onsite activities follow operational procedures with a specific chilled container for mort bins (capacity 8-10 tonnes); the grey and cream bins can't be used for anything else. The fish bins have orange coloured ties to indicate they are from the Eastern Zone leases are transported to the Tassal Rendering Plant at Triabunna on the east coast of Tasmania by the contractor Moore's Transport. Different coloured zip ties from different zones allow source to be identified – Eastern Zone uses Orange. The plant produces fish oil and fish meal, currently of an industrial grade (for animal feeds, however, this will be refined to food grade over time. At Triabunna, incoming morts are checked, if they are too old/decomposed, they are sent to a commercial composting facility at Interlaken; thus, the morts are disposed of in a responsible manner (rendering or composting). For the 16YC & 17YC issues with quality of morts, so larger quantities have been diverted to Interlaken for composting. In 15YC the total weight of mortalities in FishTalk was 408 tonnes (most of this was collected and transferred in 2016). The Senior Manager - Commercial & VA reported that in 2016, they received 319 bins at Triabunna from Eastern Zone (63 of the 319 bins were rejected to compost upon receival, however, no records kept of others rejected post coolroom storage or prior to tipping). During this period, they did not weigh by load, however, since weighing has been undertaken, the average bin weight has been about 700kg/bin – for the 319 bins this gives an estimated total of 223 tonnes which is only 55% of the 408 tonnes of mortalities recorded in FishTalk. Thus, there is insufficient evidence that 100% of dead fish removed from the cages are disposed of in a responsible manner. A Minor Non-conformance has been raised against this. C. There were no exceptional mortality events in 15YC other than POMV with 11.0% mortality rate (this contributed over 30%of all moralities); for 16YC gill necrosis moralities have been high in Mar-Apr17 (fish from this YC are still in water, harvest not finished).	**Minor**	For the 15YC the Client did not weigh by load. However, since weighing has been undertaken, the average bin weight has been about 700kg/bin – for the 319 bins this gives an estimated total of 223 tonnes which is only 55% of the 408 tonnes of mortalities recorded in FishTalk. Thus, there is insufficient evidence that 100% of dead fish removed from the cages are disposed of in a responsible manner. A Minor Non-conformance has been raised against this.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.1.4	**Indicator**: Percentage of mortalities that are recorded, classified and receive a post-mortem analysis **Requirement:** 100% [99] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain detailed records for all mortalities and post-mortem analyses including: - date of mortality and date of post-mortem analysis; - total number of mortalities and number receiving post-mortem analysis; - name of the person or lab conducting the post-mortem analyses; - qualifications of the individual (e.g. veterinarian [96], fish health manager [97]); - cause of mortality (specify disease or pathogen) where known; and - classification as 'unexplained' when cause of mortality is unknown (see 5.1.6). b. For each mortality event, ensure that post-mortem analyses are done on a statistically relevant number of fish and keep a record of the results. c. If on-site diagnosis is inconclusive and disease is suspected or results are inconclusive over a 1-2 week period, ensure that fish are sent to an off-site laboratory for diagnosis and keep a record of the results (5.1.4a). d. Using results from 5.1.3a-c, classify each mortality event and keep a record of those classifications.	A. A review of completed MO-F230 Mortality Report Sheet (29/04/2015, Issue #6) and the Mortality Classification Summary (10/01/2017, 2p) at Eastern Zone confirm that the required data is recorded by the divers; these are checked by the Fish Performance Manager before being recorded in FishTalk. Completed Mortality Report Sheets and ES-F104 Fish Health Incident Report (6/01/2016, Issue #1 2p) for selected mortality events which were also provided by the Senior Manager – Fish Health (SMFH). Moralities were recorded in an 'Environmental' category (i.e. algae species/concentrations, jellyfish, salps etc) thus encapsulating all additional moralities providing overall coverage. B. For each mortality event (generally considered over 1,000 fish or > 0.1% of total fish per day), as per the MO-430 Mortality Rate Trigger Response Procedure (09/01/15, Issue #1 1p) the post-mortem analyses are conducted on a statistically relevant number of fish and records kept of the results. In addition, the Fish Farm License requires reporting to the state govt with >0.25% for 3 consecutive days. According to the SMFH, Tassal classify most 0.1% mort rate triggers as an incident that needs investigating to form a part of their continuous improvement program. Not all Tassal's reported 0.1% incidents need histopathology as some of them are clearly handling related- this means people document their short-term and long-term actions to improve these processes. Like any safety incidents/near misses, the 0.1% mortality incidents are recorded in their incident reporting system. Since 2016 more samples are being taken of small mortality events. Generally, the samples are sent to the Animal Health Laboratory (Fish Health Uni, FHU), Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment (DPIPWE), Tasmania, for analysis. Post-mortem reports are summarised in the Fish Health Unit Pathology Reports spreadsheet maintained by the SMFH and her team; data can be sorted by symptom/cause, year and location.eg for15YC there were nine event samples taken for MF190 Creeses Mistake. By using the use Case ID, copies of the final FHU Reports can be located on file. Biggest issue was POMV with 30% of all mortalities due to this virus. For CY16 there has been an increase in sampling (16 events to date for MF190); this is now fortnightly for smolt and monthly for growout fish >500. To date only minor issues have been identified for 16YC, importantly no POMV, although some gill necrosis. Daily checks on mortalities received by divers. Data is input into FishTalk. Reviewed Final reports of examinations conducted by Animal Health Laboratory, DPIPWE, Tasmania on a case by case basis (7 records for Sep16-Dec16). These reports contain all the information required, for example: Report #15/3453 dated 10/11/2015 for Cage 2 & 23, now including Mortality Rates in the report. C. Tassal is part of the Tasmanian Salmonid Fish Health Surveillance Program, a system where all companies provide samples to the Fish Health Unit (FHU) in Launceston to look for new, emerging, and occurrence of disease in aquaculture. The diagnostics are done by the CAAHVS (Centre for Aquatic Animal Health and Vaccines). Tassal also conduct fish health research with them. The Technical Officers on each site, supported by the Fish Health Team are responsible for taking and submitting samples as part of this program (as well as focussing on other fish health related activities on each site). D338low feed rates, etc.) - and the samples are sent same day or the following day to the FHU in Launceston for processing. Reports come back to the Tassal Fish Health team and are distributed back to the sites. Reports sighted include: - Fish Health Unit Pathology Reports – Eastern Zone 2015 (nine); - Fish Health Unit Pathology Reports – Eastern Zone 2017 (increased surveillance, over 16 to date); and - Fish Health Unit Pathology Reports – Eastern Zone 2017 (smolt lease). In 2016 there was one case of 5,000 well-conditioned fish which 'rolled over 'during a crowd. The SMFH suggested this could have been cardio-vascular or stress, recorded as handling mortality due diligence on morts, so she searched for something not being picked up and checked overseas trends highlights gap in what is known. As a result, Tassal has changed crowding conditions across all marine farms with less fish and more oxygenation. Tassal now undertake Monthly post-mortem samples, occasionally subsample of cage (routine surveillance), eg. 2016-17 12016 Salmon Health Surveillance from FHU records 16 samples	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		e. Provide additional evidence to show how farm records in 5.1.4a-d cover all mortalities from the current and previous two production cycles (as needed). f. Submit data on numbers and causes of mortalities to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). g. Others, please describe	provided from Creeses Mistake, for 15YC nine sample reporting POMV major issues, some minor issues. On the lease, the TOs undertake regular field checks of gill, eg. check 13/06/2017 Position 7, records runts, deformities and other on the Health Gill Checksheet eg 20/06/2017 40 fish Badgers Pos5, deformities 20%, spinal 5%, 20% short operculum – dip net out of crowd, not rep sample, first bathe for the smolts. D. Mortality classifications are recorded i+D338 FishTalk by the Divers, checked at least weekly by the Zone Manager/SMFH. From the Mortality Classification V2 (10/01/2017 2p) mortality categories used by the divers (usually underwater) include Seal strike, Bird strike, Mature, Pinhead/runt, Deformed, Decomposed and Environmental, since early 2016 Gill Necrosis has been added. The FPM can recategorize as FishTalk has several additional categories; changes are also made by the Senior Manager – Fish Health based on lab reports from the Fish Health Unit. Lab reports reviewed from the farms confirmed some other causes, with results changed in FishTalk as required. Reviewed entry of mortality reports into Fish Talk and monthly reporting, checked for YC15, SMFH report same figures as FishTalk data provided by Fish Performance Manager, Technical. E. All lab reports and inhouse analysis are summarised in Folder 2015, Folder 2016 or Folder 2017. F. The Client has submitted post-mortem results to the ASC			
5.1.5	**Indicator**: Maximum viral disease-related mortality [100] on farm during the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 10% **Applicability:** All	a. Calculate the total number of mortalities that were diagnosed (see 5.1.4) as being related to viral disease. b. Combine the results from 5.1.5a with the total number of unspecified and unexplained mortalities from the most recent complete production cycle. Divide this by the total number of fish produced in the production cycle (x100) to calculate percent maximum viral disease-related mortality.	**A**. According to the Senior Manager of Fish Health, the high mortality levels associated with POMV (Pilchard Orthomyxovirus) are to be expected in naive populations of fish when exposed to a new virus, and this is likely to continue until some method of prevention, such as a vaccine or changes in culture techniques, is developed. Low mortalities due to other viruses are unusual. The Mortality Classification system at all farm sites has improved with most mortality causes being determined. Mass mortalities at Creeses Mistake reported due to viral disease (POMV) have been reported twice in the past four years in Tassal reports (eg. 15YC mortality breakdown) and a % of total mortalities calculated: - completed 13YC 7.3% of total mortalities - completed 14YC 0% - completed 15YC 30% of total mortalities - current 16YC 0% viral causes of mortality - the critical period is 70 days post transfer, this has passed for the 16YC so it is likely the % will be zero or low by the end of harvesting; however, there is a new issue of losses from gill necrosis (new category) with >10% to date. The 17YC smolt in water at Badgers Cove are undergoing more samples, no POMV detected to date according to the SMFH. **B**. A minor non-conformance was raised during the 2015 surveillance audit for high (>10%) viral/unspecified moralities for 14YC; and this was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence. As there were no POMV losses and no 'Unknowns' recorded in the 14YC, the 2016 surveillance audit didn't record a non-conformance; however, there were high numbers recorded in the 'Environmental' Category. For the current recertification audit, POMV losses have again been recorded with high (>10%) viral/unspecified moralities for 15YC. Thus, a new Minor Non-conformance is raised. It is worthwhile noting that numbers reported in the 'Environmental' Category have again decreased and there were no 'Unknowns' reported, proving the morality identification program has improved. According to the SMFH effective controls have been undertaken due to the 15YC reoccurrence; such as rested Badgers Cove smolt site, fallowed for 2016, used Tinderbox for these smolt (better conditions, less bait fish, more brackish water). She states that Tassal have focussed on developing culture methods that minimises fish stress; POMV is a orthomyxo-type virus in the same family as ISA. It gets into a subpopulation of fish, small numbers are positive but show no	**Minor**	POMV losses have been recorded with high (>10%) viral/unspecified moralities for 15YC.	>10%

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		c. Submit data on total mortality and viral disease-related mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).	clinical signs, when stressed the total viral load increases, then other cages are exposed to the virions (viral particle) causing the mass mortalities. The MO-116 FHMP 2017 states "It is likely that a stress event incites the outbreak, by increasing the presence of stress hormones (cortisol) and reducing immune capacity of the hosts. There will be a vaccine available to assist the host to combat the virus (through memory cells), but it is important to remember that there are a number of items that are controllable, and that the Tassal team should seek to mitigate these as much as possible." Thus, the recent focus of the SMFH, Zone Managers and others in the Fish Health Team has been to focus on reducing fish stress to combat POMV; changes described in Section 12 of MO-116 including bait fish exclusions with small smolt cage set soft net, older year class, mort extraction, spacing outside, early detection, reducing net cleaning stress and other farm management improvements are underway, working on a Vaccination, possible before end of 2017. Seafood Training Tasmania (STT) has conducted fish dissection and fish health training of 12 divers and TOs on 30/08/2016 at Eastern Zone. **C**. The Client has submitted mortality data to the ASC.			
		d. Others, please describe				
5.1.6	Indicator: Maximum unexplained mortality rate from each of the previous two production cycles, for farms with total mortality > 6% Requirement: ≤ 40% of total mortalities Applicability: All farms with > 6% total mortality in the most recent complete production cycle.	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for the most recent full production cycle. If rate was ≤ 6%, then the requirement of 5.1.6 does not apply. If total mortality rate was > 6%, proceed to 5.1.6b.	A. Creeses Mistake has had total mortalities >6% for the past three YCs. 13YC was particularly high, however, rates have significant reduced during 14YC and again with 15YC. The 13YC was the last time 'Unknown' category was used. However, more moralities were recorded in the 'Environmental' category which at other ASC audits had been reported to be used to count mortalities that do not fit into any of the other categories. This encompasses an almost endless list of sub-categories (Thermal stress, low DO, algae, jellyfish, etc.). The cause of death is commonly multi-factorial so it can be difficult to diagnose a definitive cause of death unless it is physically obvious e.g. seal strike. Following Minor Non-conformances raised last two years (including a Minor for Creeses Mistake in 2015), work by the SMFH and her team with the divers is ensuring that this category being correctly used. The new 35-page MO-501 Salmon Disease Guide covers all endemic and exotic diseases for Salmon in Tasmania. It contains a high number of photos, diagrams, descriptions, clinical signs and other information to assist in classifying diseases and other causes of mortalities. Water proof copies have been provided to all divers and all Technical Officers (TOs). It will also be used for all divers and TOs during the refresher training course scheduled for August. A breakdown of the environmental category for 15YC (spreadsheet from FishTalk) lists comments the farm staff such as algae species/concentrations, seals, jellyfish, salps etc. A new category for Gill Necrosis has also been added (this is the main cause for mortality in 16YC, due to algae, jellyfish, temp & low DO2 stress (all multifactorial in cause). This proves that a cause/category for almost all moralities is being recorded. For example, email (23/06/2017) from the Environmental Certification & Sustainability Officer reports that for 16YC at Creeses Mistake there have been no viral causes of mortality, and there is 77% of all mortalities have been classified as environmental mortalities, however, the total mortality rate is only 0.08% since entry (Out of Season were entered in May 2017). The spreadsheet/bar diagrams Eastern Zone 15YC mortality breakdown shows that the three major causes are (in order highest to lowest) are POMV, seal/predators and environmental. An Algologist has been employed part-time (3d/week) to work across all Marine Zones; duties include assist feeders, TOs and Managers with algal identifications, review the algal response and algal id and counting procedures. B. A minor non-conformance for moralities >40% was raised during the 2015 surveillance audit and was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence. A review of the two previous production cycles (14YC & 15YC) confirms that well less than 40% of total mortalities were from unexplained causes – the rate is decreasing each YC. This evidence confirms the 2015 minor non-conformance continues to be appropriately addressed. C. The Client has submitted unexplained mortality data to the ASC.	Compliant		<40%
		b. Calculate the unexplained mortality rate (%) for each of the two production cycles immediately prior to the current cycle. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle.				
		c. Submit data on maximum unexplained mortality to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle.				

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.1.7	**Indicator**: A farm-specific mortalities reduction program that includes defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities and reductions in unexplained mortalities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Use records in 5.1.4a to assemble a time-series dataset on farm-specific mortalities rates and unexplained mortality rates. b. Use the data in 5.1.7a and advice from the veterinarian and/or fish health manager to develop a mortalities-reduction program that defines annual targets for reductions in total mortality and unexplained mortality. c. Ensure that farm management communicates with the veterinarian, fish health manager, and staff about annual targets and planned actions to meet targets. d. Others, please describe	A. Tassal maintains a detailed dataset on mortalities for all farm sites which covers the required timeframe (see 5.1.4). The Eastern Zone 15YC mortality breakdown record is mostly due to another outbreak of POMV (viral and unexplained mortalities are >10% as per 5.1.5). There has been a decrease in the contribution under the 'Environmental" category and an increase in mortalities due to seal/predators, no doubt due to the higher kg loss set for Seal Assessment (seals in pen). The increase in the use of the specialised predator-proof168 cages is seeing the less protected cage seeing targeted. There program to replace all the cages with 168s is well underway. B. The defined annual targets for reductions in mortalities are reasonable and based on historical data. According to the SMFH Tassal's survival rate target is set at 90% and every year each Zone/farm needs to be moving closer to that target. The Client's Key Performance Indicators = 90% survival target, this was confirmed by Zone Manager, Fish Health Senior Manager and Fish Performance Manager. For 15YC across 4 zones it was 86%, for Eastern Zone it was 73.2% (due to higher seal predator and POMV outbreak). This is being addressed by projects focussing on improving freshwater smolt quality and husbandry, AGD controls, saltwater husbandry controls, standardisation of processes. Tassal's Zero Harm for Fish program (ZHF) aims to reduce mortalities. Better husbandry from improved training and employee engagement is thought to be a major factor in the improvement. Increasing survival is part of this wider fish welfare program which also looks at handling and other stresses that can lead to deceases. All farm sites undergo internal audits to reach specified target as per the MOPS ZHF Scorecard ver 15 (refer below 5.4.3). Mortality records are compared between different year classes. C. There is extensive training of farm staff in Fish handling & disease/biosecurity, improved procedures and guides (refer 5.1.1-2) and regular visits are conducted by the veterinarian and fish health staff. Interview with farm managers, staff & divers confirmed their improved knowledge and understanding. The reductions in unknown or unexplained mortalities, and the more focused use of the environmental category, proves better mortality analysis. However, currently (16YC) the focus is on some higher than normal levels of moralities from Gill necrosis (algae, usually jellyfish, temp & low DO2 stress, but often multifactorial in nature).	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 5.2 Therapeutic treatments [101]						
5.2.1	Indicator: On-farm documentation that includes, at a minimum, detailed information on all chemicals [102] and therapeutants used during the most recent production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing, and all disease and pathogens detected on the site Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Maintain a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant. b. If not already available, assemble records of chemical and therapeutant use to address all points in 5.2.1a for the previous two production cycles. For first audits, available records must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle. c. Submit information on therapeutant use (data from 5.2.1a) to ASC as per Appendix VI on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). d. Others, please describe	A. A review of chemical and therapeutant use records confirms they are well maintained (there are no antifoulants or other similar chemicals used). Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - The Eastern Zone Dangerous Goods Hazardous Substances Register (WHS-F129 spreadsheet update 19/10/2016) is kept on Tassal intranet site, it confirms that there are no antifoulants or other similar chemicals used. The DGHS Register notes product name and chemical name, reason for use, date(s) and amount (g) of product used for over 160 chemicals – this includes around 10 listed as HS/DG such as Formalin/Formaldehyde, Brake Cleaner, Acetone, ULP & Diesel. Other information is on the label or the MSDS. - The Tassal Antibiotics January 2017 lists Trimethoprim Micro 1kg (Antibiotic – Trimethoprim 100%) and Tetrafish (Antibiotic – Oxytetracycline 100%); according to their WHO Classification (4th Revision 2013 (Published 2016)) both are categorised as Highly Important Antimicrobials; they are both supplied by AllFarm Animal Health (Hastings, Vic). - The Medication Authority Records are associated with any medicated feed treatment; raised by the Company Vet they provide a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use that includes all the information in the indicator. The Medication Authority (MA) provides full traceability is and the SMFH was able link to fish mortality report, with fish health report, treatment records and prescription. Reassessment by the FH team confirms treatment successful. - File copy of WHO classification of antibiotic (4th Revision 2013 (published 2016)) sighted on G-Drive. A cross-check with purchase orders and sales records, inventories, documentation from feed manufacturer for any in-feed treatment, and veterinary records verifies their accuracy. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - The spreadsheet Tassal Antibiotic Use – Seawater spreadsheet (last reviewed May 2017) records treatments across all marine farms back to 28/04/2005 including the Eastern Zone. It records there have been no treatments in Eastern Zone since Jan-Feb 2009 (five treatments, 3 at Creeses, 2 at Badgers). However, 16YC smolt were held at Tinderbox as Badgers lease was being fallowed. Three pens were treated there in 2016, before the smolt were transferred to Creeses Mistake. There have never been any repeat treatments for cages at Badgers or Creeses Mistake. - example of an Allfarm invoice (#00006126 19/12/2016) for Oxytet Soluble (150kg) and Trimethoprin (25kg). The Inventory spreadsheet Antibiotics - 2015 to 2017 provided by the Financial Accountant (10/07/2017) records current stock (as at 31/05/2017) and purchases (earliest 1/10/2015, latest 22/12/2016, including the 19/12/2016 invoice)) for Trimethoprim Antibiotic and Tetrafish (Oxytetracycline); there is also some Trimsul Powder (500g Pack) in stock. All purchases were from Allfarm. The stock is held in a secure cabinet at Margate. B. A review of the spreadsheet Tassal Antibiotic Use – Seawater spreadsheet confirms that farm maintains detailed records for chemical and therapeutant use that covers the previous two production cycles. No antibiotics are held on site; these are only provided as medicated feeds, delivered by De Bruyns in labelled bags. When in use, an appropriate sign is mounted on the cage and on the hopper/silo “Medicated feed is in use.” C. The Client has submitted therapeutant information data to the ASC.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.2.2	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [103] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [104] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a list of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [104]. b. Maintain records of voluntary and/or mandatory chemical residue testing conducted or commissioned by the farm from the prior and current production cycles. - d. Others, please describe	A. According to the SMFH Tassal does not use any proactively banned therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals for use in food fish. They are authorised and dispensed as per AgVet Chemicals Code of Practice (July 12, updated for contact details Feb16, 5p) B. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - APVMA list of substances not permitted for use on food-producing animals in Australia - http://apvma.gov.au/node/11626; and - The 24-page Final list of permitted and banned therapeutants (updated February 2017). Reports of residue testing from the National Residue Survey (NRS) annual reports include: - 2013/2014 Aquaculture Salmon Industry Results Report - 2014/2015 Aquaculture Salmon Industry Results Report - 2015/2016 Aquaculture Salmon Industry Results Report Results show no records are over the MRLs. C. A cross check of Antibiotic spreadsheet (5.2.1a) confirms client is compliant, no banned therapeutants used.	Compliant		
5.2.3	**Indicator**: Percentage of medication events that are prescribed by a veterinarian **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Obtain prescription for all therapeutant use in advance of application from the farm veterinarian (or equivalent, see [96] for definition of veterinarian). b. Maintain copies of all prescriptions and records of veterinarian responsible for all medication events. Records can be kept in conjunction with those for 5.2.1 and should be kept for the current and two prior production cycles. c. Others, please describe	A. A review of the documentary evidence (on-farm records, veterinary records, and prescriptions) confirm all therapeutants have been prescribed by a qualified individual, the Company Veterinarian/Senior Fish Health Manager. The signed Medication Authority is required for all therapeutants in advance of application as per the Tasmanian Code of Practice for the supply and use of veterinary chemical products (Jul12, contact details updated Feb16, 5p). These records are kept centrally in a folder on G-drive. The spreadsheet Tassal Antibiotic Use – Seawater spreadsheet records no treatments for Badgers Cove or Creeses Mistake since 2009. However, Medication Authority MA16-09 dated 7/06/2016 was for the treatment of Yersiniosis infection in 16YC Atlantic Salmon destined for Creeses Mistake held at Tinderbox site at Channel Zone. This requires feed pellet top coating XKg (figure redacted) of OTC per 1,000Kg feed as below, 4,000kg of feed were fed to 1 pen over 10 days, B. A cross-check with results from chemical residue testing provided under 5.2.2b confirms no residues of OTC.	Compliant		
5.2.4	**Indicator**: Compliance with all withholding periods after treatments **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Incorporate withholding periods into the farm's fish health management plan (see 5.1.1a). b. Compile and maintain documentation on legally-required withholding periods for all treatments used on-farm. Withholding period is the time interval after the withdrawal of a drug from the treatment of the salmon before the salmon can be harvested for use as food. c. Show compliance with all withholding periods by providing treatment records (see 5.2.1a) and harvest dates for the most recent production cycle. d. Others, please describe	A. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p); and - MO-110 Control of Antibiotic Residue in Harvest Fish (18/05/2016, Issue #11). Both mention withholding periods, which would be specific for each treatment/ medication. Doc # MO110 states that any harvest which falls within a period of two times the stated withdrawal period will be tested for antibiotic residues. B. There are no legally-required withholding periods, all use is off-label. The Medication Authority referenced above in 5.2.3b specifies OTC treatment duration is over 10 days with 1,500 degree days withdrawal period before harvest. This is checked by Zone Manager and Planning Co-ordinator - Fresh (HOGG & Harvest) before the harvest takes place using the Log. C. Antibiotic residue testing was not necessary for the 15YC, treatments were only for smolt. Reviewed these as examples and harvest was over the 1,500 degree days for MA16-09 dated 7/06/2016.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.2.5	**Indicator**: Maximum farm level cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score as calculated according to the formula in Appendix VII **Requirement:** PTI score ≤ 13 **Applicability:** All	a. Using farm data for therapeutants usage (5..2.1a) and the formula presented in Appendix VII, calculate the cumulative parasiticide treatment index (PTI) score for the most recent production cycle. Calculation should be made and updated on an ongoing basis throughout the cycle by farm manager, fish health manager, and/or veterinarian. b. Provide the auditor with access to records showing how the farm calculated the PTI score. c. Submit data on farm level cumulative PTI score to ASC as per Appendix VI for each production cycle. d. Others, please describe	N/A - No parasites have been reported in the South East	N/A		
5.2.6	Indicator: For farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that parasiticide load [105] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles Requirement: Yes, within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All farms with a cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle	a. Review PTI scores from 5.2.5a to determine if cumulative PTI ≥ 6 in the most recent production cycle. If yes, proceed to 5.2.6b; if no, Indicator 5.2.6 does not apply. b. Using results from 5.2.5 and the weight of fish treated (kg), calculate parasiticide load in the most recent production cycle [105]. c. Calculate parasiticide load in the two previous production cycles as above (5.2.6b) and compute the average. Calculate the percent difference in parasiticide load between current cycle and average of two previous cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle. d. As applicable, submit data to ASC on parasiticide load for the most recent production cycle and the two previous production cycles (Appendix VI). e. Others, please describe	N/A - No parasites have been reported in the South East.	N/A		
5.2.7	**Indicator**: Allowance for prophylactic use of antimicrobial treatments [106] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records for all purchases of antibiotics (invoices, prescriptions) for the current and prior production cycles. b. Maintain a detailed log of all medication-related events (see also 5.2.1a and 5.2.3) c. Calculate the total amount (g) and treatments (#) of antibiotics used during the current and prior production cycles (see also 5.2.9). d. Others, please describe	A. The Medication Authority is only produced by a registered veterinarian, Medication is purchased, sent to Skretting to produce medicated feed. Antibiotic Purchase records (Purchase Order, Tax Invoices) are maintained by Finance Department, only approved suppliers are used, such as AllFarm. Only top coated feed pellets are used for the medication; all feed is used during the treatment period; silo is emptied before medicated feeds, silo is emptied before refilling with non-medicated feeds, none is left over. A review of the Antibiotic Use spreadsheet and The Medication Authority detailed above (5.2.4), confirms there have been no treatments on the growout farm during the 15YC; thus, the total amount procured by client is 0. Inspection of storage areas and feed records verify there is 0 quantity of antibiotics on-site. C. A review the Tassal Antibiotic Use – Seawater spreadsheet which records all the medications used back to 2002, verifies that the quantity of antibiotic applied by the client does not suggest prophylactic use. Antibiotic use document for Eastern Zone: - current production cycle (17YC), Total amount – 0 kg, Number of treatments – 0 - 16YC Total amount – 32kg, Number of treatments – 1 (Tinderbox) - 15YC Total amount – 0 Number of treatments – 0 C. The total amount of antibiotics used in the current production cycle is zero, which is equal to the total amount prescribed.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.2.8	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the World Health Organization (WHO [107]) **Requirement:** None [108] **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [107]. b. If the farm has not used any antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) in the current production cycle, inform the CAB and proceed to schedule the audit. c. If the farm has used antibiotics listed as critically important (5.2.8a) to treat any fish during the current production cycle, inform the CAB prior to scheduling audit. d. If yes to 5.2.8c, request an exemption from the CAB to certify only a portion of the farm. Prior to the audit, provide the CAB with records sufficient to establish details of treatment, which pens were treated, and how the farm will ensure full traceability and separation of treated fish through and post- harvest. e. Others, please describe	A. Sighted copy of current WHO list of Critically Important Antimicrobial for Human Medicine (4th edition, 2013, 32p) in DropBox (G-Drive). B. A cross-check of records for 5.2.1 and 5.2.7 confirms that the two antibiotics used by Tassal Trimethoprim and OTC are listed as highly important for human medicine. Tassal participated in the Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) workshop in Oct16, one of industries using lowest antimicrobials in primary production, actions to use bacteria in gut indicators for AMR. C. It is confirmed that the farm has not used any antibiotics listed as critically important. D. N/A E. N/A	Compliant		
5.2.9	**Indicator**: Number of treatments [109] of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 5.2.1a). For first audits, farm records must cover the current and immediately prior production cycles in a verifiable statement. b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle and supply a verifiable statement of this calculation. c. Others, please describe	A. A review of the Antibiotic use spreadsheet shows usage: - Current production cycle 17YC (Number of treatments – 0) - 16YC (Number of treatments – 1, smolt at Tinderbox while Badgers was being fallowed) - 15YC (Number of treatments – 0) A cross-check of this against on-farm chemical & therapeutant use (5.2.1a), medication events (5.2.3a), and prescription records (5.2.3b) confirms that the client maintains a record of all treatments of antibiotics. B. The confirm that the client has used ≤ 3 treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle.	Compliant		
5.2.10	Indicator: If more than one antibiotic treatment is used in the most recent production cycle, demonstration that the antibiotic load [110] is at least 15% less that of the average of the two previous production cycles Requirement: Yes [111], within five years of the publication of the SAD standard (i.e. full compliance by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All	a. Use results from 5.2.9b to show whether more than one antibiotic treatment was used in the most recent production cycle. If not, then the requirement of 5.2.10 does not apply. If yes, then proceed to 5.2.10b. b. Calculate antibiotic load (antibiotic load = the sum of the total amount of active ingredient of antibiotic used in kg) for most recent production cycle and for the two previous production cycles. For first audit, calculation must cover one full production cycle immediately prior to the current cycle. c. Provide the auditor with calculations showing that the antibiotic load of the most recent production cycle is at least 15% less than that of the average of the two previous production cycles. d. Submit data on antibiotic load to ASC as per Appendix VI (if applicable) for each production cycle. e. Others, please describe	N/A – As reported in 5.2.9, no Antibiotic treatments have been applied for 15YC, one was used for 16YC smolt held at Channel Zone, there have been no others since 2009.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.2.11	**Indicator**: Presence of documents demonstrating that the farm has provided buyers [112] of its salmon a list of all therapeutants used in production **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Prepare a procedure which outlines how the farm provides buyers [112] of its salmon with a list of all therapeutants used in production (see 4.4.3b). b. Maintain records showing the farm has informed all buyers of its salmon about all therapeutants used in production. c. Others, please describe	A. Reviewed ES-112 Disclosure to Buyers Procedure (20/01/2014, Issue #1) which states Tassal will: - provide buyer(s) of its salmon with a list of all therapeutants used in production; and - disclose to buyer(s) of any transgenic plant raw material in the feed. This information is communicated annually in Tassal's Sustainability Report which is available on Tassal's website. http://www.tassal.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Tassal-Sustainability-Report-2015.pdf A review of the 2016 Tassal Annual Sustainability Report (p49) details therapeutants used in FY13/14 to FY15/16 for marine sites and hatcheries. In addition, Tassal also report any use on their ASC Dashboard (http://www.tassal.com.au/sustainability/asc-dashboard/) within 30 days of the treatment, this is a rolling 12-month report. A check undertaken 23/06/2017 of the dashboard for specific use of antibiotics for the Eastern Zone reports the two pens treated with OTC 15/06/2016, there were smolt destined for Cresses Mistake, held at Tinderbox while Badgers was being fallowed. B. A review of sales records was not undertaken. Rather a cross-check against treatment records (5.2.1a) and a review of the generally available evidence in the 2016 Sustainability Report and the Dashboard verifies that buyers were adequately informed about therapeutants used in production.	Compliant		
Criterion 5.3 Resistance of parasites, viruses and bacteria to medicinal treatments						
5.3.1	**Indicator**: Bio-assay analysis to determine resistance when two applications of a treatment have not produced the expected effect **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. In addition to recording all therapeutic treatments (5.2.1a), keep a record of all cases where the farm uses two successive medicinal treatments. b. Whenever the farm uses two successive treatments, keep records showing how the farm evaluates the observed effect of treatment against the expected effect of treatment. c. For any result of 5.3.1b that did not produce the expected effect, ensure that a bio-assay analysis of resistance is conducted. d. Keep a record of all results arising from 5.3.1c. e. Others, please describe	N/A - The Company Vet (Senior Manager Fish Health) confirmed that no two successive treatments have been reported for MF190, likewise, none are reported in the Antibiotic use spreadsheet for 15YC.	N/A		
5.3.2	**Indicator**: When bio-assay tests determine resistance is forming, use of an alternative, permitted treatment, or an immediate harvest of all fish on the site **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Review results of bio-assay tests (5.3.1d) for evidence that resistance has formed. If yes, proceed to 5.3.2b. If no, then Indicator 5.3.2 is not applicable. b. When bio-assay tests show evidence that resistance has formed, keep records showing that the farm took one of two actions: - used an alternative treatment (if permitted in the area of operation); or - immediately harvested all fish on site. c. Others, please describe	N/A – As per 5.3.1, the Company Vet (Senior Manager Fish Health) confirmed that no two successive treatments have been reported for MF190, likewise, none are reported in the Antibiotic use spreadsheet for 15YC. Antimicrobial resistance is described in p49 of the 2016 Sustainability Report.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 5.4 Biosecurity management [113]						
5.4.1	**Indicator**: Evidence that all salmon on the site are a single-year class [114] **Requirement:** 100% [115] **Applicability:** All farms except as noted in [115]	a. Keep records of the start and end dates of periods when the site is fully fallow after harvest. b. Provide evidence of stocking dates (purchase receipts, delivery records) to show that there were no gaps > 6 months for smolt inputs for the current production cycle. - d. Others, please describe	A. During normal production cycles there is fallowing at both leases, the smolt lease Badgers Cove (MF 193) and the growout lease MF190 Creeses Mistake. This was confirmed though interviews with farm staff and cross check with Fish Talk smolt input, transfers and harvests. B. The Fish Talk spreadsheets and data confirm there were no gaps in smolt inputs > 6 months. Inspection of cages during the on-site audit to see if fish size (which may be variable) is consistent with the production of a single-year class. Fish Talk records show that stocking for 15YC of the Eastern Zone smolt lease Badgers was between 14/07/2015 & 29/08/15. For 16YC, Tinderbox was used for the smolt so all of Badgers could be fallowed as part of the strategy to address POMV. Transfer to MF190 Creeses Mistake was 18/11/2015 to 15/12/2015; this is only ever a single year class (although there may be an overlap with some pens yet to be harvested in Nov-Dec when ongrown smolt begin to be introduced into pens in other parts of the lease; these are segregated for biosecurity reasons). C. Regarding single year classes there is a variance request approved by ASC 27/10/15; file copy: "(117) VR_Tassal Operations_Criterion 5.4.1 Closed." There are only ever one year class on the Badgers Cove. The 15YC Harvest at Creeses Mistake was 22/05/2016 to 16/12/2016.	Compliant		
5.4.2	Indicator: Evidence that if the farm suspects an unidentifiable transmissible agent, or if the farm experiences unexplained increased mortality, [116] the farm has: 1. Reported the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority 2. Increased monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM 3. Promptly [118] made findings publicly available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, show evidence that the farm promptly evaluated each to determine whether it was a statistically significant increase over background mortality rate on a monthly basis [116]. The accepted level of significance (for example, $p < 0.05$) should be agreed between farm and CAB. b. For mortality events logged in 5.1.4a, record whether the farm did or did not suspect (yes or no) an unidentified transmissible agent. c. Proceed to 5.4.2d if, during the most recent production cycle, either: - results from 5.4.2a showed a statistically significant increase in unexplained mortalities; or - the answer to 5.4.2b was 'yes'. Otherwise, Indicator 5.4.2 is not applicable. d. If required, ensure that the farm takes and records the following steps: 1) Report the issue to the ABM and to the appropriate regulatory authority; 2) Increase monitoring and surveillance [117] on the farm and within the ABM; and 3) Promptly (within one month) make findings publicly available. e. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle). f. Others, please describe	A. Any mortality events above the baseline and 0.1 % per day per pen gets investigated as per the MO-430 Mortality Rate Trigger Response Procedure (09/01/15, Issue #1 1p). In Eastern Zone mortality is expected to be higher in summer around splitting & bathing, higher environmental stress. Management of mortalities, including large-scale events are covered by the AQUAVETPLAN Operational Manual Disposal (Version 2.0, 2015). A review of FishTalk for 15YC confirm that the farm suffered from POMV; the two other major mortality categories were seals/predators and environmental. A comparison with the previous two YC, shows that POMV was reported in the 13YC but not 14YC. The % of morts from POMV was higher for 15YC than 13YC, however, the 13YC had a very high % of unknown mortalities (presumably many were also due to POMV). The mortality rate reported for 14YC is higher than that for 15YC. B. The 13YC certainly suffered from evaluated mortality events which were statistically significant overo background mortality rates (compare to farm's time-series dataset in 5.1.7a). Discussion with the Zone Manager, SMFH and TOs confirmed that initially they suspected any unidentified transmissible agents associated with mortality events, however, this was identified as POMV. There was no POMV reported for 14YC, however, it did reoccur in 15YC, the most recent production cycle. C. The lack of POMV in the current 16YC and none in the smolt 17YC indicate that the many actions taken by Tassal have been effective in controlling POMV and no other viral diseases have been identified (refer to the results from 5.4.2a and 5.4.2b and whether 5.4.2d is applicable to the farm. D. The expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p) and the new 35-page MO-501 Salmon Disease Guide described the strategies to address the POM and other issues. The auditor can verify that the farm keeps records to show how each of the required steps was completed. E. The Client has submitted data/information about unidentified transmissible agents or unexplained increases in mortality as applicable to the ASC.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
5.4.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [119] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [120] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Maintain a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code on site or ensure staff have access to the most current version. b. Develop policies and procedures as needed to ensure that farm practices remain consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (5.4.3a) and with actions required under indicator 5.4.4.	A. The OIE definition is provided p70 of the 2016 Sustainability Report – "Standards for the improvement of aquatic animal health and welfare of farmed fish worldwide, and for safe international trade in aquatic animals and their products." Although it is not mentioned in IMS-P1090 Zero Harm for Fish Animal Welfare Policy or the expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p) interviews with the SMFH and Eastern Zone Manager and TOs confirm that farm management is aware of practices described in the most current version of the code; the current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (2013) is on the intranet. B. The farm has documented practices consistent with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code and has documented actions that would be taken in response to an OIE-notifiable disease (as per Indicator 5.4.4). Farm policies & procedures and other documentation/plans proving compliance include: - The Australian Aquatic Veterinary Emergency Plan-AQUAVETPLAN Enterprise Manual (Version 2.0, 2015, 203p) contains a series of technical response plans that describe the proposed Australian approach to aquatic animal disease incursions. The Enterprise Manual has been designed to provide sufficient industry-specific information to enable timely and considered decisions to be made in response to an identified or unidentified aquatic animal disease emergency in any system. The Manual has three sections: - Section A provides definitions and general response structures. It also includes a summary of the likely links and lines of communication during investigation of an outbreak or planning of a response. - Section B addresses industry-specific information needed for disease control or eradication. - Section C provides possible responses in the various systems to an aquatic animal disease emergency. The Plan's Operational Manuals include Disposal, Destruction and Decontamination. - Tassal's IMS-P1090 Zero Harm for Fish Animal Welfare Policy ((Issue # 2, 28/09/2015 1p) which states that Tassal will: - Develop company-wide standards for animal welfare in accordance with RSPCA UK and AUS framework, and update this information with published scientific literature. - Provide training for all hatchery workers, works crew, managers, bathe team leaders and technical officers in fish husbandry, water quality, basic biology/physiology and nutrition. - Update these training modules yearly to increase dissemination of information into the field. - Assign responsibilities and monitor the implementation in relation to this policy and related procedures. The Zero Harm for Fish program is based on a 3-step process: 1. Internal audit on fish welfare standards 2. Gap analysis to determine where improvements can be made 3. Action plan to optimise fish welfare. - expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p); - Emergency preparedness of each farming zone is covered in the MOPS ZHF Scorecard (ver 15) spreadsheet is in use for at least annual checking, focus on employee behaviour, to date they have been conducted by a WHS Advisor with a Fish Health background. The scores are against five categories: Fish welfare target 94%, Fish health 95%, Fish quality (harvest prep) 87.5%, Management system 94% and Emergency preparedness 90%. The Total weighted average should	Compliant		

			AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	**EVALUTAION**	**DESCRIPTION OF FINDING** Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	**VALUE/METRIC** If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		-	Management system 94% and Emergency preparedness 90%. The Total weighted average should be 92%. The last at MF190 Creeses Mistake was Nov2015 with a score of 77.85%; the process is hold at present with review of the Scorecard format and process, likely to reintroduced from July17. - The FHT are waiting for new Fish Health Field Officer, expected to be filled Jun17, every MOPs site (freshwater and farm) will be audited every 6 months. Actions will be raised in the WHS Consolidated Action Plan for Actionable (WHS-F101 Issue 6 5/05/2016) spreadsheet. The process will improve with a FHT representative keeping track of operations through the CAP. Follow-ups by the Vet will include Fortnightly catch-up with Technical officer, weekly catch up with Fish Performance Managers. C. On-site inspection and interviews with SMFH and Eastern Zone Manager and TOs confirm adequate evidence that policies and procedures in 5.4.3b are implemented. For example, their performance is monitored in the internal audit and gap analysis and resulting action plans from the Fish Welfare Scorecard (spread sheet with questions and weighting score) and the development of several procedures for High and Medium Risk Husbandry activities such environmental management, handling & transport, equipment & structures, humane culling/sampling, fish health including nutrition, disease prevention & controlling, AGD, Harvest preparation, Emergency preparedness, etc. Seafood Training Tasmania has developed training modules for ZHF, such as the recent diver and TO training on fish dissection and fish health, more are planned for Aug17.			
		d. Others, please describe				
5.4.4	Indicator: If an OIE-notifiable disease [121] is confirmed on the farm, evidence that: 1. the farm has, at a minimum, immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected 2. the farm immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3. the farm and the ABM enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease 4. the farm promptly [123] made findings publicly available Requirement: Yes Applicability: All	a. Ensure that farm policies and procedures in 5.4.3a describe the four actions required under Indicator 5.4.4 in response to an OIE-notifiable disease on the farm.	N/A – The Company Vet confirmed that no OIE-notifiable diseases have been reported on the farm.	N/A		
		b. Inform the CAB if an OIE-notifiable disease has been confirmed on the farm during the current production cycle or the two previous production cycles. If yes, proceed to 5.4.4c. If no, then 5.4.4c an 5.4.4d do not apply.				
		c. If an OIE-notifiable disease was confirmed on the farm (see 5.4.4b), then retain documentary evidence to show that the farm: 1) immediately culled the pen(s) in which the disease was detected; 2) immediately notified the other farms in the ABM [122] 3) enhanced monitoring and conducted rigorous testing for the disease; and 4) promptly (within one month) made findings publicly available.				
		d. As applicable, submit data to ASC as per Appendix VI about any OIE-notifiable disease that was confirmed on the farm. If applicable, then data are to be sent to ASC on an ongoing basis (i.e. at least once per year and for each production cycle).				
		-				
		f. Others, please describe				

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
PRINCIPLE 6: DEVELOP AND OPERATE FARMS IN A SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANNER						
6.1 Freedom of association and collective bargaining [124]						
6.1.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers have access to trade unions (if they exist) and union representative(s) chosen by themselves without managerial interference **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Workers have the freedom to join any trade union, free of any form of interference from employers or competing organizations set up or backed by the employer. Farms shall prepare documentation to demonstrate to the auditor that domestic regulation fully meets these criteria. b. Union representatives (or worker representatives) are chosen by workers without managerial interference. ILO specifically prohibits “acts which are designated to promote the establishment of worker organizations or to support worker organizations under the control or employers or employers’ organizations." c. Trade union representatives (or worker representatives) have access to their members in the workplace at reasonable times on the premises. d. Be advised that workers and union representatives (if they exist) will be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	A. Workers have the freedom to join a trade union and are actively encouraged according to staff interviews. This is also reiterated in inductions, EBA and contracts. Discussions with union (Ian Wakefield AWU), who stated that there were no issues at Nubeena in an email. The employee union rep supported this, stating that an increase in membership due to recent recruitments had occurred. B. Union representatives are chosen by workers with management support. C. both employee and union reps stated that the union had access to members when required in the workplace. D. Workers, union and employee rep stated that A,B and C criteria are met.	Compliant		
6.1.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers are free to form organizations, including unions, to advocate for and protect their rights **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employment contract explicitly states the worker's right of freedom of association. b. Employer communicates that workers are free to form organizations to advocate for and protect work rights (e.g. farm policies on Freedom of Association; see 6.12.1). c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	A. The EBA which workers contracts link to explicitly states the workers right of freedom of association. B IMS-P1047 Conditions of employment policy refers to Fair Work Act 2009 and the Fairwork Information Statement which specifically states that Freedom of Association is a right. C. Workers interviewed agreed that Tassal encouraged and supported union membership. D. Union (AWU) and employee rep reiterated that union membership was encouraged at this site.	Compliant		
6.1.3	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively for their rights **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Local trade union, or where none exists a reputable civil-society organization, confirms no outstanding cases against the farm site management for violations of employees’ freedom of association and collective bargaining rights. b. Employer has explicitly communicated a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers. c. There is documentary evidence that workers are free and able to bargain collectively (e.g. collective bargaining agreements, meeting minutes, or complaint resolutions). d. Others, please describe	A. Ian Wakefield from the AWU stated that there were no outstanding cases for violations of employees freedom of association and collective bargaining rights at Nubeena. B. Tassal in the EBA explicitly communicates a commitment to ensure the collective bargaining rights of all workers. C. Documentary evidence of freedom to bargain is contained in the EBA.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 6.2 Child labour						
6.2.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of child [125] labour [126] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All except as noted in [125]	a. In most countries, the law states that minimum age for employment is 15 years. There are two possible exceptions: - in developing countries where the legal minimum age may be set to 14 years (see footnote 125); or - in countries where the legal minimum age is set higher than 15 years, in which case the legal minimum age of the country is followed. If the farm operates in a country where the legal minimum ages is not 15, then the employer shall maintain documentation attesting to this fact. b. Minimum age of permanent workers is 15 or older (except in countries as noted above). c. Employer maintains age records for employees that are sufficient to demonstrate compliance. d. Others, please describe	A. In Australia There's no set age for when you can start work. But if you're under 15 there are limits to the type of work you can do and how many hours you can work (ref Fairwork Australia). B.The minimum age of workers at the Eastern Zone is 16 years (ASbA). C. This is recorded in the employee list.	Compliant		
6.2.2	**Indicator:** Percentage of young workers [127] that are protected [128] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Young workers are appropriately identified in company policies & training programs, and job descriptions are available for all young workers at the site. b. All young workers (from age 15 to less than 18) are identified and their ages are confirmed with copies of IDs. c. Daily records of working hours (i.e. timesheets) are available for all young workers. d. For young workers, the combined daily transportation time and school time and work time does not exceed 10 hours. e. Young workers are not exposed to hazards [129] and do not perform hazardous work [130]. Work on floating cages in poor weather conditions shall be considered hazardous. f. Be advised that the site will be inspected and young workers will be interviewed to confirm compliance. g. Others, please describe	A. Recruitment and promotion policy IMSP - 1045 identifies young workers as 15-18 year olds. Job descriptions for both ABsA workers employed at the EZ were cited in their files. B. Both young workers were identified as 16 years of age in employee list and copies of ID's confirmed this. C. Daily timesheets were cited for both ABsA employees. D. Timesheets for ABsA employees showed that they did exceed 10 hours/day on some occasions but not 15 hrs/week over 2 days as stated in the ABsA policy provided. The wording in ABsA contracts in relation to this was ambiguous stating that "2 days per fortnight to a maximum of 30 hrs during School time, additional hours can be worked in term breaks in line with the industrial document below". E. IMSP - 1045 clearly states that young workers are not to be exposed to hazards or to perform hazardous work. F. Inspection of site confirmed that young workers are identified and protected and interviews with staff reiterated this.	**Minor**	D. The wording in the two young employees (ABsA) contracts is ambiguous stating that "2 days per fortnight to a maximum of 30 hrs during School time" can be worked. This could be read as up to two 15 hr days per fortnight is permissible during school term which exceeds ASC and ABsA parameters.	
Criterion 6.3 Forced, bonded or compulsory labour						
6.3.1	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of forced, [131] bonded [132] or compulsory labour **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Contracts are clearly stated and understood by employees. Contracts do not lead to workers being indebted (i.e. no 'pay to work' schemes through labour contractors or training credit programs). b. Employees are free to leave workplace and manage their own time. c. Employer does not withhold employee's original identity documents. d. Employer does not withhold any part of workers' salaries, benefits, property or documents in order to oblige them to continue working for employer. e. Employees are not to be obligated to stay in job to repay debt. f. Maintain payroll records and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. g. Others, please describe	A. Contracts are clearly stated, link to the EBA and are understood by employees. There was no evidence of workers being indebted in the 14 worker contracts viewed. B. Workers are free to leave the workplace and manage their own time outside work hours. C. No original ID papers were evident in the 14 files viewed. D. No salaries, benefits, property or documents are withheld. E. And employees are not obligated to stay in job to repay debt. F. Payroll records of 14 employees were cited and 10 employees were interviewed to confirm above.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 6.4 Discrimination [133]						
6.4.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of comprehensive [134] and proactive anti-discrimination policies, procedures and practices **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has written anti-discrimination policy in place, stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. b. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures that outline how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints. c. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises. d. All managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination. All personnel receive non-discrimination training. Internal or external training acceptable if proven effective. e. Others, please describe	A. Employer has written anti-discrimination policy (IMS-P1004) in place, stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. B. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures (HR-100 and IMS-P1057) that outlines how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints. C. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises referring to this in policies IMS-P1040 and IMS-P1045. D. It is Tassals policy that all managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination and that personnel receive non discrimination training through workshops or induction processes. At the time of the audit not all staff at EZ had completed the training. E Training for all staff at Nubeena was held on Monday the 19th of June, 2017.	**Minor**	D. Not all staff at Nubeena have been trained in antidiscrimination, harassment and bullying. The requirement is 100%	
6.4.2	**Indicator:** Number of incidences of discrimination **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a record of all discrimination complaints. These records do not show evidence for discrimination. b. Be advised that worker testimonies will be used to confirm that the company does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. c. Others, please describe	A. HR maintains a record of all discrimination complaints however there have been no discrimination complaints made in the last 12 months. B. Interviews with staff confirmed that Tassal does not interfere with the rights of personnel to observe tenets or practices, or to meet needs related to race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. C. The union and union rep when questioned confirmed above.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.5 Work environment health and safety						
6.5.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers trained in health and safety practices, procedures [135] and policies on a yearly basis **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has documented practices, procedures (including emergency response procedures) and policies to protect employees from workplace hazards and to minimize risk of accident or injury. The information shall be available to employees b. Employees know and understand emergency response procedures. c. Employer conducts health and safety training for all employees on a regular basis (once a year and immediately for all new employees), including training on potential hazards and risk minimization, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and effective use of PPE. d. Others, please describe	A. The following policies and procedures are available to all workers in accessible folders, on the intranet and documented induction process: - WHS-101 WHS Management System Procedure - WHS-100 WHS Hazard Identification Risk Assessment and Control Procedure - WHS-103 Safety Notice Boards Preparation control procedure - WHS-124 Safety Induction Procedure - IMS-P1001 Work Health & Safety Policy - IMS-P1066 Workplace Health Safety Escalation of Risk Policy - IMS-P1011 Work Health & Safety Hazard Management Policy - IMS-P1083 Safety Partnership Agreement Policy - IMS-P1037 Golden Safety Rules Policy - WHS-108 Work Health & Safety Hazard Reporting Procedure - IMS-P1010 Health & Safety - Emergency Procedures B. During interviews it was ascertained that the Emergency response procedure is known by employees with drills carried out and documented. The assembly point was recently changed and was known by a range of those interviewed. C. Health and safety training occurs throughout the year and at daily toolbox meetings.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
6.5.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that workers use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) effectively **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a list of all health and safety hazards (e.g. chemicals). b. Employer provides workers with PPE that is appropriate to known health and safety hazards. c. Employees receive annual training in the proper use of PPE (see 6.5.1c). For workers who participated in the initial training(s) previously an annual refreshment training may suffice, unless new PPE has been put to use. d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	A. The following documents were cited at Eastern Zone farm base: WHS Risk and High Risk Task Register, Dangerous Goods and Hazardous Substances Register and WHS Consolidated Action Plan. B. WHS-128 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) Safety Procedure was cited. All PPE that was required was either available to, or being worn by, employees when the farm was visited. C. PPE is revisited if there are any observed incidents. This is also mentioned regularly through the daily toolbox meetings. Documentation of attendance at daily meetings was provided. D. Workers interviewed were very satisfied with the safety systems and culture they worked in.	Compliant		
6.5.3	**Indicator:** Presence of a health and safety risk assessment and evidence of preventive actions taken **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer makes regular assessments of hazards and risks in the workplace. Risk assessments are reviewed and updated at least annually (see also 6.5.1a). b. Employees are trained in how to identify and prevent known hazards and risks (see also 6.5.1c). c. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments (above) and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents. d. Others, please describe	A. The following policies and procedures are used to guide assessment of risk and hazards in the workplace: WHS-F133 Job Safety Analysis Worksheet, WHS-100 WHS Hazard Identification Risk Assessment and Control Procedure, WHS-124 Safety Induction Procedure, IMS-P1011 Work Health & Safety Hazard Management Policy, WHS-108 Work Health & Safety Hazard Reporting Procedure, WHS Risk and High Risk Task Register B. Daily toolbox meetings provide updates on identifying and preventing risk by reviewing incidents and accidents that occur at all sites and considering the impact and risk within workers specific zone. Several incidents were tracked to determine follow through and changes that arise out of these daily exercises. C. Health and safety procedures are adapted based on results from risk assessments and changes are implemented to help prevent accidents WHS Consolidated Action Plan was cited with key incidents and accidents tracked to action and closed.	Compliant		
6.5.4	**Indicator:** Evidence that all health- and safety-related accidents and violations are recorded and corrective actions are taken when necessary **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer records all health- and safety-related accidents. b. Employer maintains complete documentation for all occupational health and safety violations and investigations. c. Employer implements corrective action plans in response to any accidents that occur. Plans are documented and they include an analysis of root cause, actions to address root cause, actions to remediate, and actions to prevent future accidents of similar nature. d. Employees working in departments where accidents have occurred can explain what analysis has been done and what steps were taken or improvements made. e. Others, please describe	A. Several health and safety related accident records were cited (slip injury and boating incident resulting in Performance Management). The Compliance Officer at Nubeena was absent on maternity leave when a JCB rolled and connected with powerlines on the 22/1/2017. This was overlooked at the audit. The employee chose to use the JCB on 22/1/2017 without an updated license, when the incident recorded in the incident report (1066) occurred. Incident 1066 was incorrectly logged as occurring on 19/01/2017. Recommendations from the investigation were returned on the 27/1/2017 and that the incident should have been logged 29/1/2017. The driver when told of the seriousness of his decision to drive the JCB without a current license, resigned. B. The following documents are evidence that complete documentation for all occupational and safety violations and investigations is maintained. These accompanied the JCB Incident Investigation Report: License to Perform High Risk Work, Statement of Attainment detailing competencies achieved, Tassal Acknowledgement of understanding and Q&A signed by driver, Forklift induction record, JSA worksheet for task 21/1/2017, Daily start up procedure for JCB dated 21/7/2017, JCB 6 monthly checklist signed, JCB Annual Inspection Certificate dated 9/11/2016 and on 17/01/2017 a service invoice for JCB to look at steering. A Task Breakdown for mobile Crane and Forklift, including risk assessment, a witness report (handwritten) by a co-worker, dated incorrectly as occurring 20/1/2017 and a filled out Safety Management Report (1470) was also provided. C. Corrective action plans were implemented for both incidents (referred to initially in A.) and plans are documented including analysis of root cause, action to address root cause, actions to remediate, and actions to prevent future accidents of similar nature. D. Employees working where incidents occurred explained what analysis had been done and what steps were taken or improvements made. This was reiterated in reports and minutes of toolbox meetings.	Compliant	**OBSERVATION:** for A and B that the JCB incident was not brought forward at audit because the Compliance Officer was on maternity leave at the time the incident occurred. One of the records of the incident was dated 19/01/2017 instead of 22/01/2017 when the incident occurred.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
6.5.5	**Indicator:** Evidence of employer responsibility and/or proof of insurance (accident or injury) for 100% of worker costs in a job-related accident or injury when not covered under national law **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains documentation to confirm that all personnel are provided sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accidents or injuries (if not covered under national law). Equal insurance coverage must include temporary, migrant or foreign workers. Written contract of employer responsibility to cover accident costs is acceptable evidence in place of insurance. b. Others, please describe	A. ALLIANZ Certificate of Currency to 31/3/2018 was provided as proof of sufficient insurance to cover costs related to occupational accident or injury.	Compliant		
6.5.6	**Indicator:** Evidence that all diving operations are conducted by divers who are certified **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer keeps records of farm diving operations and a list of all personnel involved. In case an external service provider was hired, a statement that provider conformed to all relevant criteria must be made available to the auditor by this provider. b. Employer maintains evidence of diver certification (e.g. copies of certificates) for each person involved in diving operations. Divers shall be certified through an accredited national or international organization for diver certification. c. Others, please describe	A. Tassal directly employs all of their divers at EZ and records of all divers and diver operations were cited (personnel files, dive license register, training matrix and files). B. All diver files were accessed and included copies of divers certification which meets the national accreditation guidelines.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.6 Wages						
6.6.1	**Indicator:** The percentage of workers whose basic wage [136] (before overtime and bonuses) is below the minimum wage [137] **Requirement:** 0 (None) **Applicability:** All	a. Employer keeps documents to show the legal minimum wage in the country of operation. If there is no legal minimum wage in the country, the employer keeps documents to show the industry-standard minimum wage. b. Employer's records (e.g. payroll) confirm that worker's wages for a standard work week (≤ 48 hours) always meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. If there is no legal minimum wage, the employer's records must show how the current wage meets or exceeds industry standard. If wages are based on piece-rate or pay-per-production, the employer's records must show how workers can reasonably attain (within regular working hours) wages that meet or exceed the legal minimum wage. c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. payroll, timesheets, punch cards, production records, and/or utility records) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	A.The Fairwork Minimum wage fact sheet was made available to show the legal minimum wage in Australia. B. All pay documentation (BOOT Comparison, Employment contract and EBA 2015) cited clearly shows that Tassal employees are being paid above industry standard and the minimum wage of $17.29/hr for up to 85.7hrs per fortnight after which they are paid overtime. C. Timesheets, leave, travel etc of 10 employees were cited with HR at Margate Office. D. Workers reiterated that time worked and pay were as cited in the EBA and Employment contract.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
6.6.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that the employer is working toward the payment of basic needs wage [138] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Proof of employer engagement with workers and their representative organizations, and the use of cost of living assessments from credible sources to assess basic needs wages. Includes review of any national basic needs wage recommendations from credible sources such as national universities or government. b. Employer has calculated the basic needs wage for farm workers and has compared it to the basic (i.e. current) wage for their farm workers. c. Employer demonstrates how they have taken steps toward paying a basic needs wage to their workers. d. Others, please describe	A. Tassal farm workers are covered by a 2015 EBA. The Union stated that pay was generous for the industry. A BOOT comparison shows that Tassal workers are paid more than the award. B. BOOT comparison has been calculated and compares the EBA to Award rates and conditions with clear benefits shown in wages and conditions for employees of Tassal. An executive summary of wage increases was provided and places Tassal at 3.5% where the industry averages out at 2.73%. C. As above. D. Staff interviewed were happy with their salary level and transparency of contracts.	Compliant		
6.6.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of transparency in wage-setting and rendering [139] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Wages and benefits are clearly articulated to workers and documented in contracts. b. The method for setting wages is clearly stated and understood by workers. c. Employer renders wages and benefits in a way that is convenient for the worker (e.g. cash, check, or electronic payment methods). Workers do not have to travel to collect benefits nor do they receive promissory notes, coupons or merchandise in lieu of payment. d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	A. Wages and benefits are articulated clearly in the 2015 EBA and employment contracts. Workers interviewed (new and old) stated that wages, overtime and levels of work were clear and transparent and understood by workers. B. Pay arrangements are outlined on p. 45 of the EBA and a classification structure is in the EBA at p.47. C. The EBA and worker contracts clearly state that employees will be paid fortnightly as a direct credit into their nominated bank account. Payroll records endorsed this. D. This is reiterated in the employment contract. 14 Payroll files and 10 workers interviewed confirmed this.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.7 Contracts (labour) including subcontracting						
6.7.1	**Indicator:** Percentage of workers who have contracts [141] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a record of all employment contracts. b. There is no evidence for labour-only contracting relationships or false apprenticeship schemes. c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	A. All 14 Employment contracts/files randomly requested were produced. B. No evidence of labour only contracting was apparent. C. 10 workers interviewed reiterated that their actual work reflected the EBA and their contract.	Compliant		
6.7.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of a policy to ensure social compliance of its suppliers and contractors **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm has a policy to ensure that all companies contracted to provide supplies or services (e.g. divers, cleaning, maintenance) have socially responsible practices and policies. b. Producing company has criteria for evaluating its suppliers and contractors. The company keeps a list of approved suppliers and contractors. c. Producing company keeps records of communications with suppliers and subcontractors that relate to compliance with 6.7.2. d. Others, please describe	A. The following documents make up the process for selecting a preferred provider/supplier and the evaluation process they have gone through to ascertain they have appropriate socially responsible practices. IMS-103 Internal and supplier audits, QA-F102 Approved Supplier Questionnaire, QA-F103 Supplier Desktop Review, Handbook, Information Pack for existing contractors and new contractors. B. A list of current Preferred providers is available onsite in the lunch room. Links to supplier questionnaires were also cited showing a comprehensive process of evaluation and communication with suppliers. C. Communications with suppliers relating to compliance with 6.7.2 were cited as above. D. When asked about who supplied goods and services to the farm, the maintenance person stipulated that only preferred providers could do so and several were named.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 6.8 Conflict resolution						
6.8.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of worker access to effective, fair and confidential grievance procedures **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has a clear labour conflict resolution policy for the presentation, treatment, and resolution of worker grievances in a confidential manner. b. Workers are familiar with the company's labour conflict policies and procedures. There is evidence that workers have fair access. c. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. complaint or grievance filings, minutes from review meetings) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm the above. d. Others, please describe	A. IMS-P1057 Grievance prevention and handling policy and HR102 Grievance prevention and handling guidelines are in place for the presentation, treatment and resolution of worker grievances. B. Most workers have received training in grievance presentation on 19th June, 2017 or during their induction, workers interviewed stated that they were happy with the process and that grievances would be dealt with fairly. C. Examples of grievances at sites other than EZ have been documented and verify that there is a written process, however EZ has not had any grievances filed in the last 12 months. D. One potential issue was described that could have become a grievance but was prevented using the process described in policies above. The person involved stated that grievances were handled fairly.	Compliant		
6.8.2	**Indicator:** Percentage of grievances handled that are addressed [142] within a 90-day timeframe **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All	a. Employer maintains a record of all grievances, complaints and labour conflicts that are raised. b. Employer keeps a record of follow-up (i.e. corrective actions) and timeframe in which grievances are addressed. c. Maintain documentary evidence and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that grievances are addressed within a 90-day timeframe. d. Others, please describe	A. There have been no grievances, complaints or labour conflicts to record in the last 12 months (see 6.8.1 evidence in terms of capacity to do so if required). B. see 6.8.1 evidence. C. An example of a grievance that was resolved within 90 day timeframe, in line with the Grievance handling policy, at another site was provided. D. employees interviewed stated that they had no grievances but that there was fair process and they had faith in the system should one arise.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.9 Disciplinary practices						
6.9.1	**Indicator:** Incidences of excessive or abusive disciplinary actions **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer does not use threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a worker's physical and mental health or dignity. b. Allegations of corporeal punishment, mental abuse [144], physical coercion, or verbal abuse will be investigated by auditors. c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no evidence for excessive or abusive disciplinary actions. d. Others, please describe	A. There was no evidence in talking to management or staff of threatening, humiliating or punishing disciplinary practices that negatively impact a workers physical or mental health or dignity. B. There were no allegations of corporeal punishment, physical abuse, physical coercion or verbal abuse. C. When asked about disciplinary processes, staff were confident and comfortable with the process and its fairness. D. Union rep and officials interviewed were not aware of any abuse.	Compliant		
6.9.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of a functioning disciplinary action policy whose aim is to improve the worker [143] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has written policy for disciplinary action which explicitly states that its aim is to improve the worker [143]. b. Maintain documentary evidence (e.g. worker evaluation reports) and be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that the disciplinary action policy is fair and effective. c. Others, please describe	A. HR-106 clearly outlines the Disciplinary procedure and reiterates it is an improvement based process. B. One incident requiring changes to work role was cited, with Performance management process followed. C. This worker and others reiterated that the disciplinary process was fair and effective.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 6.10 Working hours and overtime						
6.10.1	**Indicator:** Incidences, violations or abuse of working hours and overtime laws [145] **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Employer has documentation showing the legal requirements for working hours and overtime in the region where the farm operates. If local legislation allows workers to exceed internationally accepted recommendations (48 regular hours, 12 hours overtime) then requirements of the international standards apply. b. Records (e.g. time sheets and payroll) show that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed under the law. c. If an employer requires employees to work shifts at the farm (e.g. 10 days on and six days off), the employer compensates workers with an equivalent time off in the calendar month and there is evidence that employees have agreed to this schedule (e.g. in the hiring contract). d. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm there is no abuse of working hours and overtime laws. e. Others, please describe	A. The EBA 2015 has been signed off by workers, employer, union and commissioner of Fair Work and outlines working hours and overtime that sit within the international standard. B. All 10 payroll cited with HR and timesheets at farm showed that farm workers do not exceed the number of working hours allowed in the EBA 2015. C. Tassal requires employees to work shifts at the farm and workers are compensated adequately with appropriate time off as laid out in the EBA 2015 and in employment contracts. D. Workers interviewed confirmed that overtime was required, that they wanted it and it was also flexible to some degree if circumstances required them to be elsewhere. E. Union rep and official were not aware of any breaches of hours.	Compliant		
6.10.2	**Indicator:** Overtime is limited, voluntary [146], paid at a premium rate and restricted to exceptional circumstances **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All except as noted in [146]	a. Payment records (e.g. payslips) show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours. b. Overtime is limited and occurs in exceptional circumstances as evidenced by farm records (e.g. production records, time sheets, and other records of working hours). c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that all overtime is voluntary except where there is a collective bargaining agreement which specifically allows for compulsory overtime. d. Others, please describe	A. Payment records show that workers are paid a premium rate for overtime hours. Overtime kicks in at 85.7 hrs/FN and is paid at 150% of ordinary pay rate. B. Overtime is stipulated in the worker contract and EBA 2015. It is limited to circumstances where it is required and did not exceed 12 hours/ FN in the records examined. C. Workers confirmed that overtime was expected but flexible if necessary due to life events. Workers want overtime.	Compliant		
Criterion 6.11 Education and training						
6.11.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that the company encourages and sometimes supports education initiatives for all workers (e.g., courses, certificates and degrees) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Company has written policies related to continuing education of workers. Company provides incentives (e.g. subsidies for tuition or textbooks, time off prior to exams, flexibility in work schedule) that encourage workers to participate in educational initiatives. Note that such offers may be contingent on workers committing to stay with the company for a pre-arranged time. b. Employer maintains records of worker participation in educational opportunities as evidenced by course documentation (e.g. list of courses, curricula, certificates, degrees). c. Be advised that workers will be interviewed to confirm that educational initiatives are encouraged and supported by the company. d. Others, please describe	A. IMS-P1058 Training Policy and EBA clearly states that workers are expected to continue to learn and be involved in training. It is also clearly stated that support and resources will be provided to facilitate further training. B. Worker participation in educational opportunities is recorded and kept on file, including certificates, inductions, checklists. These were cited in 14 randomly selected personnel files C. The 10 workers interviewed were glowing in their reference to the abundance of training they receive and have been offered as part of their role. D. Many staff had worked their way up into Team Leader and management roles over the years and still remain working in the zone.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 6.12 Corporate policies for social responsibility						
6.12.1	**Indicator:** Demonstration of company-level [148] policies in line with the standards under 6.1 to 6.11 above **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Company-level policies are in line with all social and labour requirements presented in 6.1 through 6.11. b. Company-level policies (see 6.12.1a) are approved by the company headquarters in the region where the site applying for certification is located. c. The scope of corporate policies (see 6.12.1a) covers all company operations relating to salmonid production in the region (i.e. all smolt production facilities, grow-out facilities and processing plants). d. The site that is applying for certification provides auditors with access to all company-level policies and procedures as are needed to verify compliance with 6.12.1a (above). e. Others, please describe	A. All social and labour policies cited for 6.1 to 6.11 for were company level policies (IMS, QA, WHS). B. Company level policies are approved by Tassal Head Office. IMS-P1103 policy relevant to all production areas was going through the endorsement process, after being updated, during the audit. C. The scope of corporate policies covers all Tassal operations relating to salmonid production in the region including smolt production facilities (Tassal and Saltas) and grow-out facilities and processing plants. D. Access to all company level policies was provided to auditors determining status of compliance against ASC Salmon Standard V.1.1	Compliant		
PRINCIPLE 7: BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND CONSCIENTIOUS CITIZEN						
Criterion 7.1 Community engagement						
7.1.1	**Indicator:** Evidence of regular and meaningful [149] consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. The farm pro-actively arranges for consultations with the local community at least twice every year (bi-annually). b. Consultations are meaningful. OPTIONAL: the farm may choose to use participatory Social Impact Assessment (pSIA) or an equivalent method for consultations. c. Consultations include participation by representatives from the local community who were asked to contribute to the agenda. d. Consultations include communication about, or discussion of, the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments (see Indicator 7.1.3). e. Maintain records and documentary evidence (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, report) to demonstrate that consultations comply with the above. f. Be advised that representatives from the local community and organizations may be interviewed to confirm the above. g. Others, please describe	**A**. Two formal consultations have occurred in the last year, primarily to address changes that are occurring due to restocking Port Arthur lease and WOW proposal. This is evidenced by emails, agendas, minutes, presentations and recorded responses, specifically relating to meetings held on the 17th of February with Tasman Council and Tourism operators in the area and an open community meeting at Tasman Council on the 15th June. **B.** Issues recorded in minutes of both meetings and grievances responded to by Tassal 1:1 and, raised during ASC community consultations on 20th June in Nubeena align. Newsletters addressing issues have been circulated and include information about Tasman/Wedge Island proposal, Port Arthur restocking of existing lease and plans for Okehampton.Twenty two consultations of varying types have occurred over the last 12 months including; a presentation to sailing groups on 7th November at RYCT and 1:1 meetings with residents of Andersons rd, Nubeena, impacted by the increased movement of traffic due to Tassal expansion activities. Tassal recognises the need for formalised community consultations and is working toward initiating community advisory committee's for each of its zones. **C**. Consultations at February 17th included council and Tourism operators who contributed to the agenda, but not general community representatives. Meetings largely centred around WOW proposal and restocking Pt Arthur lease and subsequent increased road usage. The "community" forum on the 15th June was attended by 6 community members, and unfortunately missed "Gazette" promotion. Tassal has a documented plan in 2017 to initiate a community advisory group (CAG) to meet biannually and enhance community consultations. **D**. Communication about the potential health risks of therapeutic treatments are recorded on Tassal website and in their sustainability reports. There have been no therapeutants used in the last 12 months at the Eastern Zone farm. **E**. Records and documentary evidence of meetings noted above have been kept along with meeting with RYCT 7th November, 2016. Minutes of other consultations (open days etc) were not evident. **F.** Twenty two local residents attended the ASC community consultations on 20th June at Nubeena (see attached notes). There was consensus that a sustainable salmon industry is desirable in the area with concerns that growth of the industry could impact existing robust ecosystems. The community requested assurances that this would not occur. Community stated that Tassal was accessible and requested more consultation.	**Minor**	C. Tassal intends to set up a community reference group for ongoing, formalised community consultations. This has not been initiated yet but a draft plan with timelines is documented. E. While there have been numerous presentations made by Tassal, documented evidence of agenda, minutes, feedback and outcomes are not maintained for all.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
7.1.2	**Indicator:** Presence and evidence of an effective [150] policy and mechanism for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm policy provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members, and organizations. b. The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints as evidenced by farm documentation (e.g. follow-up communications with stakeholders, reports to stakeholder describing corrective actions). c. The farm's mechanism for handling complaints is effective based on resolution of stakeholder complaints (e.g. follow-up correspondence from stakeholders). d. Be advised that representatives from the local community, including complainants where applicable, may be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	**A**. IMS-P1103 Community Complaint Policy and ES-120 Community and Stakeholder Complaints Procedure provides a mechanism for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints lodged by stakeholders, community members and organisations. Responses times have been amended to 48 hours. **B.** The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints received by email and phone (as evidenced in email responses/threads and reports to stakeholders describing corrective actions). However, at the time of the audit the new sharepoint log did not include noise complaints emailed to Creeses Mistake farm and Zone managers had not yet been trained in the system. Sharepoint is a centralised system designed to capture complaints and record responses to resolution. This will improve capture of complaints via website, DPIWE and EPA (who stated during interview that Tassal responded well to complaints raised via their portal), zone managers and staff (policy states they must all feed this information into the system. Mechanisms for capturing complaints by website will be improved and Tassal is in the process of developing a dedicated website for easy, accessible community engagement so that it is consistently effective. **C**. Complaints captured (emails regarding noise, road usage, light, marine debris) were responded to and appeared to be resolved. Relevant complainants did not attend the ASC community consultations. **D.** One person who did stated that they made a complaint about marine debris 18 months ago and it was responded to, however she was keen to see marine debris stopped at source.	**Minor**	B. A new community engagement website is currently being planned which will enable the farm to follow its policy for handling stakeholder complaints (the current website does not include a clear process for lodging complaints). Upgrade includes dedicated access point for phone, email complaints and FAQ's. Estimated launch of new website is late August 2017. Managers have not had sharepoint training to ensure all complaints are logged and recorded to resolution.	
7.1.3	**Indicator:** Evidence that the farm has posted visible notice [151] at the farm during times of therapeutic treatments and has, as part of consultation with communities under 7.1.1, communicated about potential health risks from treatments **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. Farm has a system for posting notifications at the farm during periods of therapeutic treatment. (use of aneastatic baths is not regarded a therapeutant) b. Notices (above) are posted where they will be visible to affected stakeholders (e.g. posted on waterways for fishermen who pass by the farm). c. Farm communicates about the potential health risks from treatments during community consultations (see 7.1.1) d. Be advised that members of the local community may be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	A. the farm has a procedure for posting notifications captured in ES-114 Antibiotic use notification procedure. B. this includes notices being posted where they will be visible to affected stakeholders on affected pens. C. The ASC dashboard on the website is also updated by the community engagement officer which includes potential health risks. D. One participant at the community consultations raised concerns about the health impacts of antibiotics. There have been no antibiotic treatments in the Eastern Zone in the last 12 months.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 7.2 Respect for indigenous and aboriginal cultures and traditional territories						
7.2.1	**Indicator:** Evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	a. Documentary evidence establishes that the farm does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]). If not then the requirements of 7.2.1 do not apply. b. Farm management demonstrates an understanding of relevant local and/or national laws and regulations that pertain to consultations with indigenous groups. c. As required by law in the jurisdiction: - farm consults with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR - farm confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence. d. Be advised that representatives from indigenous groups may be interviewed to confirm the above. e. Others, please describe	A. A 22 page Indigenous Consultation paper prepared by Tassal's Communications & Government Advisor establishes that the farm operates in proximity to indigenous community. B. This document tracks historical and current legislation and is reflected in Tassal policies in regard consultations with indigenous groups. This is primarily in relation to Heritage sites and regulations, which Tassal adhere to. C. As required by law in Tasmania, Tassal consults with indigenous groups about Heritage sites. This is evident in the EIS to accompany request to amend zone 14A as prescribed by the Tasman Peninsula and Norfolk Bay Marine Farming Development Plan (MFDP) November, 2005, p.40. Several facets of the indigenous community are working with Tassal on developing meaningful projects and to secure partnerships which recognise the importance of indigenous communities. Training to increase literacy and awareness of heritage laws is scheduled for all zones. D. Minutes of meetings with representatives of the indigenous community and commitments to projects that are underway have been provided and are ongoing. Input from indigenous community has also been documented regards their representation within planned community reference groups at Tassal farm and Hatchery zones.	Compliant		
7.2.2	**Indicator:** Evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes [152]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.2 apply to the farm. b. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has undertaken proactive consultations. c. Others, please describe	A. Tassal recognises unequivocally that it operates in aboriginal territories in Tasmania. B. The farm has undertaken proactive consultations with indigenous communities since 2014. C. Representatives from indigenous communities (AHT/Pakana Services) are actively working with Tassal to develop projects that mutually add value.	Compliant		
7.2.3	**Indicator:** Evidence of a protocol agreement, or an active process [153] to establish a protocol agreement, with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All farms that operate in indigenous territories or in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people [152]	a. See results of 7.2.1a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 7.2.3 apply to the farm. b. Maintain evidence to show that the farm has either: 1) reached a protocol agreement with the indigenous community and this fact is documented; or 2) continued engagement in an active process [153] to reach a protocol agreement with the indigenous community. c. Be advised that representatives from indigenous communities may be interviewed to confirm either 7.2.3b1 or b2 (above) as applicable. d. Others, please describe	A. Tassal recognises unequivocally that it operates in aboriginal territories in Tasmania. B. The farm has undertaken proactive consultations with indigenous communities since 2014. C. Representatives from indigenous communities (AHT/Pakana Services) are actively working with Tassal and implementing projects that mutually add value in terms of collaboration, communication flow, awareness raising, skill development and employment opportunities.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Criterion 7.3 Access to resources						
7.3.1	**Indicator:** Changes undertaken restricting access to vital community resources [154] without community approval **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All	a. Resources that are vital [155] to the community have been documented and are known by the farm (i.e. through the assessment process required under Indicator 7.3.2). b. The farm seeks and obtains community approval before undertaking changes that restrict access to vital community resources. Approvals are documented. c. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to confirm that the farm has not restricted access to vital resources without prior community approval. d. Others, please describe	A. Resources that are vital to the community have been documented and are known by the farm through 1:1 meetings with residents of Andersons rd and the EIS to accompany request to amend zone 14A as prescribed by the Tasman Peninsula and Norfolk Bay Marine Farming Development Plan (MFDP) November, 2005. See also reference to February 17th, 2017 meeting with Tourism operators and council representatives in 7.3.1 A. B. See below. C. One participant at the ASC community consultations stated that there had been changes made at Badgers with no community consultation regard access to resources.	Compliant		
7.3.2	**Indicator:** Evidence of assessments of company's impact on access to resources **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All	a. There is a documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources. Can be completed as part of community consultations under 7.1.1. b. Be advised that representatives from the community may be interviewed to generally corroborate the accuracy of conclusions presented in 7.3.2a. c. Others, please describe	A. There is documented assessment of the farm's impact upon access to resources in the February 17th, 2017 meeting with Tourist operators and Council representatives which identified; navigation considerations for vessels (larger tourist ships) and the need to liaise with MAST, Andersons Road issues and need to convene meeting, further engagement with Pennicott's/tourism operators on water, freshwater access for bathing fish regarding amoebic gill disease, algal blooms and salmon farming queries and adjacent mussel/oyster lease, short-term vs. long term operation prospects for jobs, marine lease area and queries over any plans to amend this going forward, tourist walking traffic. B. see above	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
INDICATORS AND STANDARDS FOR SMOLT PRODUCTION						
SECTION 8: STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIERS OF SMOLT						
Standards related to Principle 1						
8.1	**Indicator**: Compliance with local and national regulations on water use and discharge, specifically providing permits related to water quality **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Identify all of the farm's smolt suppliers. For each supplier, identify the type of smolt production system used (e.g. open, semi or closed systems) and submit this information to ASC (Appendix VI). b. Where legal authorisation related to water quality are required, obtain copies of smolt suppliers' permits. c. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring and compliance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements as required. - e. Others, please describe	**A**. Tassal sources stock from its own two hatcheries (Russell Falls – semi-closed system & Rookwood Road - closed recirc system) and from Saltas (Wayatinah – semi-closed system & Florentine – semi-closed system). For the Eastern Zone stocking of 15YC, the contribution was Rookwood (66%), Russell Falls (6%) and Saltas (29%); for both 16YC and 17YC the contributions from the hatcheries varied significantly. Breakdown for those three-year classes is Rookwood (24%), Russell Falls (24%) and Saltas (52%). 15YC stocking took place between 13/07/2015 - 27/08/2015. 11/05/2015 - 4/11/15. Client submitted to ASC information on the type of production system used by smolt suppliers (Appendix VI). **B**. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: • Russell Falls - Derwent Valley Council Planning Permit (17/03/2015), Fish Farm Licence #5 (Inland Fisheries Service) – Russell Falls , Fish Farm Licence #29 (Inland Fisheries Service) – Karanja Fish Farm and Derwent Valley Council EPN (03/07/2002). • Rookwood Road - Fish Farm Licence #9 (Inland Fisheries Service) – Rookwood Road, Construction Environmental Management Plan (x2), Huon Valley Council EPN No. 2008/1 (Huon Valley Council) & Special Plumbing Permit (SPP) Rookwood Road. • Saltas Hatcheries - Fish Farm Licence (Inland Fisheries Service) 26 – Saltas Wayatinah Hatchery & Fish Farm Licence (Inland Fisheries Service) 40 – Saltas Florentine Hatchery. For Rookwood Road, there is no requirement to submit to EPA, however, Tassal sends monthly report to Huon Valley Council with results from the re-use as per conditions in the EPN (Rookwood Road Re-Use Water Quality). They have had 100% compliance since the introduction of this EPN, reviewed report from February 2017. For Russell Falls and Karanja, Tassal submits results to EPA when requested, but this is not regularly. As part of the current DA for RF there is a requirement to submit an annual environmental report which contains all the water quality results; Tassal submitted the first of these in October 2016 (reviewed). For Saltas Florentine and Wayatinah, Tassal submits results to EPA when requested. Results are discussed below in 8.32-8.34. **C.** Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance with discharge laws, regulations, and permit requirements include: • Rookwood Road (HRH) Re-use Water Quality spreadsheet with monthly data • Russell Falls - Russell Falls and Karanja Water Quality spreadsheet with monthly data and Tyenna Aquatic Biomonitoring DA license compliance assessment reports – Autumn 2016, Spring 2016, Autumn 2017 by Freshwater Systems. • Saltas Hatcheries - Saltas Florentine and Wayatinah Water Quality spreadsheets with quarterly data. **D**. For the permitting requirements for Water Quality, Tassal provides quarterly monitoring results to EPA for its own and Saltas hatcheries (Florentine and Wayatinah) using comprehensive spreadsheets (refer above). These comply with applicable permitting requirements. A condition of the Planning Permit issued to the Russell Falls is that an Environmental Report be submitted to the EPA describing nutrient loads emitted and ecological impacts upon the Tyenna River (auditor sighted Tyenna Aquatic Biomonitoring DA license compliance assessment reports – Autumn 2016, Spring 2016, Autumn 2017 by Freshwater Systems). The hatchery has made a series of commitments to the EPA for the improvement of water quality targets. These include: i) Installation of a drum screen with a 90µm mesh for all farm effluent prior to discharge to the settlement pond. ii) Installation of a belt filter for dewatering the wastewater stream from the drum screen iii) Installation of flow monitoring equipment on the outfall. iv) Installation of a turbidity probe downstream of the drum screen. For Rookwood, Tassal is required to submit independent laboratory reports (conducted by Analytical Services Tasmania) for reuse samples in accordance with EPN issued by the Huon Valley Council. The laboratory records reviewed comply with the EPN.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.2	**Indicator**: Compliance with labour laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain declarations from smolt suppliers affirming compliance with labour laws and regulations. b. Keep records of supplier inspections for compliance with national labour laws and codes (only if such inspections are legally required in the country of operation; see 1.1.3a)	A. Tassal freshwater operations comply with labour laws and regulations as per marine operations component (ASC certified) of the business. Tassal is a vertically integrated company from egg to plate. Evidence reviewed for Saltas include Saltas Industrial Agreement 2014 (expiry 30/06/2017) & Saltas declaration from Hatchery Manager (30/06/2016) confirms that Saltas comply with all labour laws and regulations. B. The Client claims that no inspections from the FairWork commission or WorkSafe Tasmania have taken place at any of the hatcheries, the Auditor finds no grounds in which to suggest otherwise.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Standards related to Principle 2						
8.3	**Indicator**: Evidence of an assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems that contains the same components as the assessment for grow-out facilities under 2.4.1 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a documented assessment of the smolt site's potential impact on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. The assessment must address all components outlined in Appendix I-3. b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration confirming they have developed and are implementing a plan to address potential impacts identified in the assessment.	**A**. The Saltas and Russell Falls hatcheries were constructed prior to requirements to conduct an EMP. As part of the regulatory permitting process the smolt facilities have previously undertaken an independent assessment of biodiversity impact. The focus on assessment of benthic macroinvertebrates (discussed below in 8.34) is described in a report titled "Context for the Tassal-Saltas ASC compliance assessments under the ASC macroinvertebrate standard" by Prof Peter Davies of Freshwater Systems (October 2015) which refer to Appendix VIII-2 and Appendix VIII-3 of the Standard. Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: assessment of the farm's potential impacts on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems from recent facility upgrades & building constructions: • Rookwood Road - Construction EMP 2015, including Environmental Mitigation Measures & Environmental Monitoring Program. As a fully closed recirculated system Rookwood is considered to have minimal impacts beyond those identified in construction on biodiversity and nearby ecosystems. • Russell Falls - a planning permit in accordance with the Land Use and Planning Approvals Act 1993 has been issued for the construction of extensions and alterations to the hatchery and associated sites - Derwent Valley Council Planning Permit (17/03/2015) #DA 127/2013 includes protection of water quality, noise, EPA nutrient reduction program, investigation of alternative disposal options for RAS wasted water stream, max feed inputs, RAS water treatment sludge & filtered solid wastes, farm chemicals, flow monitoring, turbidity probe, water quality monitoring (15 parameters listed), biological monitoring (4 parameters listed), and overall environmental management. • Saltas Wayatinah - Planning report to support Development Application (DA) from Forestry Tasmania and the Central Highlands Council for Wayatinah facility (includes Land Title, Aug13 Rev00 14p) includes native vegetation, natural drainage lines, natural hazards, soil testing, water & soil management plans, stormwater management & erosion control, potential impacts on Derwent River, heritage provisions & State Water Quality Management Policy. • Saltas Florentine - Planning report support Development Application (DA) from Forestry Tasmania and the Central Highlands Council for Florentine facility (includes Forestry Lease correspondence 15/08/12 13p) includes Forestry Tas consent, control of vermin & noxious weeds, also consideration of native vegetation, natural drainage lines, natural hazards, soil testing, water & soil management plans, stormwater management & erosion control, potential impacts on Derwent & Florentine Rivers, heritage provisions & State Water Quality Management Policy. b. Obtain from smolt supplier(s) a declaration confirming they have developed and are implementing a plan to address potential impacts identified in the assessment. **B**. Declarations have not been provided, rather commitments are made in the planning report to support the Development Application (DA) for each facility. • Russel Falls Derwent Valley Council Planning Permit (17/03/2015) • Rookwood Rd Construction Environmental Management Plan 2015 • Saltas Planning report to support DA for Wayatinah facility (includes Land Title) and Planning report support DA for Florentine facility (includes Forestry Lease correspondence). The Saltas hatcheries have been identified as non-compliant for impacts on macroinvertebrate community assemblages downstream from the two farm sites. The consulting researcher Prof P. Davies has provided a context document that lists potential mitigation measures for these impacts (see 8.34). These mitigation measures or alternatives have largely not been implemented at the Saltas sites. Discussions with Saltas management, indicated that they have recently extracted sludge from the settlement pond at Wayatinah (invoice for the service supplied as evidence), the results from this action are yet to be determined. However, given the general lack of responsiveness by Saltas to these issues over progressive years, there appears to be a general lack of commitment to addressing potential impacts. A Minor non-conformity has been raised against this.	**Minor**	The Saltas hatcheries have been identified as non-compliant for impacts on macroinvertebrate community assemblages downstream from the two farm sites (see below 8.34). The consulting researcher Prof Peter Davies has provided a context document that lists potential mitigation measures for these impacts (see 8.34). These mitigation measures or alternatives have largely not been implemented at the Saltas farm sites. Discussions with Saltas management, indicated that they have recently extracted sludge from the settlement pond at the Wayatinah hatchery (invoice for the service supplied as evidence to the Auditor), the results from this action are yet to be determined. However, given the general lack of responsiveness by Saltas to these issues over progressive years, there appears to be a general lack of commitment to addressing potential impacts. A Minor non-conformity has been raised against this.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		c. Others, please describe	In response to this minor non-conformity, the Client has contracted Prof Davies to conduct a Biodiversity-focused Environmental Impact Assessment (B-EIA) for the Saltas and Russell Falls hatcheries. The scope of the work to be conducted will be aligned with Standard, incorporating the following: • Review data to identify candidate listed species and locations. List relevant species and characterise relative risks. • Identify all Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystem Values (CFEV) High rated RCV and ICV (Relative and Integrated Conservation Value) stream reaches, lakes, estuaries and wetlands potentially affected by farm operations and discharges. List relevant habitats and characterise relative risks. • Review sources and identify: Priority species – CFEV; commercial fishery species – eels; recreational fishery species - brown trout and bream. Assess relative significance of farm receiving waters for sensitive species within local and state context. List relevant species and characterise relative risks. • List potential causes/risk factors of environmental aquatic impact. Scan data sources for potential nutrient, antibiotic, toxicant, xenobiotic chemical and disease impacts on receiving rivers, nutrient status of lakes, nutrient status of estuaries. List and characterise risks from most relevant potential causes/risk factors. • Summarise current Tassal/Saltas procedures and assessments. Discuss current and future strategies with Tassal/Saltas personnel. Collate information and summarise key features and needs of programs and strategies. • Review current Tassal/Saltas monitoring programs. Collate information and summarise key features and needs for monitoring. The scope of the B-EIA combined with the actions and planned works described in 8.34, assist in addressing this non-conformity. An extension beyond the 90 working day deadline for this minor non-conformity will be sought so the B-EIA can be effectively completed.			

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.4	Indicator: Maximum total amount of phosphorus released into the environment per metric ton (mt) of fish produced over a 12-month period (see Appendix VIII-1) Requirement: 5 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period; within three years of publication of the SAD standards, 4 kg/mt of fish produced over a 12-month period Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing amount and type of feeds used for smolt production during the past 12 months. b. For all feeds used by the smolt suppliers (result from 8.4a), keep records showing phosphorus content as determined by chemical analysis or based on feed supplier declaration (Appendix VIII-1). c. Using the equation from Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a and b, calculate the total amount of phosphorus added as feed during the last 12 months of smolt production. d. Obtain from smolt suppliers records for stocking, harvest and mortality which are sufficient to calculate the amount of biomass produced (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months. e. Calculate the amount of phosphorus in fish biomass produced (result from 8.4d) using the formula in Appendix VIII-1. f. If applicable, obtain records from smolt suppliers showing the total amount of P removed as sludge (formula in Appendix VIII-1) during the past 12 months. g. Using the formula in Appendix VIII-1 and results from 8.4a-f (above), calculate total phosphorus released per ton of smolt produced and verify that the smolt supplier is in compliance with requirements. h. Others, please describe	A. The 2 Rookwood hatcheries are totally recirculating as no effluents are released into waterways, all biosolids go to composting and waste water to irrigation. Only Skretting provide feeds for Tassal and Saltas hatcheries - they provide the annual Phosphorus calculations. Their ASC Declaration EASTERN ZONE 2017_15YC (15/03/2017 22p) states that the annually provide a feed declaration detailing the total amount of phosphorous in their smolt feeds - ASC Feed nitrogen, carbon & phosphorous declaration. This allows the Farming Company to be able to calculate the total phosphorous discharged per ton of smolt produced. Reviewed the Russell Falls Phosphorus calculation (1 January 2016 – 31 December 2016) and Saltas Phosphorus calculation (01/01/2016 – 31/12/2016). Both record a negative kg/MT fish due to sludge removal from settlement ponds (annual for RF and fortnightly for Saltas). B. SkA's ASC Feed Nitrogen, Carbon and Phosphorus declaration (V0.2 2p) reviewed for the Tassal & Saltas hatcheries for the calendar year. It states: "The level of phosphorous in the feed is derived from the formulated phosphorous level in the feed. The inclusion level of phosphorous in the feed is aligned with the Skretting Aquaculture Research Centre's (ARC) agreed standard. Our individual product data sheets are a representation of our commercially formulated phosphorous level in the feed. For the above P in calculation, the total phosphorous is derived from the value specified on the product data sheet." C. The calculations are done according to Appendix VIII-1. Phosphorus in (supplied in feeds) determined for Russell Falls Hatchery and Saltas Hatcheries (not required for Rookwood Road Hatchery as it is zero discharge to natural waterways). The calculations checked in Phosphorus Release spreadsheets and confirmed accurate for both, including ATS lab reports and monthly (Saltas) and annual (Tassal) sludge removal records: - Russell Falls Spectran invoice (02/03/2016) & AST Report (31/03/2016) - Saltas - AST Report (11/12/2014) & Fortnightly sludge removal – correspondence and Spectran invoice. D. Both the hatcheries are compliant. Total phosphorus released per ton of smolt produced (kg/mt of fish). Data for the past four years shows significant improvement for both hatcheries with a net loss of P released to the water body in CY2016: Russell Falls - Calendar year 2013 = 2.14 kg/mt fish (30,000 L sludge removed from recirculation tank) - Calendar year 2014 = 9.52 kg/mt fish - Calendar year 2015 = 10.03 kg/mt fish - Calendar year 2016 = - 3.27 kg/mt fish (20,000 L sludge removed in March 2016) Saltas: - Calendar year 2013 = 0.85 kg/mt fish (48,000 L sludge removed from settling pond) - Calendar year 2014 = 3.38 kg/mt fish (20,000 L sludge removed from settling pond) - Calendar year 2015 = 9.51 kg/mt fish - Calendar year 2016 = -39.08 kg/mt fish (10,000L of sludge removed per fortnight) E. The calculations are done according to Appendix VIII-1. F. The farm has provided sufficient records showing that smolt supplier determined the amount of phosphorus removed from the system as sludge (refer C. above). G. Review calculations confirms that the farm's smolt supplier(s) do not exceed requirements for release of phosphorus in Calendar year 2016. Both record a negative kg/MT fish due to sludge removal (annual for RF and fortnightly for Saltas).	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Standards related to Principle 3						
8.5	Indicator: If a non-native species is being produced, the species shall have been widely commercially produced in the area prior to the publication [156] of the SAD standards Requirement: Yes [157] Applicability: All Smolt Producers except as noted in [157]	a. Obtain written evidence showing whether the smolt supplier produces a non-native species or not. If not, then Indicator 8.5 does not apply. b. Provide the farm with documentary evidence that the non-native species was widely commercially produced in the area before publication of the SAD Standard. (See definition of area under 3.2.1). c. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b, provide documentary evidence that the farm uses only 100% sterile fish. d. If the smolt supplier cannot provide the farm with evidence for 8.5b or 8.5c, provide documented evidence for each of the following: 1) non-native species are separated from wild fish by effective physical barriers that are in place and well maintained; 2) barriers ensure there are no escapes of reared fish specimens that might survive and subsequently reproduce; and 3) barriers ensure there are no escapes of biological material that might survive and subsequently reproduce. e. Retain evidence as described in 8.5a-d necessary to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm. f. Others, please describe	A. Atlantic Salmon being produced by the hatcheries is a non-native species; it was introduced by Government and private acclimation groups in the 1800s. In the 1980s the Tasmanian Government began the development of a commercial salmonid aquaculture industry. Several salmonid species are also produced by the Tas Gov't for stocking rivers and impoundments for recreational fisheries. A research paper by Abrantes et al (2011) indicated that escaped Atlantic salmon in Tasmania do not feed on native species and are unlikely to form self-sustaining populations. Although this paper is not a conclusive document for all locations and scenarios across the state, it demonstrates a general favourable trend for salmon producers. The Tasmanian salmon industry also points to the fact that salmonid smolt have been purposely released by the government into freshwater habitats throughout Tasmania since the 1800s, as supportive evidence of their comparative environmental impact. B. The State Government's Inland Fisheries Service purchases salmon and trout from the hatcheries to stock waterways and dams in Tasmania. For more information on the history of the industry and Tassal refer to: - http://www.tassal.com.au/our-history/ - http://www.tsga.com.au/history/ C. N/A D. N/A E. Sufficient evidence is provided by the hatcheries to show compliance of each facility supplying smolt to the farm.	Compliant		
8.6	**Indicator**: Maximum number of escapees [158] in the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** 300 fish [159] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers except as noted in [159]	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers maintained monitoring records of all incidences of confirmed or suspected escapes, specifying date, cause, and estimated number of escapees. b. Using smolt supplier records from 8.6a, determine the total number of fish that escaped. Verify that there were fewer than 300 escapees from the smolt production facility in the most recent production cycle. c. Inform smolt suppliers in writing that monitoring records described in 8.6a must be maintained for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which the farm is first applying for certification (necessary for farms to be eligible to apply for the exception noted in [159]). d. If an escape episode occurs at the smolt production facility (i.e. an incident where > 300 fish escaped), the farm may request a rare exception to the Standard [159]. Requests must provide a full account of the episode and must document how the smolt producer could not have predicted the events that caused the escape episode. e. Others, please describe	A. Tassal hatcheries - No recorded escapes (FishTalk report); escapes are well controlled as per MO-146 Escape Prevention and Response Protocol (12/12/2016, Issue #5), this is linked to a Smolt Transfer and Receival Procedure (MO - 145) and Smolt Dispatch Form (MO - F278), which are used for the traceability of smolt from the hatchery to a lease. Saltas declaration from Hatchery Manager (30/06/2016) confirms that no escapes from either hatchery in the FW 15YC production cycle. B. The hatcheries' records have been checked, there have been no escapes in the most recent production cycle at any of the hatcheries. C. Saltas declaration from Hatchery Manager (30/06/2016) confirms that Saltas maintain records of escapes for at least 10 years beginning with the production cycle for which Tassal began certification in 2014. Acknowledged by Tassal, all records from their hatcheries are in the database FishTalk. D. Tassal have acknowledged they are aware of this requirement.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.7	**Indicator**: Accuracy [160] of the counting technology or counting method used for calculating the number of fish **Requirement:** ≥98% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records showing the accuracy of the counting technology used by smolt suppliers. Records must include copies of spec sheets for counting machines and common estimates of error for hand-counts. b. Review records to verify that accuracy of the smolt supplier's counting technology or counting method is ≥ 98%. c. Others, please describe	A. Vaki Macro Counters are used at the hatcheries; the Technical Specifications states accuracy "Over 99%"; these are a scanning camera based counter, with each image being analysed and then counted. Saltas hatchery management consider that at maximum capacity, the counter is over 98% accurate. Because it is a camera based counter, the images are automatically recorded and can be used to validate the accuracy of the count. B. Summary of the Calibration by the hatcheries: - Saltas: Counters are checked daily before the first load of the day. Each load of fish has a hard copy of what was loaded - on the back of the sheet of the first load the counter check is recorded. The Saltas evidence reviewed 17/06/2016 & 1/08/2016. - Tassal: Set up as per Task breakdown MO-146 Escape Prevention and Response Protocol (12/12/2016, Issue #5) for setting up and operating counters which includes calibration requirements. - Russell Falls: Counter generated reports reviewed for Nov16 showing appropriate accuracy. - Rookwood Road: The calibration on the counter is to calibrate the wavelength of the light to the camera. If it can't be calibrated the counter will not work. Vaki do an online check (two reviewed Feb&Jun16) to verify that the count is accurate. Each day's count is stored on the hard drive. If need be it can be revisited and a manual count carried out.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 4						
8.8	**Indicator**: Evidence of a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain a policy which states the supplier's commitment to proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production. It must explain how the supplier's policy is consistent with best practice in the area of operation. b. Others, please describe	Documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance for a functioning policy for proper and responsible treatment of non-biological waste from production (e.g., disposal and recycling) include: Tassal Hatcheries - MO-130 Marine Operations Waste Management Plan (12/12/2016, Issue #3 4p) includes all land bases such as the hatcheries; - IMS-P1002 Environmental Policy (13/06/13, Issue #3 1p) states continuous improvement for prevention of pollution; - Russell Falls – Waste removal and recycling covered by council. Larger items go to the Hamilton tip; and - Veolia consolidated reports for Q1 FY2017 & Q2 FY2017 which include all hatcheries. Saltas Hatcheries: - Saltas Waste Management Plan (ENV-001 Issue 1, 2p); and - Invoice for waste collection at Saltas – Veolia. General waste is removed once a fortnight (approx. 33-36 m3 removed per fortnight), tax invoice for Dec15.	Compliant		
8.9	Indicator: Presence of an energy-use assessment verifying the energy consumption at the smolt production facility (see Appendix V subsection 1 for guidance and required components of the records and assessment) Requirement: Yes, measured in kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records from the smolt supplier for energy consumption by source (fuel, electricity) at the supplier's facility throughout each year. b. Confirm that the smolt supplier calculates total energy consumption in kilojoules (kj) during the last year. c. Obtain records to show the smolt supplier calculated the total weight of fish in metric tons (mt) produced during the last year. d. Confirm that the smolt supplier used results from 8.9b and 8.9c to calculate energy consumption on the supplier's facility as required and that the units are reported as kilojoule/mt fish/production cycle. e. Obtain evidence to show that smolt supplier has undergone an energy use assessment in compliance with requirements of Appendix V-1. Can take the form of a declaration detailing a-e. f. Others, please describe	A. The Conversion Tool EZ is in use; it includes tabs for Conversion of Fuel Volume to Energy, Electricity to Energy, Energy Use, CO2e- Emissions and Emissions. Records of energy consumption & GHG emission are collected over a financial year (FY) and published annually for all the Tassal business units (Admin, hatcheries, farms, processing, vessels, transport), including each farming zone, for example the Tassal Eastern Zone Energy Use and GHG Assessment FY2016 (5p) report with sections including Introduction, Inventory Boundaries, Results (energy use, GHG Emissions) and References. B. The Client has reviewed the supplier's calculations and reported energy usage in kilojoules (separate figures for Rookwood and Russell Falls, combined figure for Saltas). C. Total weight of fish produced during the last year has been provided. D. Calculations were undertaken correctly and stated in the spreadsheet Tassal data FY16 (ASC GHG and Energy Use assessment) with tabs data from relevant suppliers of electricity & fuel, hatchery biomass, MOPs biomass and Biomass produced. Assumptions made which are relevant for 8.9 and 8.10 are described in 4.6.1B above. The calculations are aligned with the Standard and are appropriately separated for the hatcheries. E. The energy use and GHG assessment conducted by the Client covers all hatcheries and has been conducted to the Standard. The results from this assessment are aligned with the Standard.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.10	**Indicator**: Records of greenhouse gas (GHG [161]) emissions [162] at the smolt production facility and evidence of an annual GHG assessment (See Appendix V, subsection 1) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain records of greenhouse gas emissions from the smolt supplier's facility. b. Confirm that, on at least an annual basis, the smolt supplier calculates all scope 1 and scope 2 GHG emissions in compliance with Appendix V-1. c. For GHG calculations, confirm that the smolt supplier selects the emission factors which are best suited to the supplier's operation. Confirm that the supplier documents the source of the emissions factors. d. For GHG calculations involving conversion of non-CO2 gases to CO2 equivalents, confirm that the smolt suppliers specify the Global Warming Potential (GWP) used and its source. e. Obtain evidence to show that the smolt supplier has undergone a GHG assessment in compliance with requirements Appendix V-1 at least annually. f. Others, please describe	A. The Tassal Eastern Zone Energy Use and GHG Assessment FY2016 (5p) includes all the smolt suppliers (separate figures for Rookwood and Russell Falls, combined figure for Saltas). B. The calculations are performed annually and comply with the Standard. C. The energy use and GHG assessment report conducted by the Client states that all sources are incorporated except emissions from fuel used in fleet vehicles. D. The Client has provided the Auditor with monthly data on all GWPs used and their sources for the Tassal hatcheries. For the Saltas hatcheries annual totals have been provided for GWPs used and their sources. An 82.1% attributable portion to Tassal has been calculated for the Saltas hatcheries in alignment with Tassal's proportion of ownership. E. The evidence provided complies with the requirements of Appendix V-1.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 5						
8.11	**Indicator**: Evidence of a fish health management plan, approved by the designated veterinarian, for the identification and monitoring of fish diseases and parasites **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the supplier's fish health management plan for the identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites. b. Keep documentary evidence to show that the smolt supplier's health plans were approved by the supplier's designated veterinarian. c. Others, please describe	A. Documents reviewed which sufficiently cover the requirements of the Standard include: - expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p); - Zero Harm for Fish Animal Welfare Policy (IMS-P1090 28/09/2015, Issue #2 1p); and - Tassal ASC Company Veterinarian declaration (18/01/2017). B. Tassal ASC Company Veterinarian declaration (18/01/2017) states Tassal's Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p) incorporates components related to identification and monitoring of fish disease and parasites, it includes the freshwater operations/hatcheries, including SALTAS. Tassal's Company veterinarian in her role as SMFH has confirmed that she and her team in consultation with the Zone Managers and TOs have reviewed and expanded the Protocol; the SMFH approved it with an electronic signature on Q-Pulse, Tassal's Electronic document system, the changes made by Vet identified as CR36.38 20/06/2017 includes a request to release new documentation.	Compliant		
8.12	**Indicator**: Percentage of fish that are vaccinated for selected diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region and for which an effective vaccine exists [163] **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Maintain a list of diseases that are known to present a significant risk in the region, developed by farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence. b. Maintain a list of diseases for which effective vaccines exist for the region, developed by the farm veterinarian and supported by scientific evidence. c. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration detailing the vaccines the fish received. d. Demonstrate, using the lists from 8.12a-c above, that all salmon on the farm received vaccination against all selected diseases known to present a significant risk in the regions for which an effective vaccine exists. e. Others, please describe	A. The significant diseases are listed in the expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p). p2 "Significant disease events either from the State list of diseases of concern as released by the CVO's office; or significant endemic diseases should be communicated internally and to other neighbouring farms" B. The Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol provides details on the most relevant diseases in the region and those that could potentially occur. Amongst this information is vaccine status. "p13 Fish get vaccinated at the hatchery to prime their adaptive immune system, so when they reach the marine sites they have a bank of proteins that they can recognise." C. Tassal ASC Company Veterinarian declaration (18/01/2017) states for Vaccinations at Freshwater Hatcheries (Tassal and Saltas) "… during the freshwater phase of their lifecycle, all fry is vaccinated with Yersinivac-B against Yersinia Ruckeri. Parr that are destined for Macquarie Harbour are also vaccinated with Anguimonas against Aeromonas salmonicida and Vibrio anguillarum." This is for flowthrough hatcheries, there is no need for vaccination at the Rookwood Rd RAS hatcheries. D. The Zone Manager checks all fish transfers with the Senior Manager Freshwater against the Vet Health Certificates to verify that all required vaccines were received by all batches of smolt received by the farm during the current production cycle. The 5-6page Vet Health Certificates signed by the SMFH for 15YC include Certificate #15013 (sourced from Saltas Florentine 10/07/2015), #15016 (RRH 6/08/2015), #15010 (sourced from Russell Falls 26/05/2015) and #15025 (Saltas Florentine and Wayatinah 26/10/2015), cross check confirms (see 8.12 c).	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.13	**Indicator**: Percentage of smolt groups [164] tested for select diseases of regional concern prior to entering the grow-out phase on farm **Requirement:** 100% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier a list of diseases of regional concern for which smolt should be tested. List shall be supported by scientific analysis as described in the Instruction above. b. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a declaration and records confirming that each smolt group received by the farm has been tested for the diseases in the list (8.13a). c. Others, please describe	A. The Vet Health Certificates for 15YC referenced in 8.12 prove all smolt groups are passed for health prior to entering the water at the grow-out site. B. The Veterinarian Health Certificates above in 8.12 represent all the 15YC stockings for Creeses Mistake farm (Eastern Zone).	Compliant		
8.14	Indicator: Detailed information, provided by the designated veterinarian, of all chemicals and therapeutants used during the smolt production cycle, the amounts used (including grams per ton of fish produced), the dates used, which group of fish were treated and against which diseases, proof of proper dosing and all disease and pathogens detected on the site Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier(s) a detailed record of all chemical and therapeutant use for the fish sold to the farm that is signed by their veterinarian and includes: - name of the veterinarian prescribing treatment; - product name and chemical name; - reason for use (specific disease) - date(s) of treatment; - amount (g) of product used; - dosage; - mt of fish treated; - the WHO classification of antibiotics (also see note under 5.2.8); and - the supplier of the chemical or therapeutant. b. Others, please describe	Medication Authorities signed by the Company Vet/SMFH have been produced for all antibiotic treatments, for example for 2016 they include: - Saltas – none to date in 2017, 5 in 2016 (Trimethoprim & Tetrafish) – MA16-01, MA16-02, MA16-04, MA16-05 & MA 16-10. - Russel Falls – none to date in 2017, 2 in 2016 (Trimethoprim) - MA16-03 & MA 16-16. - Rookwood Rd – none in 2016 and 2017. This matches the records in the spreadsheet Antibiotic Use – Freshwater (reviewed May2017) with tabs for 2015, 2016 and 2017. Tassal's document Antibiotics January 2017 lists Trimethoprim Micro 1kg (Antibiotic – Trimethoprim 100%) and Tetrafish (Antibiotic – Oxytetracycline 100%); according to their WHO Classification (4th Revision 2013 (Published 2016)) both are categorised as Highly Important Antimicrobials; they are both supplied by AllFarm Animal Health (Hastings, Vic). Until 2017, this included all required data except for the WHO classification of antibiotics – a column has been added to the 2017 sheet. Other data columns include Date, Hatchery, MA, Antibiotic, Product Name, Total antibiotic used (active ingredient) (g), Dose rate (mg/kg), Disease, Prescribing Vet, Tx Duration, Biomass (Kg), Tanks, Pathology.	Compliant		
8.15	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of therapeutic treatments that include antibiotics or chemicals that are banned [165] in any of the primary salmon producing or importing countries [166] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to the smolt supplier the list (see 5.2.2a) of therapeutants, including antibiotics and chemicals, that are proactively banned for use in food fish for the primary salmon producing and importing countries listed in [166]. b. Inform smolt supplier that the treatments on the list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification. c. Compare therapeutant records from smolt supplier (8.14) to the list (8.15a) and confirm that no therapeutants appearing on the list (8.15a) were used on the smolt purchased by the farm. d. Others, please describe	A. The hatcheries have been provided with a List of Permitted and Banned Therapeutants for primary salmon producing importing countries by the Client. This 24-page list was updated in February 2017. B. The Client had confirmed that their Veterinarian prescribes all medication authorities for the fish they use at any of the hatcheries. The Veterinarian has a copy of the list of permitted and banned therapeutants. C. The two antibiotics uses Trimethoprim and Oxytetracycline are listed as approved for the applicable primary salmon producing and importing nations.	Compliant		
8.16	**Indicator**: Number of treatments of antibiotics over the most recent production cycle **Requirement:** ≤ 3 **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain from the smolt supplier records of all treatments of antibiotics (see 8.14a). b. Calculate the total number of treatments of antibiotics from their most recent production cycle. c. Others, please describe	A. Tassal maintains treatment records from all hatcheries; these are listed above in 8.14 – all have been signed by the Company Vet/SMFH). B. The spreadsheet Antibiotic Use – Freshwater (reviewed May2017) with tabs for 2015, 2016 and 2017 records all treatments: - Saltas – none to date in 2017, 5 in 2016 (Trimethoprim & Tetrafish) - Russel Falls – none to date in 2017, 2 in 2016 (Trimethoprim) - Rookwood Rd – none in 2016 and 2017. The Medication Authorities are listed in 8.14 above A review of column L Tanks which records tank numbers/ids, proves that only single treatments have been made on individual tanks for 2016, no treatments at all to date in 2017.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.17	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO [167] **Requirement:** None [168] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide to smolt supplier(s) a current version of the WHO list of antimicrobials critically and highly important for human health [167]. b. Inform smolt supplier that the antibiotics on the WHO list (8.17a) cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification. c. Compare smolt supplier's records for antibiotic usage (8.14, 8.15a) with the WHO list (8.17a) to confirm that no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine by the WHO were used on fish purchased by the farm. d. Others, please describe	A. Tassal's Company Veterinarian prescribes all medication authorities for the fish they use at any of the hatcheries. The Veterinarian confirmed she can access the Intranet copy of the WHO list of Critically Antimicrobials Important for Human Medicine – 4th Revision 2013 (published 2016, 32p) and is aware that critically important antibiotics cannot be used. B. The Hatchery Managers at Rookwood, Russell Falls and Saltas have confirmed that copies of the WHO List are available from the Tassal Intranet and that the antibiotics on the WHO list cannot be used on fish sold to a farm with ASC certification. C. A review of the spreadsheet Antibiotic Use – Freshwater (reviewed May2017) with tabs for 2015, 2016 and 2017 confirm no antibiotics listed as critically important for human medicine on the WHO List – 4th Revision 2013 were used. The two antibiotics used Trimethoprim and Oxytetracycline are both listed in the WHO list as highly important, not as critically important.	Compliant		
8.18	**Indicator**: Evidence of compliance [169] with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code [170] **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Provide the smolt supplier with a current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (or inform the supplier how to access it from the internet). b. Inform the supplier that an ASC certified farm can only source smolt from a facility with policies and procedures that ensure that its smolt production practices are compliant with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. c. Obtain a declaration from the supplier stating their intent to comply with the OIE code and copies of the smolt suppliers policies and procedures that are relevant to demonstrate compliance with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. d. Others, please describe	A. Saltas declaration from Hatchery Manager (30/06/2016) confirms Tassal has provided Saltas with a link to the current version of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code and Saltas intend to comply with the OIE Code. Tassal ASC Company Veterinarian declaration (18/01/2017) states that Tassal's freshwater hatcheries comply with the OIE Code as per criteria 8.18. Also reviewed email Environmental Certification & Sustainability Officer (18/01/2017) with link to the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code. B. The hatcheries were informed that a requirement of the ASC Standard is compliance with the Code. C. Tassal's Veterinarian has provided the Auditor with a declaration that the hatcheries comply with the OIE Code.	Compliant		
Standards related to Principle 6						
8.19	**Indicator**: Evidence of company-level policies and procedures in line with the labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11 **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain copies of smolt supplier's company-level policies and procedures and a declaration of compliance with the labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11. b. Review the documentation and declaration from 8.19a to verify that smolt supplier's policies and procedures are in compliance with the requirements of labour standards under 6.1 to 6.11. c. Others, please describe	A. Smolt is supplied by Saltas and through Tassal's own hatcheries. Tassal is a vertically integrated company with corporation wide policies and general and division specific procedures and plans. These have been reviewed and found to be comply with labour and other associated legislative requirements during the audit of Principle 6. Saltas has provided a comprehensive set of company level policies that meet the requirements of 6.1 - 6.11. B. The Saltas WHS system policies is comprehensive and meets labour requirements. All other policies reflect Tassal's policies. The Grievance prevention and handling policy HR-002 has been amended to include the importance of confidentiality as part of the grievance handling process (Tassal's Grievance procedures have also been updated accordingly). All other policies as per Tassal's corporate wide policies meet 6.1 - 6.11.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
Standards related to Principle 7						
8.20	**Indicator**: Evidence of regular consultation and engagement with community representatives and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. From each smolt supplier obtain documentary evidence of consultations and engagement with the community. b. Review documentation from 8.20a to verify that the smolt supplier's consultations and community engagement complied with requirements. c. Others, please describe	A. Tassal is a vertically integrated company supplying its own smolt. Community engagement is integrated across all operations. The 2016 Sustainability Report on page 2 reports that Tassal's extensive Community Engagement program ensures that all key stakeholders are part of everyday communication activities; Chapter 8 is entitled People & Communities, Stakeholders and Community Engagement Activities are detailed on pages 56-60. Tassal has engaged with the following organisations in the areas within which the Rookwood Road and Russell Falls hatcheries operate: Russell Falls Hatchery - Russell Falls Cottages (neighbours to Russell Falls Hatchery – currently building fence on property boundary for noise mitigation) - Derwent Estuary Program and involvement in National Estuaries Network - Derwent Valley Council - Support of the Derwent Valley Festival - Donations to Westerway Primary School - EPA Rookwood Road Hatchery - Huon Valley Council - Huon Valley Rotary and Lions clubs - Various donations to local area (sporting clubs etc. and Huon Valley Show) - Huon Valley Trade Training Centre (provision of fish for dissections, Senior Manager – Fish Health and Company Veterinarian takes some classes there and Community Engagement Officer did a talk there on Sustainability. They also make product donations for various events for their Hospitality/cooking classes) - Individual neighbours with noise issues - Head of Risk sent a letter to neighbours for consulting re RWII – there was an information session for RWI also Saltas organised a specific open day on the 10th of January 2017 at Wayatinah site, according to Hatchery Manager (email 9/02/2017) 6 local people attended. Saltas also supported chilleFM and Make a Wish special children's Christmas party 2016. B. This evidence proves that Tassal and Saltas community consultations comply with requirements.	Compliant		
8.21	**Indicator**: Evidence of a policy for the presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain a copy of the smolt supplier's policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders and organizations. b. Others, please describe	A. Saltas WHS-037 Community Grievance Policy and Tassal IMS-P1103 Community Complaint Policy and ES-120 Community and Stakeholder Complaints Procedure were cited and verify that both smolt suppliers have a policy for presentation, treatment and resolution of complaints by community stakeholders.	Compliant		
8.22	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that indigenous groups were consulted as required by relevant local and/or national laws and regulations **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. Obtain documentary evidence showing that the smolt supplier does or does not operate in an indigenous territory (to include farms that operate in proximity to indigenous or aboriginal people (see Indicator 7.2.1). If not then the requirements of 8.22 do not apply. b. Obtain documentation to demonstrate that, as required by law in the jurisdiction: smolt supplier consulted with indigenous groups and retains documentary evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, summaries) to show how the process complies with 7.2.1b; OR smolt supplier confirms that government-to-government consultation occurred and obtains documentary evidence. c. Others, please describe	A. Indicator 8.22 is applicable to the farm's smolt suppliers (see 7.1.3 above) as Tassal is a vertically integrated company producing its own smolt and a majority shareholder of Saltas which comes under the umbrella of Tassals indigenous consultations. B. Tassal and Saltas meet consultation requirements and this is outlined in a 22 page Indigenous Consultation paper. Tassal also retains documentary evidence such as emails, timelines and minutes of consultations, training and partnerships. These are documented in 7.2.1b.	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.23	**Indicator**: Where relevant, evidence that the farm has undertaken proactive consultation with indigenous communities **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers	a. See results of 8.22a (above) to determine whether the requirements of 8.23 apply to the smolt supplier. b. Where relevant, obtain documentary evidence that smolt suppliers undertake proactive consultations with indigenous communities. c. Others, please describe	A. Indicator 8.23 is applicable to the farm's smolt suppliers Tassal and Saltas. B. A range of documentary evidence confirms that the smolt suppliers both come under Tassals indigenous consultations and have therefore undertaken proactive consultations as recorded in 7.2.2 above.	Compliant		
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN (NET-PEN) PRODUCTION OF SMOLT						
8.24	**Indicator**: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in water bodies with native salmonids **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating whether the supplier operates in water bodies with native salmonids. b. Request smolt suppliers to identify all water bodies in which they operate net pens for producing smolt and from which facilities they sell to the client. c. For any water body identified in 8.24b as a source of smolt for the farm, determine if native salmonids are present by doing a literature search or by consulting with a reputable authority. Retain evidence of search results. d. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		
8.25	Indicator: Allowance for producing or holding smolt in net pens in any water body Requirement: Permitted until five years from publication of the SAD standards (i.e full compliance by June 13, 2017) Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Take steps to ensure that by June 13, 2017 the farm does not source smolt that was produced or held in net pens. b. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		
8.26	Indicator: Evidence that carrying capacity (assimilative capacity) of the freshwater body has been established by a reliable entity [171] within the past five years [172, and total biomass in the water body is within the limits established by that study (see Appendix VIII-5 for minimum requirements) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. For the water body(s) where the supplier produces smolt for the client (see 8.24b), obtain a copy of the most recent assessment of assimilative capacity. b. Identify which entity was responsible for conducting the assessment (8.26a) and obtain evidence for their reliability. c. Review the assessment (8.26a) to confirm that it establishes a carrying capacity for the water body, it is less than five years old, and it meets the minimum requirements presented in Appendix VIII-5. d. Review information to confirm that the total biomass in the water body is within the limits established in the assessment (8.26a). e. If the study in 8.26a is more than two years old and there has been a significant increase in nutrient input to the water body since completion, request evidence that an updated assessment study has been done. f. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.27	**Indicator**: Maximum baseline total phosphorus concentration of the water body (see Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≤ 20 µg/l [174] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence to show that smolt suppliers conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements of Appendix VIII-6. b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a map with GPS coordinates showing the sampling locations. c. Obtain from smolt suppliers the TP monitoring results for the past 12 months and calculate the average value at each sampling station. d. Compare results to the baseline TP concentration established below (see 8.29) or determined by a regulatory body. e. Confirm that the average value for TP over the last 12 months did not exceed 20 ug/l at any of the sampling stations nor at the reference station. f. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		
8.28	**Indicator**: Minimum percent oxygen saturation of water 50 centimetres above bottom sediment (at all oxygen monitoring locations described in Appendix VIII-6) **Requirement:** ≥ 50% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain evidence that smolt supplier conducted water quality monitoring in compliance with the requirements (see 8.27a). b. Obtain from smolt suppliers the DO monitoring results from all monitoring stations for the past 12 months. c. Review results (8.28b) to confirm that no values were below the minimum percent oxygen saturation. d. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		
8.29	**Indicator**: Trophic status classification of water body remains unchanged from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain documentary evidence from the supplier stating the trophic status of water body if previously set by a regulator body (if applicable). b. If the trophic status of the waterbody has not been classified (see 8.29a), obtain evidence from the supplier to show how the supplier determined trophic status based on the concentration of TP. c. As applicable, review results from 8.29b to verify that the supplier accurately assigned a trophic status to the water body in accordance with the table in Appendix VIII-7 and the observed concentration of TP over the past 12 months. d. Compare the above results (8.29c) to trophic status of the water body as reported for all previous time periods. Verify that there has been no change. e. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		
8.30	**Indicator**: Maximum allowed increase in total phosphorus concentration in lake from baseline (see Appendix VIII-7) **Requirement:** 25% **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Determine the baseline value for TP concentration in the water body using results from either 8.29a or 8.29b as applicable. b. Compare the baseline TP concentration (result from 8.30a) to the average observed TP concentration over the past 12 months (result from 8.27e). c. Verify that the average observed TP concentration did not increase by more than 25% from baseline TP concentration. d. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.31	**Indicator**: Allowance for use of aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water body **Requirement:** None **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Open Systems	a. Obtain a declaration from the farm's smolt supplier stating that the supplier does not use aeration systems or other technological means to increase oxygen levels in the water bodies where the supplier operates. b. Others, please describe	N/A - Net pens are not used for smolt production.	N/A		
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEMI-CLOSED AND CLOSED PRODUCTION OF SMOLTS						
8.32	**Indicator**: Water quality monitoring matrix completed and submitted to ASC (see Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** Yes [177] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing that water quality monitoring was conducted at least quarterly (i.e. once every 3 months) over the last 12 months. b. Obtain water quality monitoring matrix from smolt suppliers and review for completeness. c. Submit the smolt supplier's water quality monitoring matrix to ASC as per Appendix VIII-2 and Appendix VI at least once per year. d. Others, please describe	A. The hatcheries have provided the appropriate water quality monitoring data in alignment with the Standard. Spreadsheets reviewed with data for 2015, 2016 and 2017 include: - Saltas Florentine and Wayatinah Water Quality for upstream and settlement ponds with quarterly monitoring - Russell Falls and Karanja Water Quality for upstream, downstream and settlement pond with monthly monitoring - Rookwood Rd Water Quality for Reuse & Bore with monthly monitoring (oxygen is not measured and there is no effluent discharge or outflow). B. Water quality monitoring at all hatcheries covers the parameters detailed in Appendix VIII-2 (i.e. Oxygen saturation, TP, TN, BOD, TSS), except O2 saturation of Rookwood which uses bore water and has zero discharge to natural waterways. C. The Client has submitted to the ASC their smolt suppliers' water quality monitoring matrices for the last 12-month period.	Compliant		
8.33	**Indicator**: Minimum oxygen saturation in the outflow (methodology in Appendix VIII-2) **Requirement:** 60% [178,179] **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Obtain the water quality monitoring matrix from each smolt supplier (see 8.32b). b. Review the results (8.33a) for percentage dissolved oxygen saturation in the effluent to confirm that no measurements fell below 60% saturation. c. If a single DO reading (as reported in 8.33a) fell below 60%, obtain evidence that the smolt supplier performed daily continuous monitoring with an electronic probe and recorder for a least a week demonstrating a minimum 60% saturation at all times (Appendix VIII-2). d. Others, please describe	A. Appendix VIII-2 requires that Oxygen saturation in the effluent must be measured at least monthly in the early morning and late afternoon. All the hatcheries are compliant with their Dissolved Oxygen monitoring frequency & timing: - Russell Falls & Karanja monthly am & pm readings since 2/10/2014; and - Florentine & Wayatinah Outfall am & pm readings weekly since 6/04/2016 to 21/02/2017. N/A for Rookwood Rd since there is no discharge to natural waterways. B. A Minor non-conformance for 8.33b was raised during the 2015 surveillance audit and was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence. Oxygen saturation in The DO did not fall below 60% at any of the hatcheries from the 2016 & 2017 data in the spreadsheets including: - Saltas Florentine and Wayatinah Water Quality for upstream and downstream and (measured quarterly since Oct16), figure sighted to 26/06/2017; - Russell Falls and Karanja Water Quality for upstream, downstream and settlement pond (measured monthly since Jul16; - n/a for Rookwood Rd Water Quality for Reuse & Bore. This evidence confirms the 2015 minor non-conformance continues to be appropriately addressed. C. N/A	Compliant		

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		a. Obtain documentation from smolt supplier(s) showing the results of macro-invertebrate surveys.	**A**. Twice annual (spring & autumn) Macro-invertebrate surveys are conducted by the independent environmental consultant Freshwater Systems at upstream and downstream of the hatchery's discharge. The 39-page report "Context for the Tassal-Saltas ASC compliance assessments under the ASC macroinvertebrate standard" by Peter Davies, Freshwater Systems (October 2015) describes the sampling program. The Rookwood Hatchery has no biomonitoring assessment due it being a fully closed re-circulated system. Surveys of Tassal Hatcheries include: - Freshwater Systems – Benthic Macroinvertebrate Monitoring ASC Salmon Standard Compliance Assessment – Tassal Russell Falls Hatchery 2013; - Freshwater Systems – Benthic Macroinvertebrate Monitoring ASC Salmon Standard Compliance Assessment – Tassal Russell Falls Hatchery 2014; - Freshwater Systems – Benthic Macroinvertebrate Monitoring ASC Salmon Standard Compliance Assessment – Tassal Russell Falls Hatchery 2015; - Freshwater Systems – Hatchery Macroinvertebrate Context Report 2015; - Rookwood Road irrigation record. The Tassal ASC Macroinvertebrate schedule projections for Tyrenna indicates a period of 3 years of 'consistent results' (i.e. consistency of compliance or non-compliance) for Spring 2013, 2014 & 2015. As per the Context report the sampling has dropped back to every 2 years (the within-year follow-up if non-compliant is still in force); the Spring 2017 monitoring will be conducted sometime in September – November 2017. The Spring 2017 monitoring at Tyrenna will be conducted sometime in September – November 2017 – this two year cycle is due to 3 consecutive years of compliance. Saltas Benthic Macroinvertebrate Monitoring surveys include: - Winter 2014 Wayatinah & Florentine Hatcheries; - Spring 2014 Florentine Hatchery; - Autumn 2015 Wayatinah & Florentine Hatcheries; – Spring 2015 Wayatinah & Florentine Hatcheries; – Autumn 2016 Wayatinah & Florentine Hatcheries; – Spring 2016 Wayatinah & Florentine Hatcheries - Autumn 2017 Florentine Hatchery. . **B**. The survey were conducted in accordance with Appendix III-3. **C**. According to the Wayatinah Biomonitoring report for Spring 2016 the downstream site was rated as poor in contrast to the upstream site, which was rated as in good condition. The differences between the two sites in composition and abundance reflected a high level of organic enrichment at the downstream site. Most importantly this poor rating has prevailed across the summer 2014; autumn 2015, spring 2015 and autumn 2016 sampling periods, indicating that the Client's action plans have not brought about improvement. A similar pattern was observed at the Florentine hatchery where upstream conditions were rated as good and downstream as poor. In terms of progressive ratings, downstream spring 2016 sampling at the Florentine hatchery displayed poorer conditions than during autumn 2014, spring 2014 and autumn 2015 (rated as moderate), yet better than autumn 2016. Regardless, this hatchery has also displayed consistent negative impacts on benthic health, demonstrating that neither hatchery meets the ASC standard. Major non-conformity. The Lead Auditor has discussed these matters with Prof Peter Davies of Freshwater Systems researcher who conducted the biomonitoring assessment. Prof Davies reinforced the findings from his surveys and directed the Auditor to the document he provided to the Client titled "Context for the Tassal-Saltas ASC compliance assessments under the ASC macroinvertebrate standard" October 2015. Prof Davies advice on how to mitigate the impacts of the farm on river health for the Saltas hatcheries comprised of: <u>Florentine</u> 1) discharge via a second pipeline from the settlement pond outlet to the Derwent River (a distance of ca 200 m). The relative volume of discharge from the hatchery to the Derwent and			
		b. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm that the surveys followed the prescribed methodology (Appendix VIII-3).				

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.34	Indicator: Macro-invertebrate surveys downstream from the farm's effluent discharge demonstrate benthic health that is similar or better than surveys upstream from the discharge (methodology in Appendix VIII-3) Requirement: Yes Applicability: All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	c. Review supplier documents (8.34a) to confirm the survey results show that benthic health is similar to or better than upstream of the supplier's discharge.	Florentine Rivers could be regulated in relation to flow in each river, noting that flow in the Derwent above Lake Catagunya is often low and frequently variable. The potential for impact on Lake Catagunya would need to be scoped, but is likely to be lower than the localised intense impact on the rivers. 2) improving discharge quality by addition of drum filtering and/or further treatment; 3) reducing discharge quantity/loads by partial or shandied re-circ. and/or land disposal. Wayatinah -same as above excluding option 1 and including the following. 1) improving downstream dilution of the discharge by requesting Hydro Tasmania to provide sustained water release/diversion into the Derwent upstream of Wayatinah offtake; and/or 2) shifting the discharge (all or part) to a location within the lagoon body in order to maximise the dilution provided by the combination of flow inputs from the Nive River and Derwent River – ensuring this location is 'downstream' of any hatchery lagoon intake. As of March 2017, the Saltas Wayatinah hatchery settlement pond pumped for sludge. The effects of this action have not yet been determined. The Client has provided a detailed action plan to reach compliance through the reduction of organic particulates at the outfall of the hatchery. Central to these actions are a commitment of capital expenditure to install a drum screen at both facilities by June 2018. In the interim, the Client will implement a nine stage integrated approach to improve water quality and reduce environment impact, as follows: Stage 1: Identify biological impacts of effluent through biological and water quality monitoring. - The Client has re-contracted Prof Davies of Freshwater Systems (author of 2015 context report above) in June 2017 to conduct the following: i) Collate and analyses data on benthic macroinvertebrates from the hatcheries, incorporating: water quality, farm (water flows, feed etc.) and river flow data. ii) Assessment of benthic macroinvertebrate responses to deployment of drum screen or other mitigation options, either in full installation and/or trial modes. Stage 2: Revise Saltas Biosolids Management Plan (ENV-002). - The Client has revised their Biosolids Management Plan to include a new commitment to desludging the settlement ponds at both Saltas hatcheries on an annual basis at minimum. Stage 3: Reduce smolt production at Saltas hatcheries. As an immediate response to the major non-conformity, annual production for 2017 will be reduced by 20% overall. This equates to an 82 t drop in production and will result in an associated reduction in feed. The results of this drop in production on stream health will be witnessed in the spring 2017 benthic macroinvertebrate monitoring for both hatcheries. Stage 4: Desludging of settlement ponds. A financial commitment has been made by the company to dredge the Florentine settlement pond in August 2017 and Wayatinah in November 2017. The Client has provided the Auditor with a copy of a works description and quote from the waste removal company Spectran to desludge the Florentine settlement pond. The Client has estimated that desludging will result in a 200% increase in pond volumes and therefore residence times, for both the Florentine and Wayatinah settlement ponds. The expected water quality improvements for this practice are reductions in total phosphorus, total nitrogen and Biological Oxygen Demand. Annual sludge removal has been built in to the Biosolids Management Plan as the most effective short term measure to this issue. Stage 5: Identify improvements in suspended solids and other parameters required to achieve compliance. Consultants from Freshwater Systems have been engaged to provide advice regarding the level of reduction in suspended solids and other parameters required to achieve compliance. Freshwater Systems have determined that further information will be required to sufficiently relate discharge loads to degree of change in macroinvertebrate community structure. To pursue this analysis, the Client will provide additional data on nutrient loads over the coming months based on dates and time periods determined by Freshwater Systems. The Client has thus far provided Freshwater Systems with historical water quality monitoring results and increased future water quality sampling frequencies. In addition, the Client has held meetings with Freshwater Systems to facilitate their further understanding of the operational context and drum screen scoping	Major	Macroinvertebrate sampling demonstrated that river health was in better condition upstream from the Saltas hatcheries compared to downstream.	

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	AUDIT EVIDENCE Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	EVALUTAION	DESCRIPTION OF FINDING Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	VALUE/METRIC If applicable for the respective Indicator.
		d. Others, please describe	requirements. Stage 6: Sustainable hatchery feed technology. The Client has been working with their feed supplier to investigate a feed based solution to reduce organic load at the Saltas hatcheries. By introducing binding additives in the feed, the risk of fine particulates re-suspending in the settlement ponds is minimised and the efficiency and efficacy of the desludging process improved. The Client has recently implemented this change in feed types at the hatcheries. Stage 7: Identify interim, additional or alternative methods to achieve compliance. The Client has met with and will continue to engage with a range of providers to review, discuss and trial a suite of alternative methods, which have been communicated to the Auditor. The Client's listed alternatives can only be considered as possibilities at present, but demonstrate a commitment to finding alternate solutions. Stage 8: Drum screen specification and approval. Using the fully Client owned and presently ASC compliant Russell Falls hatchery as a guide, the Client proposes to install a similar drum screen system at the industry owned Saltas hatcheries. The specifications for the Faivre filter system used at Russell Falls has been provided to the auditor as proof of concept. The flow rates at the Wayatinah and Florentine hatcheries are within the same range as the Russell Falls hatchery. Quotations for the installation of the drum screens have been sought from the two main local suppliers Technolab and FBD. Stage 9: Drum screen installation. The Client has also provided a "Statement of Intent" from the CEO declaring the company's commitment to investing in the capital expenditure required to bring the Saltas hatcheries into compliance with the ASC requirements. The early estimates of practical removal efficiency of a drum screen indicate a considerable reduction in particulates, which should translate to improved stream health. The Client has demonstrated a considerable level of intent and commitment to closing out this major non-conformity through a mixture of short, medium and longer term solutions. Given that this compliance criteria involves a highly dynamic environment, it is impractical to expect a conclusive change in macroinvertebrate community structure in the downstream site, for the time allowed to close out the major non-conformity. To do so would provide opportunity for sampling to occur in favourable conditions, thus masking the problem. Given the Client's commitment to i) increasing monitoring, ii) sludge removal from settlement ponds, iii) decreasing hatchery production, iv) altering feed composition, v) contracting experts to determine implication of actions to instream health, vi) voluntary reporting to the CAB prior to the next surveillance audit, and vii) capital commitment to the instillation of an appropriate filtration system, it is the Auditor's view that this major non-conformity can be closed (S. Leporati 17 July 2017).			

		COMPLIANCE CRITERIA (Use as guidance for audit only)	**AUDIT EVIDENCE** Write down all audit evidence for each criterion. Audit evidence should be sufficiently recored/referenced so that theresult is repeatable.	**EVALUTAION**	**DESCRIPTION OF FINDING** Substantiation with explicit rationale (referenced) describing element of the requirement not met and how not met.	**VALUE/METRIC** If applicable for the respective Indicator.
8.35	**Indicator**: Evidence of implementation of biosolids (sludge) Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix VIII-4) **Requirement:** Yes **Applicability:** All Smolt Producers Using Semi-Closed or Closed Production Systems	a. Maintain a copy of smolt supplier's biosolids (sludge) management plan and confirm that the plan addresses all requirements in Appendix VIII-2. b. Obtain from smolt suppliers a process flow diagram (detailed in Appendix VIII-2) showing how the farm is dealing with biosolids responsibly. c. Obtain a declaration from smolt supplier stating that no biosolids were discharged into natural water bodies in the past 12 months. d. Obtain records from smolt suppliers showing monitoring of biosolid (sludge) cleaning maintenance, and disposal as described in Appendix VIII-2. e. Others, please describe	A. The 2 Rookwood Rd hatcheries are totally recirculating so no effluents are released into waterways, all biosolids are collected while waste water goes to irrigation. Tassal's biosolids management plan contains a declaration of the hatcheries commitment to the proper and responsible management of biosolids at Rookwood Rd hatcheries and Russell Falls hatchery. The Saltas Biosolids Management Plan (ENV-002 3p) contains process flow charts for both hatcheries. Although both are brief in nature, the management plans detail the processes involved. This includes the hiring of contractors to remove sludge and reuse it in accordance management methods approved by the EPA. Other documentation reviewed for Tassal includes: - Huon Valley Council EPN No. 2008/1 (Rookwood Road Hatchery) - Rookwood Road Hatchery (HRH) Water Re-use Scheme - Southern Water Tankered Trade Waste Consent - Derwent Valley Council Planning Permit (17/03/2015) These show high level of government compliance requirements. B. The Client has provided flow diagrams for all hatcheries, thus specifying the process and satisfying ASC requirements. - Rookwood Road Process Flow Diagram - Russell Falls Process Flow Diagram - Saltas Biosolids Management Plan (ENV-002 3p) with process flow charts for both hatcheries. C. Both declarations from the Saltas Hatchery Manager (20/01/2017) and Tassal Senior Manager Freshwater (6/03/2017) state that no sludge has been discharged from the settlement ponds/basins/lagoons into waterways. Tassal's declaration for Rookwood Rd I & II states "I can confirm that all solids are dewatered and removed by Veolia to a licenced composts facility at Plenty." For Russell Falls, the Senior Manager Freshwater states "I can confirm that all waste water discharges …. Are via our sedimentation tanks and/or settlement lagoon, and further that when the accumulated biosolids are removed they are transported as required by approved contractor Spectran Pty ltd for beneficial re-use on agricultural land. Spectran follow EPA management methods for Biosolids Reuse Regulation 12A (1) 2006." D. The 2 Rookwood Rd hatcheries are totally recirculating as no effluents are released into waterways, all biosolids are collected while waste water goes to irrigation - TWC002 - Southern Water Tankered Trade Waste Consent 9?02/2012 for Rookwood Rd. Invoices from contractors used to remove the biosolids from each of the other hatcheries have been provided including: - Saltas - Spectran Invoice (19/03/2017) for 10,000L/fortnight sludge from 3 effluent tanks, and pump out of fish wastes from seven tanks. - Tassal Veolia consolidated report Q1 FY2017, Q2 FY2017, Russell Falls – Spectran invoice (02/03/2016) and Russell Falls – AST Report (31/03/2016). Email (30/03/2017) from Operations Manager Spectran that on 28/03/2017 Spectran removed approximately 44,000 L of sludge from tanks at Russell Falls.	Compliant		

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	VR (#)
NC7	3.4.1	Major	The number of escapes that may occur due to holes in the pen netting as a result of seal predation has not been quantified.	A. The Auditor has been provided with correspondence from a Senior Manager at the DPIPWE's Marine Farming Branch, confirming that there hasn't been any reports of fish escapes from MF190. The Client's escape log lists the last significant escape occurring in December 2007 for this site. A minor non-conformity was issued for this criteria during the 2016 surveillance, regarding the recording of predator incidences and holes in nets discovered during net inspections being recorded. Currently, all losses due to predators are expected to result in mortalities (predation) rather than escapes. The Client has not attempted to estimate the quantity of fish that may escape through holes caused by seal damage. An explanation for this is that nets cannot be set in the region to capture escaped fish. Discussion with Dr Jeremy Lyle from IMAS have primarily focussed on the potential for escaped fish to establish themselves. Although this research is relevant, it doesn't answer the question of estimating how many fish may escape from holes in a salmon pen. Hence the non-conformity remains open and has been upgraded to a Major non-conformity.	November 4, 2016	Closed	N/A
NC8	5.1.1	Minor	Client's fish health management plan has been provided to the Auditor. The current plan does not detail Pilchard Orthomyxovirus (POMV). No evidence that the current version of the plan was reviewed, revised or signed by the Client's veterinarian.	A. A minor non-conformance for 5.1.1a+b was raised during the 2016 surveillance audit and was closed following evidence of actions to prevent reoccurrence.	November 4, 2016	Closed	N/A

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	VR (#)
NC9	5.1.3	Minor	For the 15YC the Client did not weigh by load. However, since weighing has been undertaken, the average bin weight has been about 700kg/bin – for the 319 bins this gives an estimated total of 223 tonnes which is only 55% of the 408 tonnes of mortalities recorded in FishTalk. Thus, there is insufficient evidence that 100% of dead fish removed from the cages are disposed of in a responsible manner. A Minor Non-conformance has been raised against this.	Site inspection confirmed that onsite activities follow operational procedures with a specific chilled container for mort bins (capacity 8-10 tonnes); the grey and cream bins can't be used for anything else. The fish bins have orange coloured ties to indicate they are from the Eastern Zone leases are transported to the Tassal Rendering Plant at Triabunna on the east coast of Tasmania by the contractor Moore's Transport. Different coloured zip ties from different zones allow source to be identified – Eastern Zone uses Orange. The plant produces fish oil and fish meal, currently of an industrial grade (for animal feeds, however, this will be refined to food grade over time. At Triabunna, incoming morts are checked, if they are too old/decomposed, they are sent to a commercial composting facility at Interlaken; thus, the morts are disposed of in a responsible manner (rendering or composting). For the 16YC & 17YC issues with quality of morts, so larger quantities have been diverted to Interlaken for composting.	June 20, 2017	Closed	N/A
NC10	5.1.5	Minor	POMV losses have been recorded with high (>10%) viral/unspecified moralities for 15YC.	In 15YC the total weight of mortalities in FishTalk was 408 tonnes (most of this was collected and transferred in 2016). The Senior Manager - Commercial & VA reported that in 2016, they received 319 bins at Triabunna from Eastern Zone (63 of the 319 bins were rejected to compost upon receival, however, no records kept of others rejected post coolroom storage or prior to tipping). During this period, they did not weigh by load, however, since weighing has been undertaken, the average bin weight has been about 700kg/bin – for the 319 bins this gives an estimated total of 223 tonnes which is only 55% of the 408 tonnes of mortalities recorded in FishTalk. Thus, there is insufficient evidence that 100% of dead fish removed from the cages are disposed of in a responsible manner. A Minor Non-conformance has been raised against this.	June 20, 2017	Open	N/A
NC11	6.2.2	Minor	D. The wording in the two young employees (ABsA) contracts is ambiguous stating that "2 days per fortnight to a maximum of 30 hrs during School time" can be worked. This could be read as up to two 15 hr days per fortnight is permissible during school term which exceeds ASC and ABsA parameters.	t is Tassals policy that all managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination and that personnel receive non discrimination training through workshops or induction processes. At the time of the audit not all staff at EZ had completed the training.	June 20, 2017	Open	N/A
NC12	6.4.1	Minor	D. Not all staff at Nubeena have been trained in antidiscrimination, harassment and bullying. The requirement is 100%	A. Employer has written anti-discrimination policy (IMS-P1004) in place, stating that the company does not engage in or support discrimination in hiring, remuneration, access to training, promotion, termination or retirement based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age or any other condition that may give rise to discrimination. B. Employer has clear and transparent company procedures (HR-100 and IMS-P1057) that outlines how to raise, file, and respond to discrimination complaints. C. Employer respects the principle of equal pay for equal work and equal access to job opportunities, promotions and raises referring to this in policies IMS-P1040 and IMS-P1045. D. It is Tassals policy that all managers and supervisors receive training on diversity and non-discrimination and that personnel receive non discrimination training through workshops or induction processes. At the time of the audit not all staff at EZ had completed the training. E Training for all staff at Nubeena was held on Monday the 19th of June, 2017.	June 20, 2017	Open	N/A
NC13	6.5.4	Observation	Observation for A and B that the JCB incident was not brought forward at audit because the Compliance Officer was on maternity leave at the time the incident occurred. One of the records of the incident was dated 19/01/2017 instead of 22/01/2017 when the incident occurred.	Several health and safety related accident records were cited (slip injury and boating incident resulting in Performance Management). The Compliance Officer at Nubeena was absent on maternity leave when a JCB rolled and connected with powerlines on the 22/1/2017. This was overlooked at the audit. The employee chose to use the JCB on 22/1/2017 without an updated license, when the incident recorded in the incident report (1066) occurred. Incident 1066 was incorrectly logged as occurring on 19/01/2017. Recommendations from the investigation were returned on the 27/1/2017 and that the incident should have been logged 29/1/2017. The driver when told of the seriousness of his decision to drive the JCB without a current license, resigned. B. The following documents are evidence that complete documentation for all occupational and safety violations and investigations is maintained. These accompanied the JCB Incident Investigation Report: License to Perform High Risk Work, Statement of Attainment detailing competencies achieved, Tassal Acknowledgement of understanding and Q&A signed by driver, Forklift induction record, JSA worksheet for task 21/1/2017, Daily start up procedure for JCB dated 21/7/2017, JCB 6 monthly checklist signed, JCB Annual Inspection Certificate dated 9/11/2016 and on 17/01/2017 a service invoice for JCB to look at steering. A Task Breakdown for mobile Crane and Forklift, including risk assessment, a witness report (handwritten) by a co-worker, dated incorrectly as occurring 20/1/2017 and a filled out Safety Management Report (1470) was also provided.	June 20, 2017	Open	N/A

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	VR (#)
NC14	7.1.1	Minor	C. Tassal intends to set up a community reference group for ongoing, formalised community consultations. This has not been initiated yet but a draft plan with timelines is documented. E. While there have been numerous presentations made by Tassal, documented evidence of agenda, minutes, feedback and outcomes are not maintained for all.	Consultations at February 17th included council and Tourism operators who contributed to the agenda, but not general community representatives. Meetings largely centred around WOW proposal and restocking Pt Arthur lease and subsequent increased road usage. The "community" forum on the 15th June was attended by 6 community members, and unfortunately missed "Gazette" promotion. Tassal has a documented plan in 2017 to initiate a community advisory group (CAG) to meet biannually and enhance community consultations.	June 20, 2017	Closed	N/A
NC15	7.1.2	Minor	B. A new community engagement website is currently being planned which will enable the farm to follow its policy for handling stakeholder complaints (the current website does not include a clear process for lodging complaints). Upgrade includes dedicated access point for phone, email complaints and FAQ's. Estimated launch of new website is late August 2017. Managers have not had sharepoint training to ensure all complaints are logged and recorded to resolution.	The farm follows its policy for handling stakeholder complaints received by email and phone (as evidenced in email responses/threads and reports to stakeholders describing corrective actions). However, at the time of the audit the new sharepoint log did not include noise complaints emailed to Creeses Mistake farm and Zone managers had not yet been trained in the system. Sharepoint is a centralised system designed to capture complaints and record responses to resolution. This will improve capture of complaints via website, DPIWE and EPA (who stated during interview that Tassal responded well to complaints raised via their portal), zone managers and staff (policy states they must all feed this information into the system. Mechanisms for capturing complaints by website will be improved and Tassal is in the process of developing a dedicated website for easy, accessible community engagement so that it is consistently effective.	June 20, 2017	Closed	N/A
NC16	8.3	Minor	The Saltas hatcheries have been identified as non-compliant for impacts on macroinvertebrate community assemblages downstream from the two farm sites (see below 8.34). The consulting researcher Prof Peter Davies has provided a context document that lists potential mitigation measures for these impacts (see 8.34). These mitigation measures or alternatives have largely not been implemented at the Saltas farm sites. Discussions with Saltas management, indicated that they have recently extracted sludge from the settlement pond at the Wayatinah hatchery (invoice for the service supplied as evidence to the Auditor), the results from this action are yet to be determined. However, given the general lack of responsiveness by Saltas to these issues over progressive years, there appears to be a general lack of commitment to addressing potential impacts. A Minor non-conformity has been raised against this.	B. Declarations have not been provided, rather commitments are made in the planning report to support the Development Application (DA) for each facility. - Russel Falls Derwent Valley Council Planning Permit (17/03/2015) - Rookwood Rd Construction Environmental Management Plan 2015 - Saltas Planning report to support DA for Wayatinah facility (includes Land Title) and Planning report support DA for Florentine facility (includes Forestry Lease correspondence). The Saltas hatcheries have been identified as non-compliant for impacts on macroinvertebrate community assemblages downstream from the two farm sites (see below 8.34). The consulting researcher Prof Peter Davies has provided a context document that lists potential mitigation measures for these impacts (see 8.34). These mitigation measures or alternatives have largely not been implemented at the Saltas farm sites. Discussions with Saltas management, indicated that they have recently extracted sludge from the settlement pond at the Wayatinah hatchery (invoice for the service supplied as evidence to the Auditor), the results from this action are yet to be determined. However, given the general lack of responsiveness by Saltas to these issues over progressive years, there appears to be a general lack of commitment to addressing potential impacts. A Minor non-conformity has been raised against this.	June 20, 2017	Open	N/A

NC reference	Indicator	Grade of NC	Description of NC	Evidence	Date of detection	Status	VR (#)
NC17	8.34	Major	Macroinvertebrate sampling demonstrated that river health was in better condition upstream from the Saltas hatcheries compared to downstream.	**C**. According to the Wayatinah Biomonitoring report for Spring 2016 the downstream site was rated as poor in contrast to the upstream site, which was rated as in good condition. The differences between the two sites in composition and abundance reflected a high level of organic enrichment at the downstream site. Most importantly this poor rating has prevailed across the summer 2014; autumn 2015, spring 2015 and autumn 2016 sampling periods, indicating that the Client's action plans have not brought about improvement. A similar pattern was observed at the Florentine hatchery where upstream conditions were rated as good and downstream as poor. In terms of progressive ratings, downstream spring 2016 sampling at the Florentine hatchery displayed poorer conditions than during autumn 2014, spring 2014 and autumn 2015 (rated as moderate), yet better than autumn 2016. Regardless, this hatchery has also displayed consistent negative impacts on benthic health, demonstrating that neither hatchery meets the ASC standard. Major non-conformity. The Lead Auditor has discussed these matters with Prof Peter Davies of Freshwater Systems researcher who conducted the biomonitoring assessment. Prof Davies reinforced the findings from his surveys and directed the Auditor to the document he provided to the Client titled "Context for the Tassal-Saltas ASC compliance assessments under the ASC macroinvertebrate standard" October 2015. Prof Davies advice on how to mitigate the impacts of the farm on river health for the Saltas hatcheries comprised of: Florentine 1) discharge via a second pipeline from the settlement pond outlet to the Derwent River (a distance of ca 200 m). The relative volume of discharge from the hatchery to the Derwent and Florentine Rivers could be regulated in relation to flow in each river, noting that flow in the Derwent above Lake Catagunya is often low and frequently variable. The potential for impact on Lake Catagunya would need to be scoped, but is likely to be lower than the localised intense impact on the rivers. 2) improving discharge quality by addition of drum filtering and/or further treatment; 3) reducing discharge quantity/loads by partial or shandied re-circ. and/or land disposal. Wayatinah - same as above excluding option 1 and including the following. 1) improving downstream dilution of the discharge by requesting Hydro Tasmania to provide sustained water release/diversion into the Derwent upstream of Wayatinah offtake; and/or 2) shifting the discharge (all or part) to a location within the lagoon body in order to maximise the dilution provided by the combination of flow inputs from the Nive River and Derwent River – ensuring this location is 'downstream' of any hatchery lagoon intake. As of March 2017, the Saltas Wayatinah hatchery settlement pond pumped for sludge. The effects of this action have not yet been determined.	June 20, 2017	Open	N/A

NC reference	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions implemented	Deadline for NC close-out
NC7	Tassal is confident that losses due to predators result in mortalities (predation) rather than escapes. When a seal is found in a pen the net is inspected and any holes are repaired by divers immediately. Employees complete MO-F364 In Pen Seal Breach Form – Eastern Zone. This internal document contains a section titled 'Potential for fish escape'. If the response to this is 'possible', the pen will be counted at the next handling event. If the count shows a variance this would be reported to the Environment and Sustainability department for recording of possible escape event and reporting to the Marine Farming Branch (MFB) of DPIPWE if it constituted a significant escape (>500 fish).	The Client has proposed a staged approach to closing out this major non-conformity as follows: 1) Provide contextual evidence to support Tassal's position, where video footage has been provided to the Auditor showing seals engaging with holes in nets and fish behaviour. 2) Operational response - site management. When a seal is found in a pen, the net is inspected and any holes are repaired by divers immediately. Employees complete MO-F364 In Pen Seal Breach Form – Eastern Zone. This internal document contains a section titled 'Potential for fish escape'. If the response to this is 'possible', the pen will be counted at the next handling event. If the count shows a variance this would be reported to the Environment and Sustainability department for recording of possible escape event and reporting to the Marine Farming Branch (MFB) of DPIPWE if it constituted a significant escape (>500 fish). The Eastern Zone have implemented seven day dive coverage so that if there are any incidents of seal attacks, divers are present and can respond faster than an on call dive team. 3) Wildlife exclusion technologies (K-grid). All cage netting is heavily weighted to tension the netting to provide protection against seal predation. The above water surface portion of each cage is covered by a net with a high tensile mesh size of less than 115 mm to prevent seals entering cages. The implementation of K-Grid nets across MF 190 is the key preventative action for this non-conformance. To date K-Grids have been 100% successful. Full implementation is expected to be complete by March 2018. K-Grid netting is made of a high tenacity knotless stiffened polyester mesh. K-Grids have proven successful to date with zero seals or sharks breaching the nets. 4) Escape prevention and response. This includes: i) a diving regime to routinely monitor net integrity, sub-surface inspections for holes, conditions of mooring lines and cage infrastructure, ii) daily inspections of bird netting, iii) stock transactions only to occur in weather conditions that do not present an unacceptable risk of fish escapes and iv) staff training. 5) Ongoing research. Tassal has engaged the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Science, University of Tasmania, to conduct a project looking at fish behaviour and movement through various sized holes in fish nets. This project is being facilitated by Tassal's Senior Manager – Breeding & Research and is currently being discussed internally at IMAS to determine an option for developing a student project. All predator incidences are recorded, and holes in nets discovered during net inspections are repaired and recorded. The Eastern Zone have also recently implemented seven day dive coverage so that if there are any incidents of seal attacks, divers are present and can respond faster than an on call dive team. The implementation of K-Grid nets across MF 190 is the key preventative action for this non-conformance. To date K-Grids have been 100% successful. Full implementation is expected to be complete by June 2018. Tassal has also been proactive in conducting research regarding the potential for escaped fish to establish in Tasmania, and this is ongoing. Recently, Tassal has initiated further conversations with IMAS about the potential to conduct a study on fish escapes in the South East. This project is being led by Tassal's Senior Manager – Breeding and Research.	3 months
NC8	When the FHMP was developed, the knowledge of POMV was limited. And now, knowledge of POMV risk factors are still limited but research is underway for a vaccine and to understand the pathogen.	Fish Health Management Plan to be reviewed and updated. Document will include a section confirming sign off by company veterinarian. Fish Health Management Plan will be reviewed and updated annually by company veterinarian.	12 months

NC reference	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions implemented	Deadline for NC close-out
NC9	Triabunna records do not equal to those in Fish Talk – issue with record keeping process and traceability.	Improve records being kept at Triabunna Rendering to reflect biomasses processed and those disposed of via composting. Amend record keeping processes to eliminate this NC from recurring- ensuring there is accurate weighing of mortalities being processed and composted; and adequate traceability.	3 Months.
NC10	Pilchard orthomyxovirus infection- baitfish exposure causing transmission of disease.	Maintain good biosecurity strategy to reduce transmission of the virus. POM-V strategy built into FHMP and early detection- surveillance program implemented in 2015 for early detection of disease for early intervention.	3 months
NC11	I think the confusion comes from the FAQ sheet from the Department of Education which states: "you are allowed to work between 7.5 and 15 hours in the workplace each week. This can be one or two days at work in school time or you may even work after school hours and on the weekend". We extended this to fortnights given that's the way we work however, on reflection this could be read as one 15hr day.	Given the restriction is on hours (not days), we will reword the contracts to read: "you will work between 15 hours and up to a maximum of 30 hours per fortnight during School time". We have developed a School-Based Apprenticeships policy and sent out to all the relevant Managers at our Zones, which outlines the details around School-Based Apprentices so that there is a clearer understanding of the program. The wording states "ensure a minimum of 7.5 hours (maximum of 15 hours) of work per week. The Client's Environmental Certification and Sustainability Officer will meet with the Apprenticeship Network Provider (MEGT) and the Department of Education on the 30th of August to discuss the potential for an exemption for our Southern based farms (Southern, Channel, Eastern) to extend the maximum working hours to 20 per week. This would allow for two shifts per week (17.14 hours) + some extra hours to cater for those times when a day's work goes over the normal working hours	3 months
NC12	Employees who did not receive training were either on leave or had not yet started with Tassal when the training was conducted.	A second training session will be conducted to capture staff who have not received training. Anti-discrimination training will continue to be rolled out to capture all employees. Training will be included in induction process to ensure all new employees are captured.	3 months
NC13	N/A	N/A	N/A

NC reference	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions implemented	Deadline for NC close-out
NC14	Tassal has conducted a range of community engagement activities across the Eastern Zone under the current audit timeline. Sensational media backlash and campaign groups targeting Tassal, made it particularly difficult to facilitate meaningful engagement with ensuing interest by these party members across the Eastern Zone.	Tassal has undergone an internal stakeholder engagement strategy review to better communicate and provide opportunity for members of the broader community to meet in a constructive forum. Tassal is establishing community reference groups for ongoing, formalised community consultations. A draft plan with timelines is documented and has been provided to auditors. Documented evidence of agenda, minutes, feedback and outcomes will be maintained for these meetings.	3 months
NC15	Feedback and complaints generated as a result of increased media attention placed additional burden on the existing stakeholder complaint management system and processes. The system was not adequately evolved to capture and document the complaints that arose from these events.	The complaints procedure has been updated and complaints made through other avenues are being captured. To address this non-conformity, Tassal has developed a seven step action plan. The first five steps have been implemented and are operational, while the final two are underway, with timeframes in place to completion. Zone Manager training for the complaints system is scheduled for the next Zone Manager meeting on 29 August 2017. The new website is currently in development.	3 months
NC16	Historically to address criteria 8.3, Saltas has referred to the note within the ASC audit manual where it is possible to use documents from regulatory processes to demonstrate compliance. Documents provided previously included Planning Reports to support development applications to Council that include environmental considerations.	Tassal on behalf of Saltas have initiated conversations with consultants from Freshwater Systems to discuss how components within appendix I-3 can be addressed and reported on within the same framework as the work completed for criteria 8.34. Going forward it is anticipated that requirements under criteria 8.3 will be addressed within reports developed for criteria 8.34.	12 months

NC reference	Root cause (by client)	Corrective/ preventive actions implemented	Deadline for NC close-out
NC17	Existing settlement pond may not be coping adequately with the solids discharged from the hatchery. Addressing this criteria will involve significant capital investment. Tassal has continued to work with Saltas and freshwater consultants to determine the scale of works required to improve the abundance aspect of macroinvertebrate conditions downstream of both the Saltas Florentine hatchery and the Wayatinah hatchery. Both hatcheries are impacting the receiving water biota by discharge of a combination of suspended organic solids and water chemistry. Specific to the influence of hatchery outfalls, low to moderate levels of nutrient enrichment in streams can cause changes in both abundance and/or diversity of macroinvertebrate communities primarily due to enhanced benthic algal production. These effects are greater at the Saltas Wayatinah facility than the Saltas Florentine facility. With regards to the Saltas Wayatinah facility, the fauna is variable in composition due to major fluctuations in the flow regime caused by releases and spills from Hydro Tasmania infrastructure. In addition, periodically high water levels in the Wayatinah Lagoon can result in temporary inundation of the Derwent River channel immediately downstream of the hatchery outfall, and this partial 'ponding' can exacerbate benthic responses to the impact of the Wayatinah hatchery outfall. To achieve compliance at both Industry owned hatcheries, a reduction in the load of organic particulates is required. A reduction in dissolved nutrient loads would also be effective as a secondary action. In response to this, Tassal have made a commitment of capital expenditure to install a drum screen at both facilities by June 2018. In the interim, Tassal will implement a number of other mitigation strategies, detailed below, to improve water quality and reduce environment impact until the drum screens are commissioned.	**Stage 1: Identify biological impacts of effluent through biological and water quality monitoring.** • The Client has re-contracted Prof Davies of Freshwater Systems (author of 2015 context report above) in June 2017 to conduct the following: i) Collate and analyses data on benthic macroinvertebrates from the hatcheries, incorporating: water quality, farm (water flows, feed etc.) and river flow data. ii) Assessment of benthic macroinvertebrate responses to deployment of drum screen or other mitigation options, either in full installation and/or trial modes. **Stage 2: Revise Saltas Biosolids Management Plan (ENV-002).** • The Client has revised their Biosolids Management Plan to include a new commitment to desludging the settlement ponds at both Saltas hatcheries on an annual basis at minimum. **Stage 3: Reduce smolt production at Saltas hatcheries.** • As an immediate response to the major non-conformity, annual production for 2017 will be reduced by 20% overall. This equates to an 82 t drop in production and will result in an associated reduction in feed. The results of this drop in production on stream health will be witnessed in the spring 2018 benthic macroinvertebrate monitoring for both hatcheries. **Stage 4: Desludging of settlement ponds.** • A financial commitment has been made by the company to dredge the Florentine settlement pond in August 2017 and Wayatinah in November 2017. The Client has provided the Auditor with a copy of a works description and quote from the waste removal company Spectran to desludge the Florentine settlement pond. The Client has estimated that desludging will result in a 200% increase in pond volumes and therefore residence times, for both the Florentine and Wayatinah settlement ponds. The expected water quality improvements for this practice are reductions in total phosphorus, total nitrogen and Biological Oxygen Demand. Annual sludge removal has been built in to the Biosolids Management Plan as the most effective short term measure to this issue. **Stage 5: Identify improvements in suspended solids and other parameters required to achieve compliance.** • Consultants from Freshwater Systems have been engaged to provide advice regarding the level of reduction in suspended solids and other parameters required to achieve compliance. Freshwater Systems have determined that further information will be required to sufficiently relate discharge loads to degree of change in macroinvertebrate community structure. To pursue this analysis, the Client will provide additional data on nutrient loads over the coming months based on dates and time periods determined by Freshwater Systems. The Client has thus far provided Freshwater Systems with historical water quality monitoring results and increased future water quality sampling frequencies. In addition, the Client has held meetings with Freshwater Systems to facilitate their further understanding of the operational context and drum screen scoping requirements. **Stage 6: Sustainable hatchery feed technology.** • The Client has been working with their feed supplier to investigate a feed based solution to reduce organic load at the Saltas hatcheries. By introducing binding additives in the feed, the risk of fine particulates re-suspending in the settlement ponds is minimised and the efficiency and efficacy of the desludging process improved. The Client has recently implemented this change in feed types at the hatcheries. **Stage 7: Identify interim, additional or alternative methods to achieve compliance.** • The Client has met with and will continue to engage with a range of providers to review, discuss and trial a suite of alternative methods including: micro bubble aeration, Nano bubbles and a vacuum pump; wastewater treatment through the use of macro and micro algae and bioremediation by removing nitrogen with algae. The Client's listed alternatives can only be considered as possibilities at present, but demonstrate a commitment to finding alternate solutions. **Stage 8: Drum screen specification and approval.** • Using the fully Client owned and presently ASC compliant Russell Falls hatchery as a guide, the Client proposes to install a similar drum screen system at the industry owned Saltas hatcheries. The specifications for the Faivre filter system used at Russell Falls has been provided to the auditor as proof of concept. The flow rates at the Wayatinah and Florentine hatcheries are within the same range as the Russell Falls hatchery. Quotations for the installation of the drum screens have been sought from the two main local suppliers Technolab and FBD. **Stage 9: Drum screen installation.** • The Client has also provided a "Statement of Intent" from the CEO declaring the company's commitment to investing in the capital expenditure required to bring the Saltas hatcheries into compliance with the ASC requirements. The early estimates of practical removal efficiency of a drum screen indicate a considerable reduction in particulates, which should translate to improved stream health.J26	3 months

NC reference	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
NC7	Further research to quantify the number of fish that may escape as a product of holes in nets should assist in satisfying the requirements of the Standard. The video footage provided by the Client showed that the salmon do not generally engage with seal sized holes in a net, this is non-conclusive, but corresponds with the accounts of multiple divers and net cleaners interviewed at Tassal lease sites around Tasmania. The operational response should generally assist in minimising the potential for fish to escape from holes caused by seals and assist in determining if significant quantities of escaped fish occur. The Client has provided copies of dive report forms, which record the identification, size and the mending of holes caused by seals. Farm staff have informed the auditor that holes caused by seals are easily identifiable compared to those caused by sharks, which are considerably larger. All staff interviewed have stated that they haven't seen a shark (primarily seven-gill sharks) bite a hole in a pen for at least a few years. The records provided and interviews with staff indicate that holes are identified and mended as quickly as possible. The introduction of k-grid pens throughout MF190 should remove any threat of seals biting holes in the nets. The Auditor's discussions with staff across all roles in each zone, have confirmed that there haven't been any incidents of seals biting holes in k-grid netting. The escape prevention and response described by the Client is typical net management and is something that will require consistent diligence for it to be effective. The quantification of fish that may escape from holes in nets is planned to be addressed in the proposed research with IMAS. The Auditor accepts that determining potential escapes through holes is not a simple exercise, given the scale of operations. The preliminary research objectives and available expertise at IMAS should adequately address this issue, although it will require an appropriate research period. Given that the Client, is actively checking nets, mending them immediatley, is in the process of changing all nets to ones seals haven't been able to bite holes in and has instigated research to address this, it is the Auditor's view that this non-conformity should be closed (13 September 2017). It should be noted that followup evidence of research activities and K-grid net deployment will be monitored during future audits.					
NC8	The Fish Health Management Plan has been sufficiently reviewed and updated, thus closing out this non-conformity. The 15YC had a second year of high losses to POMV, possible related to stress; low incidents of TSRV virus were also found during passive surveillance, no need for further sampling. For current 17YC there have been no major signs of virus of disease issues. The MO-152 Fish Health Management Plan – Macquarie Harbour and the MO-175 Fish Health Management Plan - South East Region have been combined into the expanded Farm Disease Management and Biosecurity Protocol (MO-116 Issue 4 33p). This major review was led by the Senior Fish Health Manager (SFHM) with the Zone Managers. It was revised with Zero Harm Intent as documented in the IMS-P1090 Zero Harm for Fish Animal Welfare Policy ((Issue # 2, 28/09/2015 1p). According to the SFHM it details the 'gold standards' for all fish health & biosecurity activities and procedures. It includes a new Section 15 for Pilchard Orthomyxovirus (POMV); this virus is also referenced in Section 12 Fish Health Incident Reporting and Emergencies.The FHMP is augmented by the new 35-page MO-501 Salmon Disease Guide which covers all endemic and exotic diseases for Salmon in Tasmania. It contains a high number of photos, diagrams, descriptions, clinical signs and other information to assist in classifying diseases and other causes of mortalities. Water proof copies have been provided to all divers and all Technical Officers (TOs). It will also be used for all divers and TOs during the refresher training course scheduled for August. This training is supported by annual refresher by Seafood Training Tasmania (STT) completed for 12 Eastern Zone employees on 30/08/16. The focus is on normal vs. abnormal behaviour and appearance, taking and preserving samples for laboratory analysis.Unchanged documents reviewed providing evidence of conformance include: - ES-F104 Fish Health Incident Report (06/01/16, I#1 2p) - IMS-106 Integrated Incident Reporting & Investigation Procedure (29/01/16, I#7 19p) for Fish Health, WHS & Quality. - The MO-430 Mortality Rate Trigger Response Procedure (09/01/15, Issue #1 1p) is set at >0.1% daily mortality per pen. In Eastern Zone mortality is expected to be higher in summer around splitting & bathing, higher environmental stress. IMS-106 states that on first discovery of any fish health or escape issue, actions must be put into place immediately to minimise the impact of spread. All Fish Health related incidents as defined in the definitions tables for each category are to be recorded on incident report ES-F104 form and forwarded to the Fish Health - Field Officer & Technical Officer within the required time frame. Incident reports are to be fully completed by the Team Leader in consultation with the worker involved. Incidents are to be investigated by Site Management and controls implemented that prevent re-occurrence, these are to be closed off and signed by Management on completion. All incidents are to be investigated by Site Management and the completed preliminary investigation report (WHS-F100) forwarded to the Senior Manager Fish Health for further investigation and/or recommendations. B. On Q-Pulse, the Electronic document system, the changes made by Vet identified as CR36.38 20/06/2017 includes a request to release new documentation, this is the electronic signature in Review Change Requests for this revised document.					

NC reference	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
NC9	Revising and improving record keeping and associated processes should assist in closing out this non-conformity. The Client has changed their system to involve the following traceability aspects: - Dive crew mortality report sheets (MO-F230) altered to include bin number. - Bin number coded as zone/year/month/date/quantity. For example a bin from the Eastern Zone on the 31 August 2017 would be EZ170831a, the "a" specifies the first bin, the second would be "b" and so on. - A sticker clearly identifying the bin number will be applied. - Noting of bin numbers in a load by the truck diver at pick-up, if a bin is unable to be identified then it will stay behind until it can be identified. - At the recieving point the fork lift driver will record date and bin numbers. - If paperwork is incomplete for any bin then the bin is excluded and identified as non ASC compliant. - The forklift driver will record bin number when tipped to process or sent to compost. The aforermentioned processes will enable the Client to more efficiently track their mortality records and conform to the requirements of the Standard. This effectively closes out the non-conformity (S.Leporati 11 September 2017).					
NC10	The effectiveness of the biosecurity strategy will require continual review to ensure it's effectiveness.					
NC11	The proposed actions should assist in closing out this non-conformity. Meeting with the network provider and department of Education will help enable the hours worked are conforming with local regulations.					
NC12	Further training sessions and the inclusion of training for future induction processes should assist in closing out this non-conformity.					
NC13	N/A					

NC reference	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
NC14	Tassal has provided a documented strategy and timeframes to engage councils, NGOs, ENGO's, "Friends of" groups, Landcare/coastcare groups, NRM, Recreational fishers (TARfish), Boaties, educators, research bodies, DPIWE, MAST, local community groups and community members in developing a Channel and Southern Region Community Advisory Group (SRCAG). SRCAG will meet quarterly in-line with the existing Western region community group. This strategy dovetails with the Community Engagement Strategy which includes a new website, dedicated portal for complaints, quarterly Newsletters. A realistic draft schedule to implement this strategy has been cited. These actions should address the need for bi annual, meaningful consultation where community representatives contribute to the agenda and effectively closes out this minor non-conformity					
NC15	Tassal has a 7 step plan toward developing a new system for complaints. The first five steps have been implemented and are operational, while the final two are underway, with timeframes in place to completion. Completed actions include; a dedicated email address for complaints community@tassal.com.au providing direct access for stakeholders to the Tassal Corporate Engagement and Community Relations team (promoted through all future newsletters and communications with the public), Increased resourcing with two full time positions - a Communications Manager – appointed 14 March 2017 and Senior Manager, Corporate Engagement– appointed 3 April 2017, Quarterly Newsletters have been developed for Macquarie Harbour, Okehampton and Tasman and will continue to be developed as per a documented schedule, for all regions. These will promote complaints and enquiries and their resolution, **ES-120 Community and Stakeholder Complaints Procedure** (Appendix 4) and **IMS-P1103 Community Complaints Policy** continue to be updated with a 48hr response to all enquiries and complaints and are in the process of being endorsed, The Tassal IT department have developed a SharePoint portal to capture and track all enquiries and complaints. Complaints are being entered currently. The final stages include; training of all zone managers in the use of sharepoint so that all enquiries and complaints are logged. This is planned to be complete by end of September, 2017. A dedicated website for community engagement is out for tender and is expected to be operational by end of August 2017. These actions should effectively address community access to a complaint mechanism, timely response to complaints, logging of all complaints and subsequent resolution of complaints inline with policy and procedure. The non conformity is therefore closed out.					
NC16	In response to this minor non-conformity, the Client has contracted Prof Davies to conduct a Biodiversity-focused Environmental Impact Assessment (B-EIA) for the Saltas and Russell Falls hatcheries. The scope of the work to be conducted by Prof Davies will be aligned with Standard, incorporating the following: - Review data to identify candidate listed species and locations. List relevant species and characterise relative risks. - Identify all Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystem Values (CFEV) High rated RCV and ICV (Relative and Integrated Conservation Value) stream reaches, lakes, estuaries and wetlands potentially affected by farm operations and discharges. List relevant habitats and characterise relative risks. - Review sources and identify: Priority species – CFEV; commercial fishery species – eels; recreational fishery species - brown trout and bream. Assess relative significance of farm receiving waters for sensitive species within local and state context. List relevant species and characterise relative risks. - List potential causes/risk factors of environmental aquatic impact. Scan data sources for potential nutrient, antibiotic, toxicant, xenobiotic chemical and disease impacts on receiving rivers, nutrient status of lakes, nutrient status of estuaries. List and characterise risks from most relevant potential causes/risk factors. - Summarise current Tassal/Saltas procedures and assessments. Discuss current and future strategies with Tassal/Saltas personnel. Collate information and summarise key features and needs of programs and strategies. - Review current Tassal/Saltas monitoring programs. Collate information and summarise key features and needs for monitoring. The scope of the B-EIA combined with the actions and planned works described in 8.34, will assist in addressing this non-conformity. An extension beyond the 90 working day deadline for this minor non-conformity will be sought so the B-EIA can be effectively completed.	17 July 2017 as part of an earlier audit which involved the same hatcheries.	To enable the B-EIA to be conducted appropriately with sufficient time lines to identify a range of applicable impacts.	July 17, 2018	The extension is granted on the basis that the B-EIA and measures identified in 8.34 need sufficient time to be implemented and adapted if necessary.	July 17, 2017

NC reference	Evaluation by CAB (including evidence)	Date request for delay received	Justification for delay	Next deadline	Request evaluation by CAB	Date request approved
NC17	The Client has demonstrated a considerable level of intent and commitment to closing out this major nonconformity through a mixture of short, medium and longer term solutions. Client has: A. identified root cause - adequacy of settlement ponds and allocation of necessary financial resources to address the finding. B. Submitted a comprehensive 9-stage action plan. C. Provided evidence of implementation of the stages 1-5 of the plan. D. Taken together SCS assess that the plan's implemented actions and preventive actions appear sufficient to address the root cause of the non-conformity (Q&A3_CAR_v.0_17.10) Documentary evidence: • Tassal Western Zone Client Action Plan_NC20_FinalDraft.pdf • Appendix 1.pdf - Statement of Intent • Appendix 2.pdf - Context for the Tassal-Saltas ASC compliance assessments under the ASC macroinvertebrate standard • Appendix 3 – Saltas budget commitment • Appendix 4 – Contractor agreement • Appendix 5 – Scope of Works • Appendix 6 – Third Party proposal 1a (ThermoFisher Scientific – Nano Bubble Generators) • Appendix 7 – 3rd Party proposal 1b (ThermoFisher Scientific – correspondence w/ Imbros) • Appendix 8 – Third Party Proposal 2a (MBD Wastewater Treatment) • Appendix 9 – Third Party Proposal 2b (MBD Algal Bioremediation Strategy) • Invoice 9176.pdf - Evidence of payment to Spectran for sludge removal at Florentine (demonstrates implementation for Stage 4) • Various monitoring reports from ALS Laboratory group (demonstrates implementation Stage 5) (SCS- JSwecker 17Sept2017)	July 17, 2017	The Client has demonstrated a considerable level of intent and commitment to closing out this major non-conformity through a mixture of short, medium and longer term solutions. Given that this compliance criteria involves a highly dynamic environment, it is impractical to expect a conclusive change in macroinvertebrate community structure in the downstream site, for the time allowed to close out the major non-conformity. To do so would provide opportunity for sampling to occur in favourable conditions, thus masking the problem. Given the Client's commitment to i) increasing monitoring, ii) sludge removal from settlement ponds, iii) decreasing hatchery production, iv) altering feed composition, v) contracting experts to determine implication of actions to instream health, vi) voluntary reporting to the CAB prior to the next surveillance audit and vii) capital commitment to the installation of an appropriate filtration system, it is the Auditor's view that this major [appears to be being addressed]	2018 Surveillance Audit June 20, 2018 (+/- 3 months)	By the 2018 Surveillance audit the client has planned to have completed all 9 stages of their Action Plan including installation of the drum screens and at least one post-drum installation biomonitoring report should be availalbe to demonstrate improvements in down stream health and estimatation of level of hatchery-dependent affects on downstream results. Interpretation response was received by SCS from ASC on 28 September allowing SCS to make determination on extending NC17 and finalizing Certification Decision.	29 September 2017

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.	Low Risk	All fish produced on the farm lease have been included in the scope of the ASC farm assessment.
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.	Low Risk	All fish produced on the farm lease have been included within the scope of this assessment. Only one individual pen from a farm lease is harvested at one time and will receive a unique harvest ID number.
10.3	The possibility of subcontractors being used to handle, transport, store, or process certified products.	Low Risk	Transportation to the processing facility is subcontracted. The fish are counted at harvest and receipt at the processing facility.
10.4	Any other opportunities where certified product could potentially be mixed, substituted, or mislabelled with non-certified product before the point where product enters the chain of custody.	No Risk	At no point is there an opportunity for mixing certified and non-certified fish.

10.5	Detail description of the flow of certified product within the operation and the associated traceability system which allows product to be traced from final sale back to the unit of certification	Smolt are delivered to the farm using a subcontracted trucking company. Once on the farm, the fish will remain in one grow-out pen until market size is reached. A harvest plan is followed according to an annual then weekly schedule based on customer demands. Harvested fish are taken to the processing facility by the harvest boat. Fish are counted using a calibrated counter during harvest and then again at the processing facility to ensure the integrity of the CoC system.

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	Yes
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.	N/A the system is sufficient.
10.6.3	The point from which chain of custody is required to begin.	At unloading at the processing facility.
10.6.4	Is a separate chain of custody certificate required for the producer?	No not for the producer. There is a separate CoC certificate in place for the processing facilities (MSC-C-54608).

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.	The re-assessment audit addressed four existing non-conformities and identified two new majors, ten minors and two observation. The following is a breakdown of these findings. Four existing non-conformities from the previous surveillance audit were addressed, as follows: 5.1.1 was closed out for the fish health management plan; 2.5.6 was closed out for birds, but a new non-conformity has been identified for seals; 2.5.7 the lack of a risk assessment was closed out, however a new incident without opportunity to enact the findings from a risk assessment has instigated a new minor non-conformity; 3.4.1 the Client has not quantified escapes through holds in nets turning this previously minor non-conformity into a major. This non-conformity has been closed out. New findings from the re-assessment audit, include one major non-conformity for impacts on stream health at the Saltas hatchery, which was closed out. Related to this non-conformity is a minor for failing to implement a plan to address environmental impacts at the hatcheries. Further minors were given for i) failure to use appropriate vessel navigational marks which lead to a collision, ii) maximum viral disease-related mortality, iii) dead fish disposal procedures, iv) roll-out of anti-discrimination training, v) effectiveness of community consultation and vi) community complaints procedures. An observation was given for misreporting (over reporting) wildlife mortalities on the companies website and delayed reporting to the Audit Team for a workplace incident involving a telehandler. Post Draft Report non-conformities were identified during July 2017 under 1.1.1 for a collision incident with the towing of a pipe and 2.5.7 & 2.5.6 when two seals perished in the false bottom of one of the pens. The major non-conformity for the collision has been closed out and the minor non-conformities for the seal deaths have been given extensions to determine if mitigation measures are appropriate.
12.2 A clear statement on whether or not the audited unit of certification has the capability to consistently meet the objectives of the relevant standard(s).	The unit of certification has the capability to meet the certification requirements. The overall operation is consistent with ASC objectives and demonstrates a well run salmon farm.
123 In cases where Biodiversity Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA) or Participatory Social Impact Assessment (PSIA) is available, it shall be added in full to the audit report. IF these documents are not in English, then a synopsis in English shall be added to the report as well.	A B-EIA is presently in the process of being drafted for the Saltas hatchery. Upon availability this document will be attached to the report.

13 Decision

13.1 Has a certificate been issued? (yes/no)	Yes
13.2 The Eligibility Date (if applicable)	N/A
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.	Validity date: 18 September 2017 Expiration date: 17 September 2020
13.4.2 The scope of the certificate	Aquaculture production of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) from the Tasman Region MF 190 - Creeses Mistake
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.	

14 Surveillance

14.1 Next planned Surveillance	
14.1.1 Planned date	21 June 2018
14.1.2 Planned site	
14.2 Next audit type	
14.2.1 Surveillance 1	Single
14.2.2 Surveillance 2	Single
14.2.3 Re-certification	Singe
14.2.4 Other (specify type)	

FORM 1 – REQUEST FOR INTERPRETATION OR VARIANCE

1.1 Name of CAB	1.2 Date of Submission	1.3 CAB Contact Person	1.4 Email of CAB Contact Person
SCS Global Services	13th March 2014	Sabine Daume	SDaume@scsglobalservices.com

1.5 ASC Document Reference
ASC Salmon Standard V1.0 2.1 Benthic biodiversity and benthic effects 2.2 Water quality in and near the site of operation
1.6 Background (Provide full explanation of the issue)

Comprehensive regional monitoring programs are already established for the Tasmanian salmon farming industry to measure benthic biodiversity, benthic effects and water quality.

This criterion's rationale provided by ASC is closely aligned with the Tasmanian salmon farming industry's approach. In Tasmania a collaborative approach with several companies including Tassal was developed to understanding the function of the marine system. The understanding of the marine ecosystem is important as it shows the functionality of the system rather than using methods that only provide a snapshot at a particular point in time.

Tassal requested to submit this variance in order to be able to retain environmental monitoring under current regulatory processes as it is built on many years of credible, robust research, addressing issues discussed in the ASC rationale for these criterion.

2.1.1 Redox potential or[3] sulphide levels in sediment outside of the Allowable Zone of Effect (AZE),[4] following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1
Redox potential > 0 millivolts (mV) OR Sulphide ≤ 1,500 microMoles / l

Redox is a requirement under Schedule 3B for new leases but thereafter is not monitored unless at the discretion of the Marine Farming Branch (MFB) of the Department of Primary Industry, Parks, Water and Environment (DPIPWE) or lease holder. The MFB can at any stage request the lease holder to sample for redox or sulphides. Historical data suggests that no marine farming lease has had a redox potential below zero or sulphides above 1,500 microMoles. To address this criteria, Tassal propose to continue using the researched and approved visual assessment methodology under Schedule 3V of the Marine Farming Licence to replace chemical proxies such as redox and sulphide, which presents itself as spontaneous outgassing of sediments without or upon disturbance. A variance request has already been granted for a similar approach but a different Tassal farming region (Macquarie Harbour).

2.1.2 Faunal index score indicating good[5] to high ecological quality in sediment outside the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1
AZTI Marine Biotic Index (AMBI[6]) score ≤ 3.3, or Shannon-Wiener Index score > 3, or Benthic Quality Index (BQI) score ≥ 15, or Infaunal Trophic Index (ITI) score ≥ 25

The indices referred to by the ASC are fairly commonplace in benthic faunal evaluations, and are a core component of sediment quality assessments in Europe and the Americas; however Australia and Tasmania specifically are not a complete fit. The similarities and differences in the local Tasmanian ecology

compared with overseas systems, are well recognised (Macleod *et al*. 2004 & 2007 and Edgar 2010), as are the differences between Northern and Southern Hemisphere systems (Macleod *et al*. 2008, Keeley *et al*.

2012). As a result it has been highlighted that many of the biotic indices metrics derived in northern context do not readily translate to Australian context. Many of the recommended faunal indices are species specific but not all. Currently benthic biodiversity is analysed using Bray-Curtis Similarity Index and multidimensional scaling (MDS). A variance request has already been granted for a similar approach but a different Tassal farming region (Macquarie Harbour).

2.1.3 Number of macrofaunal taxa in the sediment within the AZE, following the sampling methodology outlined in Appendix I-1
≥ 2 highly abundant[7] taxa that are not pollution indicator species

Tassal's farms in the SE region of Tasmania in the Huon River and D'Entrecasteaux Channel Marine Farm Development Plan Areas have been well studied as per Tasmanian (Southern Hemisphere) systems. Tassal propose the possibility of ASC recognising that there is enough infauna data from previous studies (the majority of them conducted in this specific region) to assess benthic impacts using visual means rather than faunal indices. Under Schedule 3B of the Marine Farming Licence Tassal is required by law to investigate benthic infauna (see above)

2.1.4 Definition of a site-specific AZE based on a robust and credible[8] modelling system
Yes, within three years of the publication[9] of the ASC Salmon Standard

The AZE is 35 metres and this distance was defined by the regulators (Marine Farming Branch) based on multiple lines of evidence from the international (Brown *et al*. 1987; Gowen *et al*. 1988; Cromey *et al*. (1998); Hargrave *et al*. 1993; Cromey *et al.* 2002) and local research (Macleod 2000; Crawford 2002; Macleod *et al.* 2004). This 35 m AZE has been in place for over 15 years as a part of the licence conditions. Monitoring since then by research bodies and farms has provided the government with evidence that a 35 m AZE is a suitable distance for this particular farming environment.

2.2.3 For jurisdictions that have national or regional coastal water quality targets[17], demonstration through third-party analysis that the farm is in an area recently[18] classified as having "good" or "very good" water quality[19]
Yes[20]

SE Regions (North West Bay, Dover, Tasman, Bruny and Huon Regions)
The Tasmanian Salmon farming industry have had a SE (South East of Tasmania) Broadscale Environmental Monitoring Program (BEMP) which was implemented in 2009 in association with a State regulated Nitrogen Cap. The Macquarie Harbour FFEMP (Fish Farm Environmental Monitoring Program) as per the MH AMA was developed on the same principles. The SE BEMP is further developed, with more environmental parameters measured, than the MH FFEMP and has recently undergone a third party scientific review by the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Sciences (IMAS). The review can be found at http://dpipwe.tas.gov.au/Documents/Ross---Macleod-BEMP-Data-Review-2009-2012-.pdf#search=broadscale%20environmental%20monitoring%20program. Assessment of the monitoring data (the review) has shown that at current levels of industry production, which are capped under regulation, the ecosystem has the capacity to assimilate the inputs from salmon farms. The BEMP was developed from an ecological model which generated water quality triggers and compliance against these triggers and is government-mandated within Tassal`s jurisdiction.

Benthic monitoring is conducted as outlines above.

2.2.4 For jurisdictions without national or regional coastal water quality targets, evidence of weekly monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous[21] levels on farm and at a reference site, following methodology in Appendix I-5

If the method for addressing 2.2.3 are approved with this variance request, this criterion would be

redundant.

References

Crawford, C. M., Macleod, C. K., and Mitchell, I. Evaluation of Techniques for Environmental Monitoring of Salmon Farms in Tasmania. Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute, University of Tasmania, May 2002.

Macleod, C., Forbes, S., Bisset, A., Burke, C., Crawford, C., Holdsworth, D., Nichols, P., Revill, A., and Volkman, J. Guide to the assessment of sediment condition at marine finfish farms. Aquafin CRC Project 4.1 Extension report to FRDC. Tasmanian Aquaculture & Fisheries Institute, 2004.

Macleod, C. and Ross, J Evaluation of Broadscale Environmental Monitoring Program (BEMP) data from 2009-2012 IMAS – Institute of Marine and Antarctic Sciences.

1.7 Recommended action/decision

SCS recommends that ASC accepts Tarsal's current, well developed and scientifically credible water quality and benthic monitoring methodologies. These have long been employed for the whole SE region in Tasmania and are under stringent government regulations that are appropriate to the local conditions.

Q&A3_CAR_v.2_17.10

Original text

What are measures included in corrective action(s) of a non-conformity against standard metric indicators?

Question from on 24/08/2017

Official response

In normal circumstances, a corrective action includes the following steps:
a. Correction of what has happened, if possible
b. Root cause analysis
c. Implementation of accepted by the CAB (corrective) actions to eliminate the root cause(s)
d. Implementation of (preventive) actions to prevent similar situations from happening again at the same site/farm or at other sites/farms
e. Evaluation of effectiveness of the actions.
However, given the nature of many metric indicators in ASC standards, correction is not always possible, if at all (e.g. marine mammal mortalities, sea lice, etc.), it is acceptable that corrective actions for non-conformities against those metric indicators consist of steps b, c, d and e above.

link

Tassal reassessment of MF 190-Creeses Mistake, Eastern Zone farm

Community Consultation notes Tuesday 20th June, 5.30pm – 7pm.
Audit Team: Stephen Leporati (Lead), David O'Sullivan (Technical), Sarah Lowe (Social).

Twenty-two local residents attended the community consultation, 15 of which registered through the Eventbrite page and six by phone. Participants at the consultation represented a wide demographic of the community, including representatives from the Council and tourism operators. The event was promoted to existing stakeholders and the local community via: email, phone, facebook, posters in local hotspots (shops etc), the school newsletter, networks, local council and word of mouth. It was suggested at the consultation that future events could be promoted through the local Tasman Gazette. Published monthly, the timing of the Gazette did not correspond with the organisation of the consultation. Overall, participants stated that the consultation meeting had been well advertised.

The opening of the consultation included: an overview of the ASC process, the function of SCS Global Services, auditor introductions including their backgrounds and responsibilities, and the objectives of the consultation (i.e. capturing community sentiments, feedback, concerns and improvement opportunities). The auditors then divided the meeting into three groups as a means of enabling all stakeholder to have a greater opportunity to voice their views. The focus of each group was to capture feedback and issues specific to: the farm site within the scope of the audit, general feedback and issues regarding Tassal operations in the area as well as feedback and questions about the ASC. All participants had an opportunity to contribute, with notes captured by auditors. Upon reconvening, the three auditors presented the notes from their group for validation and discussion as a collective. The Audit team were assured by participants that all issues were adequately captured. The majority of participants provided their contact details in an attendance sheet. The Audit Team assured participants that through the provision of their details, they would be part of future communications regarding the audit. Contact details for SCS Global Services were provided to participants in a handout. The handout also detailed an over view of the process, the scope of the audit, frequently asked questions and relevant web site addresses for further information. The participants were also informed of the opportunity to make a submission in writing within the next 30 days prior to the posting of the draft report, the ability to make submission during the public consultation phase and the overall time line for the audit. At the end of the meeting four people made a request to be included in future communications directly with Tassal. These were passed on to the Tassal Community Engagement Officer the following day.

<u>Themes and comments:</u>

There was general consensus that the community appreciated the economic benefits associated with Tassal operating in the region, such as: the employment opportunities (2nd largest employer), educational activities (skill centre, traineeships science programs etc) and sponsorship. A local swimmer stated that they had seen no changes to the seabed in the last 10 years and they wanted to be assured that this would continue. Another participant wanted confirmation that testing and video monitoring underwater was carried out regularly.

Overall the group generally agreed that Tassal regularly meet and consult (Quarterly) with Council representatives and Tourism operators. Further to this, participants mentioned that Tassal are prepared to present information if requested to do so, through open days etc.
However, participants also conveyed genuine fear that if the growth of the industry at the current rate continued, it would cause significant environmental damage. This lead to the participants asking for assurances that preventative and proactive strategies are employed to ensure that ecosystems remain healthy were called for. As were answers to queries generally about Tassal's expansion in the region and how growth can be balanced whilst maintaining water quality? Such questions were a consistent theme for the evening, which the Audit Team answered to the best of their ability. The following are a range of questions and statements raised during proceedings arranged in specific topics:

ASC questions:

• Who pays the ASC auditors? Who appoints the ASC auditors?

Team Response: The Auditor's charge the Client a service fee regardless of the outcome of the assessment. The Auditors are appointed by SCS Global Services on the basis of their expertise, qualifications and auditing experience.

• Which pens are audited? Smolt?

Team Response: was that only grow out farms were audited

Water quality and environmental monitoring

• "Is water quality being impacted along with wild species and the water column?"

Team Response: These factors are central to the Standard and are addressed during audit process and conveyed in the report.

• The volume of fish have increased in pens and not as much antibiotics are being used – what is being used (fish health)?

Team Response: Antibiotics are used as a needed response during incidents of outbreaks. The reduction of antibiotic usage primarily has to do with a focus on disease monitoring and early detection.

• Volume of freshwater going into bay (bathing etc), is it going to impact the salinity of the water? Is the water tested for impurities that may cause algal blooms etc?

Team Response: The freshwater used won't impact salinity, particularly in an exposed site like Creeses Mistake. Water quality monitoring is conducted daily for dissolved oxygen, temperature, salinity, plankton and turbidity. The bathing water sources are tested once per month.

• What critical impact are larger vessels/barges pulling nets etc having on the bay in terms of bilge water, effluent?

Team Response: Black and grey water from the feed barge is collected in a waste tank which is routinely emptied by the service vessel. The waste is discharged to an approved disposal point on-shore.
Bloodwater from the harvest vessel is stored on board and pumped to shore when docked at the Dover factory. Bloodwater is treated at the fish harvest processing factory at Dover in the effluent treatment system. This system is an EPA authorised waste water treatment facility that has a marine discharge permit for treated effluent.

• How often do Tassal monitor the bottom under the pens?

Team Response: Annual benthic monitoring is conducted by the Client. The EPA has the authority to order increased and more in-depth monitoring if conditions warrant it.

• Does Tassal support FRDC recommendations on revitalising estuaries (coastal)?

Team Response: This is a specific question for Tassal. From past discussions with the Client's environment staff, IMAS researchers and publication records, the Client is frequently involved in FRDC projects.

• What offsets can be provided by Tassal such as recreational species replacement (hatchery produced)?

Team Response: I am not entirely sure I understand this question?

• Concerns about the transparency of data collected were raised.

• Water quality issues and algal blooms evident below Hatcheries was raised along with potential conflict of the Government being part owner of Saltas.

• "No remediation of sites have been forced – nature is expected to do it."

• Several people raised concerns about Salmon farming attracting more seals which in turn impacts availability of wild catch including recreational fisheries.

• Perceived degradation of sea floor below farms and surrounds

• "Dumping of fish faeces/pellets", more fish means more impacts.

• Impact estuarine waterways by fish farming, affects fish and other species 75% commercial plus 90% recreational have a significant part of their life in an estuary.

Fish health

• Media stories about nutrition of fish not being equivalent to wild caught salmon and that more than one feed of salmon a month could be harmful to health.
• Queries were made about medicine input in production and residues in flesh.

Noise and light pollution

• Concerns were raised in one group about cars and trucks using the road and noise and light pollution emanating from the farms at night.
• Noise increase due to vessels on water was raised.

Employment

• Concerns that there are now fewer farm jobs due to increased mechanisation.

Road use and maintenance

• Concerns were raised about the maintenance of the roads predominantly used by Tassal.
• Concerns were also raised about the amount of rubbish on the sides of the road.

Communication

• More communication and updates was requested and some stated there was a lack of communication with community (in one group no one had used the Tassal website or made direct contact with Tassal)
• It was also noted that Tassal was easy to contact and the Community engagement officer was responsive. Others were unaware of the community engagement officer and had not been aware of the meeting convened by Tassal on the 15th of June. Some had attended.
• One group wanted more information about monitoring, data. Some of the concerns raised are addressed on the Tassal website which they had not accessed.

Complaints process

• One person stated they had made a complaint about marine debris 18 months ago directly to Tassal and that there had been a response.

Marine debris

• It was acknowledged that Tassal did regular clean ups of marine debris, although in one nothing was known of the annual marine debris clean-up and results (i.e amounts & types); more information was welcomed
• A regular walker on White beach stated they picked up marine debris daily and that the bins for marine debris always had waste in them. Cigarette butts (another responded saying that was not necessarily from Tassal workers), plastics and rope were regularly seen.
• Another stated there were regularly buoys, rope on beaches in area
• There was a request that Tassal focus on stopping marine debris at source
• More clean ups were requested along with more communication about clean ups.

Visual Amenity

• The farm seems to be getting bigger
• Visual amenity is impacted for one resident due to Badgers
• Another stated that if they were going to be looking at the pens they would like to be able to eat the fish at least. Another responded that this was about to occur and Salmon would be available for purchase locally soon.