

Terms of Reference (ToR)

for revising

ASC Freshwater Trout standard v1.0

This document is publicly available on the ASC website.
Comments are welcome and appreciated. Form for submitting comments is in the annex (at the end of this document)

Document history

Version	Date	Description of amendment	Affected section/ page
1.0	21/04/2017	New document	-

Table of contents

Table of contents.....	1
1. Background information	2
2. Justification of need for the standard	2
3. Objectives of the standard	2
4. Stakeholder mapping	2
5. Process of standard development.....	9
6. Decision making procedure.....	10
7. Assessment of risks	10
8. Contact information	11
9. Annex	11

1. Background information

ASC vision and mission

The Vision of the Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) is of a world where aquaculture plays a major role in supplying food and social benefits for mankind whilst minimizing negative impacts on the environment. To achieve this the ASC will promote the use of its standards for best environmental and social aquaculture performance and seek to reward responsible farming practices in the market through the use of its consumer facing logo.

About this document

This document explains the reasoning behind the need for a review and possible revision of the ASC Freshwater Trout Standard v1.0 and outlines proposed areas in the standard to address in this process.

2. Justification of need for the Operational Review

This is not a new standard development process. This TOR is concerned with reviewing and (possible) revision of the ASC Freshwater Trout Standard v1.0. During this Operational Review, various topics will be reviewed and possibly revised. An overview is presented under the next Chapter “**4. Scope of the review/revision**”.

3. Objectives of the Operational Review

This Operational Review aims to ensure continued relevance and effectiveness of the trout standard in terms of inclusion of the industry best practise.

4. Scope of the review/revision

It is not intended that this operational review will be a full review of the ASC Freshwater Trout Standard v1.0, but rather a focussed review on areas where the effectiveness of a standard is not as anticipated or will not deliver the intent set out in the ASC's Theory of Change.

Since the launch of the ASC Freshwater Trout Standard, various Variance Requests have been received that have illustrate the need to further develop the standard in order to better reflect best management practices for those particular situations. Additionally the ASC will benchmark the ASC Freshwater Standard against the GSSI Benchmark Tool, and a number of elements of the ASC Freshwater Trout Standard will need to be revised to comply with GSSI criteria. Finally, this review will consider the certification of salmon smolt production within the ASC Freshwater Trout Standard. The review will cover at least the following areas of the standard:

- Scope of the Standard
- 2.5 Escape requirements
- 3.2 & 3.3 Phosphorus requirements
- 4.1 Farm Health Management
- 4.2 Chemicals and treatments
- Requirements for fingerlings and egg producers

- Preparations for GSSI benchmarking
- Textual corrections
- References to external documents/organizations via hyperlinks

Stakeholder input is sought to identify other areas appropriate for this operational review as noted above. Feedback may also be submitted on issues outside of the scope of this review and while ASC will welcome this feedback and will acknowledge and record issues submitted, these will likely only inform future full reviews of the ASC Trout Standard in the future.

5. Stakeholder mapping

Main stakeholder groups	Relevance (why they should participate in the process)	Interest in the process and standards	Outreach strategies for participation in revision	Communication means	Participation goal
<p>(Trout and salmon) aquaculture farms, both certified and working towards certification</p> <p><i>(including farm trade bodies / representative organisations)</i></p>	<p>Potentially most directly affected group. In order for standards to be effective, requirements in these must be possible in practice. Fish farms can provide these practical insights.</p>	<p>Applicability and achievability of the changes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -direct contact with farms in the system -where necessary, translation of certain process documents (e.g. this TOR, draft standards, synopsis, final standards) -via Conformity assessment bodies (CABs) -local/regional workshops, where and when necessary -participation in pilot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -E-mail newsletter (if possible) -Website (if possible) -Webinars (if possible) -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) -Through trade associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both audited (certified and in assessment) and non-audited farms in all three species - Farms in all active countries and regions
<p>Communities (around certified farms and farms in assessment)</p> <p><i>(This group may be represented by Social NGO's, see below)</i></p>	<p>Directly affected group in case of changes to standards content that would have an effect on them when farms implement the changes</p>	<p>Need a fair voice in both standards revision and farm assessment processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -where necessary, translation of certain process documents (e.g. this TOR, draft standards, synopsis, final standards) -via social ngo's where possible -local/regional workshops, where and when necessary -participation in pilot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -E-mail newsletter (if possible) -Website (if possible) -Webinars (if possible) -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) -Through (local) social / environmental ngo's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least people living around audited farms in all active countries and regions
<p>Processing companies / Trade</p>	<p>Processing and trade companies match supply and demand. Changes on either side may affect their</p>	<p>Costs for sourcing and availability of certified products must be in line with demand and sales of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Direct contact with these companies (e.g. through ASC Outreach colleagues) -Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Companies trading any of the three species - Companies in all active countries and

Main stakeholder groups	Relevance (why they should participate in the process)	Interest in the process and standards	Outreach strategies for participation in revision	Communication means	Participation goal
	work directly.	those.	fairs	-Trade press	regions
Retail	Continuous supply at reasonable price. Credible, attainable standards.	Price and availability of products is important. Retail likes to make sure relevant issues will be covered by the ASC certification program while not raising costs of implementing changes	-Direct contact with these companies (e.g. through ASC Outreach colleagues) -Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs	-E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) -Trade press	- Companies trading any of the three species - Companies in all countries and regions involved in producing or buying ASC-
Environmental NGO's	Standards are aimed at reducing the environmental impact.	Changes to the standards must contribute to addressing key environmental concerns.	-Direct contact with these organisations -Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs	-E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops)	- Between 1 to 5 engo's (who could be regarded as representatives of engo's at large. This should include local organisations to the extent reasonably possible) actively participating - A wider group to provide input during public consultation
Social NGO's	Standards are aimed at reducing the social impact (farm workers & communities)	Changes to the standards must contribute to addressing key social concerns.	-Direct contact with these organisations -Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs	-E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops)	- Between 1 to 5 sngo's (who could be regarded as representatives of sngo's at large. This

Main stakeholder groups	Relevance (why they should participate in the process)	Interest in the process and standards	Outreach strategies for participation in revision	Communication means	Participation goal
					should include local organisations to the extent reasonably possible) actively participating - A wider group to provide input during public consultation
Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs)	Standards' content directly relates to CABs' internal processes/documents.	CABs need to be able to build a viable business model based on credible assessments of the standards	-Direct contact with these organisations -Face-to-face meetings at or around conferences/trade fairs	-E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person (e.g. workshops)	- 1 or 2 CABs (who could be regarded as representatives of CABs at large) actively participating - A wider group to provide input during rounds of public consultation
Farm inputs suppliers (feed, broodstock, etc.)	In order for the standards to be effective, requirements in these areas must be possible in practice. Suppliers to fish farms can provide these practical insights.	Changes to the standards are reasonable but should not put their business at risk due to inapplicability	-direct contact with suppliers -where necessary, translation of certain process documents (e.g. this TOR, draft standards, synopsis, final standards -local/regional workshops, where and when necessary -possibly, participation in pilot	-E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) -Trade press	- 1-2 inputs suppliers delivering to farms in each species - Delivering to farms in all active countries and regions
Scientists / Academics	ASC aims to bring together today's state of the art in fish farming and sound	Providing scientific data where decided needed.	-direct contact with scientists -where necessary, organise discussions with them -Where necessary, have them	-E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent	- Research potentially related to farms across all active countries and

Main stakeholder groups	Relevance (why they should participate in the process)	Interest in the process and standards	Outreach strategies for participation in revision	Communication means	Participation goal
	scientific evidence.		do specific research on identified topics.	possible (e.g. workshops)	regions
Governments (incl. UN)	Cross check potential legal implications of proposed changes.	For governments it is important to be assured that standards are not imposing trade barriers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -direct contact with government officials (or through consultants) -where necessary, organise discussions with government officials -Where necessary, have them advise on solutions for identified legal topics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent needed (e.g. workshops) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - related to farms across all active countries and regions related to the three species
Service Providers (e.g. consultants who have done BEIAs or p-SIAs)	Can bring in practical experience: what worked well and what should be reconsidered?	A more effective (and efficient) approach to BEIA and p-SIA and other parts of the standard(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Direct contact -Indirect contact via CABs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person (e.g. workshops) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 or 2 individuals (who could be regarded as representatives of service providers at large) actively participating - A wider group to provide input during rounds of public consultation
Other aquaculture standards/schemes (e.g. GlobalG.A.P., BAP)	In order to facilitate the uptake of sustainability initiatives at large, it is important for schemes like the ASC and others, to be as aligned as possible. Hence the MoU	To provide input into the process on future plans, which may not yet be available in the public domain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Since the ASC has a MoU in place with BAP and GG, there is regular contact between the 3 organisations, as well as 1:1 with either of those. -Like in other projects (e.g. ASC Feed Standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -E-mail newsletter -website -webinars -In person to the extent possible (e.g. workshops) -As observers in relevant meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - related to all species the ASC is applicable to and to farms across all active countries and regions

Main stakeholder groups	Relevance (why they should participate in the process)	Interest in the process and standards	Outreach strategies for participation in revision	Communication means	Participation goal
	between the ASC, GG and BAP.		development), we will invite both organisations as observers to relevant meetings.		

6. Process of standard review/revision

This Operational Review will adhere to the ASC's Standard Setting Procedure (http://www.asc-aqua.org/upload/ASC%20Standard%20Setting%20Procedure_v.1.0_including%20forms.pdf).

The following steps characterize this procedure:

Step	Activity:	Output:	Deadline:	By:
1	Prepare & submit proposal to SB	Proposal for revision	March 2017	Secretariat
2	SB to consider proposal	SB approved revision in SB-meeting of	March 2017	SB
3	Approval proposal			
4	Prepare TOR	TOR	28 April 2017	Secretariat
5	TAG to endorse TOR	Endorsed TOR	Mid May 2017	Secretariat & TAG
6	As needed and with SB approval formation of a steering committee and technical working groups	Due to the limited scale of the review, the formation of a SC is not foreseen. Oversight and technical input will be provided through existing governance arrangements.	End May 2017	Secretariat
7	Write 1 st draft Standard or revision	1 st draft	June 2017	Secretariat
8	Organise 1 st Public Consultation Period (60 days)	Comments from stakeholders on the proposed revisions in 1 st draft	Early July 2017	All relevant stakeholders
9	Prepare & publish synopsis	A public synopsis	Early September 2017	Secretariat
10	Prepare 2 nd draft	2 nd draft	September 2017	Secretariat
11	SC to decide on 2 nd public consultation (30 days)	Decision (y/n) on 2 nd consultation	End September 2017	TAG
12	Organise 2 nd Public Consultation Period (<i>in case needed</i>)	Comments from stakeholders on the proposed revisions in the 2 nd draft	October 2017	Secretariat
13	Prepare & publish synopsis	A public synopsis	November 2017	Secretariat
14	Prepare final draft	Final draft & sign-off by SC/TAG	November 2017	Secretariat and TAG
15	SB to approve final draft	Approval by SB	December 2017	ASC's SB

16	Publish revised standard and inform stakeholders	Launch ASC Freshwater Trout Standard v1.1	December/January 2018	Secretariat
----	--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

7. Decision making procedure

The ASC’s Supervisory Board (SB) supported by the work of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will provide decision making oversight. The ASC secretariat will coordinate the project.

TAG’s responsibility

The TAG has the task to:

- To review the current standard and related logged issues; and,
- Provide inputs into developing proposed revisions following consultation with other relevant stakeholders

TAG membership

- Members of the TAG are able and willing to share relevant knowledge and expertise on accreditation, certification, and relevant, related issues and will be able to spend sufficient time to support this project.
- Members must demonstrate affinity with the ASC’s objectives and the membership must reflect necessary representation from relevant technical areas and a broad background.
- The TAG Chair, will be the main point of contact to ASC’s Head of Standards & Science.

Reporting requirements:

- The Chair shall ensure minutes of all proceedings at meetings of the TAG are kept, including the names of those members of any required Working Group present at each such meeting, and all views, advice, recommendations and opinions of the Working Group.
- Chatham House Rules will be applied for all public documents related to this project.

Decision-making procedure:

- The TAG not possible it will apply the principle of ‘majority voting’ and will report the different opinions, the votes attributed and a summary of each opinion. The TAG will advise ASC’s Supervisory Board (SB) for the SB to take a final decision.

Meetings:

- The ASC strives to work in a cost and time efficient manner and has a strong preference to work primarily via e.g. teleconference and e-mail. Meeting schedules will be set to allow participation at reasonably convenient times.
- Need for in person meeting(s) will be decided as the process progresses.

8. Assessment of risks

At this very moment the ASC can only identify generic risks in terms of changes to the current standards in case of revision. These risks will be further elaborated once it becomes clearer regarding the direction of proposed changes. This TOR will again be updated accordingly.

Identified risk No 1:

Resistance by audited farms (certified and in assessment) leading to possibility that certified farms would leave the programme due to the changes. Or fewer farms would be willing to join the programme.

Farms would have to adjust their practices to meet changes to the standards, and possibly additional resources used to meet future compliance (e.g. training for workers, efforts to find new inputs suppliers, lower productivity, etc.).

Strategies for managing risk No 1:

In order to avoid risk No 1, the ASC engages various stakeholders in its standard setting, review and revision processes to make sure that the standards or changes are applicable and accessible.

Besides, the ASC is also committed through other policy developments (e.g. group certification, harmonization and quality and assurance processes) that will be launched soon will also contribute to reducing implementation and certification costs for farmers, especially the small holder.

The ASC is also willing to offer training for farms to raise their awareness of sustainable and responsible farming and reduce impacts of the sector as a whole, providing that funds are available to implement this strategy.

Identified risk No 2:

Auditors will need to be retrained to safeguard consistent implementation of any changes. It may prove difficult to have all auditors (re)trained in time, especially if an in-person training is required.

Strategy for managing risk No 2:

Development of training materials and planning of training will be planned as far in advance as reasonably expected and may involve on-line delivery.

9. Contact information

- Key contact person: Michiel Fransen – Head of Standards & Science
- Email: michiel.fransen@asc-aqua.org
- Phone/ fax: +31 6 47 103 247
- Address: HNK, Weg der Verenigde Naties 1, 3527 KT Utrecht, Netherlands

10. Annex

- a. Comment submitting form