



Naturland Standards for Organic
Aquaculture (Version 05/2011)
Carp (Cyprinidae)



Benchmarking equivalency results assessed against the Seafood
Watch Aquaculture Criteria

May 2013

Final Seafood Recommendation

Naturland Standards for Organic Aquaculture - Carp

Criterion	Score (0-10)	Rank	Critical?
C1 Data	8.61	GREEN	
C2 Effluent	6.00	YELLOW	NO
C3 Habitat	6.53	YELLOW	NO
C4 Chemicals	4.00	YELLOW	NO
C5 Feed	8.63	GREEN	NO
C6 Escapes	2.00	RED	NO
C7 Disease	4.00	YELLOW	NO
C8 Source	10.00	GREEN	
3.3X Wildlife mortalities	-4.00	YELLOW	NO
6.2X Introduced species escape	0.00	GREEN	
Total	45.77		
Final score	5.72		

Final Score	5.72
Initial rank	YELLOW
Red criteria	1
Final rank	YELLOW
Critical Criteria?	NO

FINAL RANK
YELLOW

Scoring note – scores range from zero to ten where zero indicates very poor performance and ten indicates the aquaculture operations have no significant impact, except for the two exceptional “X” criteria for which a score of -10 is very poor and zero is good.

Summary

The Naturland Standards for Organic Aquaculture, assessed for carp, have a final numerical score of 5.72 out of 10 and with one red criterion (escapes) the final result is a yellow “Good Alternative” recommendation.

Executive Summary

The benchmarking equivalence assessment was undertaken on the basis of a positive application of a realistic worst-case scenario.

- “Positive” – Seafood Watch wants to be able to defer to equivalent certification schemes
- “Realistic” – we are not actively pursuing the theoretical worst case score. It has to represent reality and realistic aquaculture production.
- “Worst-case scenario” – we need to know that the worst-performing farm capable of being certified to any one standard is equivalent to a minimum of a Seafood Watch “Good alternative” or “Yellow” ranking.

The final result of the equivalence assessment for the Naturland Standards for Organic Aquaculture, assessed for carp is a yellow “Good Alternative” recommendation. Seafood Watch does not consider all certified farms to be at that level, but the standards could allow a farm equivalent to a “Yellow” Seafood Watch recommendation to be certified. This means Seafood Watch can defer to the Naturland Organic Aquaculture Standards for carp certification as an assurance that all certified products meet at least a yellow “Good Alternative” recommendation.

In general, the Naturland Standards for Organic Aquaculture:

- contain overview requirements for all species and production systems certified under the standards (under Part A and Part B- Section I)
- contain species-specific and production-specific standards (under Part B- Sections II through VII)
- frequently use terms such as “prefer” or “minimize” which have no value in certification
- have few robust requirements above industry norms

Specifically for each criterion, the Naturland Organic Aquaculture Standards for carp:

- necessitate considerable data collection to demonstrate compliance with the standards, and when combined with the farm-level certification process (ie. audit) result in a high data score,
- prohibit effluents from impacting surrounding habitats or ecosystem functionality, yet do not set discrete effluent limits,
- restrict chemical use and prohibit impacts on non-target organisms,
- have no specific limits for fishmeal inclusion or any other specific requirements for feed sustainability
- have no specific escape requirements or limits, and do not robustly prevent the culture of non-native species.
- certify open production systems that allow the exchange of pathogens and parasites,
- prohibit the use of wild-caught broodstock,
- only recommend (i.e. do not require) passive, non-lethal predator deterrents,
- do not directly address the introduction of non-native species as a result of international shipping, however the benchmarking assumes 50% shipping of non-secure stock for shellfish standards for consistency across standards.

Table of Contents

Final Seafood Recommendation.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction	5
Scope of the analysis and ensuing recommendation.....	5
Analysis	5
Scoring guide.....	6
Criterion 1: Data quality and availability	7
Criterion 2: Effluents.....	8
Criterion 3: Habitat	13
Factor 3.3X: Wildlife and predator mortalities.....	16
Criterion 4: Evidence or Risk of Chemical Use.....	17
Criterion 5: Feed	19
Criterion 6: Escapes	22
Factor 6.2X: Escape of unintentionally introduced species.....	25
Criterion 7. Disease; pathogen and parasite interactions.....	25
Criterion 8. Source of Stock – independence from wild fisheries.....	27
Overall Recommendation	28
References	30
Guiding Principles	29
Data points and all scoring calculations.....	31

Introduction

Scope of the analysis and ensuing recommendation

The Naturland Organic Aquaculture Standards consist of general regulations for organic aquaculture (and other forms of organic agriculture) and contain supplemental sections for specific species groups. This assessment is specific to relevant general standards (Part B – Section I) as well as Part B – Section II supplementary regulations for the culture of carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) and its accompanying species (eg. Tench *Tinca*, pike *Esox*, and other *Cyprinidae* species) in ponds.

Species

This assessment was conducted for all *Cyprinidae* species, most notably *Cyprinus carpio*

Geographic coverage

Global

Production Methods

Ponds

Analysis

Benchmarking principles

The benchmarking equivalence assessment was undertaken on the basis of a positive application of a realistic worst-case scenario

- “Positive” – Seafood Watch wants to be able to defer to equivalent certification schemes
- “Realistic” – we are not actively pursuing the theoretical worst case score. It has to represent reality and realistic aquaculture production.
- “Worst-case scenario” – we need to know that the worst farm capable of being certified to any one standard is equivalent to a minimum of a Seafood Watch “Good alternative” or “Yellow” rank.

Benchmarking assumptions

A number of assumptions were made to enable an equivalence assessment to be made either in the face of differing language or units etc., or in the case of missing information or gaps in the standards. The assumptions enable consistency across all the standards being assessed.

Specific assumptions have been noted where relevant in the individual criteria sections below, but the following were applied to all standards:

- Anything referred to as “should”, “recommend”, “prefer”, “minimize”, “minor must” or any similarly non-specific language was ignored
- Any deferral to local or national regulations in a standard of global scope was ignored.

- Any aspirational intent not supported by robust standards was ignored (for example “You must prevent escapes” was ignored if there were not effective supporting standards to actually prevent escapes).
- Any standards based on a future timeframe were ignored.
- Assume standards are applicable globally unless the standards or the scheme’s label specify or differentiate production regions. Assume the worst-case farm is in the worst country or region.
- Only “complete” production systems were assessed across all criteria – for example all criteria for tilapia are assessed for cages because this gives the lowest overall final score and rank, even though ponds would have a lower habitat criterion score.
- Requirements for animal health plans, veterinary supervision, or veterinary prescription of medications were ignored without further robust requirements in the standards

Scoring guide

- With the exception of the exceptional factors (3.3x and 6.2X), all scores result in a zero to ten final score for the criterion and the overall final rank. A zero score indicates poor performance, while a score of ten indicates high performance. In contrast, the two exceptional factors result in negative scores from zero to minus ten, and in these cases zero indicates no negative impact.

- **The full Seafood Watch Aquaculture Criteria to which the following scores relate are available [here](#)¹:**
- **The full data values and scoring calculations are available in Appendix 1**

¹ http://www.montereybayaquarium.org/cr/cr_seafoodwatch/sfw_aboutsfw.aspx

Criterion 1: Data quality and availability

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: poor data quality and availability limits the ability to assess and understand the impacts of aquaculture production. It also does not enable informed choices for seafood purchasers, nor enable businesses to be held accountable for their impacts.*
- *Sustainability unit: the ability to make a robust sustainability assessment*
- *Principle: robust and up-to-date information on production practices and their impacts is available to relevant stakeholders.*

Criterion 1 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for C1 can be found on pages 3-4 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Data Category	Relevance (Y/N)	Data Quality	Score (0-10)
Industry or production statistics	yes	10	10
Effluent	yes	7.5	7.5
Locations/habitats	yes	10	10
Predators and wildlife	yes	10	10
Chemical use	yes	10	10
Feed	yes	7.5	7.5
Escapes, animal movements	yes	7.5	7.5
Disease	yes	7.5	7.5
Source of stock	yes	7.5	7.5
Other – (e.g. GHG emissions)	no	n/a	n/a
Total			77.5

C1 Data Final Score	8.61	GREEN
----------------------------	-------------	--------------

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions:

- The “Source of stock” and “Energy use” categories were considered “non-relevant” unless the scheme specifically required data collection on these aspects. Schemes could improve their score by requirements in this respect, but would not be penalized for not providing information on what would be considered universal practice.

While there are few specific data collection requirements, certification to the standards necessitates monitoring and data collection on all aspects relevant to the Seafood Watch criteria. The lack of specific requirements in many standards means that the data score is only 7.5 rather than 10 in many categories.

The Criterion 1 (Data) score is 8.61 out of 10.

Criterion 2: Effluents

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: aquaculture species, production systems and management methods vary in the amount of waste produced and discharged per unit of production. The combined discharge of farms, groups of farms or industries contributes to local and regional nutrient loads.*
- *Sustainability unit: the carrying or assimilative capacity of the local and regional receiving waters beyond the farm or its allowable zone of effect.*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations minimize or avoid the production and discharge of wastes at the farm level in combination with an effective management or regulatory system to control the location, scale and cumulative impacts of the industry's waste discharges beyond the immediate vicinity of the farm.*

Criterion 2 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for C2 can be found on pages 8-12 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Effluent parameters	Value	Score	
F2.1a Biological waste (nitrogen) production per of fish (kg N ton-1)	18.8		
F2.1b Waste discharged from farm (%)	100		
F2 .1 Waste discharge score (0-10)		8	
F2.2a Content of regulations (0-5)	2		
F2.2b Enforcement of regulations (0-5)	5		
F2.2 Regulatory or management effectiveness score (0-10)		4	
C2 Effluent Final Score		6.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO		

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions

- For consistency, the full assessment was used across all species
- The cumulative impacts questions on regulations and enforcement were assessed according to the standards requirements in this respect
- No fertilizer use was considered unless specified in the standards
- Tilapia, salmon and cod effluent was assessed for cages, other species were assessed for high-exchange ponds as a worst-case scenario unless otherwise specified

The “Full assessment” in the Seafood Watch criteria was used to calculate the total waste produced and discharged per ton of production, combined with the effectiveness of management measures to control total and cumulative impacts.

Factor 2.1. Waste discharged from the farm

The Naturland Standards for Organic Aquaculture do not have any specific effluent water quality requirements. Therefore the full Seafood Watch assessment was used to calculate waste production.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Protein content of feed Not addressed by initiative	32.5% from FAO (2010)
Feed conversion ratio Not addressed by initiative	0.9 (1.8 for carp taken from Tacon et al [2011] however eFCR was halved in the calculations because Naturland standards require 50% of feed from natural productivity)
Fertilizer input	Naturland standards specify a limit for fertilizer use yet however for consistency we assumed zero for all benchmarking assessments. This should not affect the score as fertilizer uptake by primary productivity is considered responsible for the natural feed with reduces the eFCR and improves the score
Protein content of whole harvested fish Not addressed by initiative	17.5% from Boyd et al (2007)

These values result in a nitrogen waste production of 18.8 kg per ton of farmed carp (see Criteria – Factor 2.1a for calculations).

Factor 2.1b calculates the proportion of the waste produced that is discharged from the farm. As a worst-case scenario, ponds with daily water exchange have been determined to discharge 100% of the waste produced by the cultured fish.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Basic discharge score or percentage of waste discharged Not addressed by initiative	From the Seafood Watch criteria, 100% of waste produced by fish in ponds with daily water exchange has the potential to impact beyond the farm AZE.

Waste discharge per ton of farmed salmon (available for impact beyond an allowable zone of effect [AZE]) is 18.8 kg. This results in an initial waste score of 8 out of 10 for the 10-20 kg category.

Factor 2.1 score is 8 out of 10.

Factor 2.2. Effluent management effectiveness (appropriate to the scale of the industry)

Factor 2.2 assesses the effectiveness of management measures or regulations etc. to control the total waste produced from the total tonnage of the farm and the cumulative impact of multiple neighboring farms. Explanatory tables and calculations can be found on page 14 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Factor 2.2a assesses the content of the management measures.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
<p>Section I 1.1. By selection of site and the method of management of the farm, the surrounding ecosystems shall not be adversely affected. In particular, negative impact caused by effluents as well as by escape of animals shall be prevented by adopting suitable preventive measures.</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2a Question 1 because the standard has set specific regulations and control measures that are designed for aquaculture.</p>
<p>Are the control measures applied according to site-specific conditions and/or do they lead to site-specific effluent, biomass or other discharge limits? Not addressed by initiative</p>	<p>Score of 0 out of 1 for F2.2a Question 2 because the standards can be universally applied and as such no site-specific limits or requirements are included</p>
<p>Do the control measures address or relate to the cumulative impacts of multiple farms? Not addressed by initiative</p>	<p>Score of 0 out of 1 for F2.2a Question 3 because the farm-level certification has no control over the cumulative impacts of neighboring or multiple farms.</p>
<p>Section I 1.1. By selection of site and the method of management of the farm, the surrounding ecosystems shall not be adversely affected. In particular, negative impact caused by effluents as well as by escape of animals shall be prevented by adopting suitable preventive measures.</p> <p>Section I 1.3 Through appropriate design and management of the farm areas it shall be ensured that the water bodies inside the operation retain their ecological functions depending on the respective geographical conditions (e.g. breeding ground for amphibians and water insects, resting place for migratory birds, migration routes for fish).</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2 Question 4 because the standards require that the ecosystem functionality not be adversely affected by the farming operation.</p>
<p>Do the control measures cover or prescribe monitoring of all aspects of the production cycle including peak biomass, harvest, sludge disposal, cleaning etc? Not addressed by initiative</p>	<p>Score of 0 out of 1 for F2.2a Question 5 because the standards do not specify how often monitoring must be conducted and as such significant aspects of production (ie. harvest) may go unmonitored in a worst-case scenario.</p>

Factor 2.2a score is 2 out of 5.

Factor 2.2b assesses the enforcement of the above measures.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
<p>Previously announced (at least once a year) and unannounced visits and inspections by personnel authorized by Naturland shall monitor adherence to the standards. They shall be provided with unrestricted access and scrutinizing opportunities into all the relevant areas of the farm. Upon request, all the documents relating to the managing of the farming operation as well as any other relevant information shall be made available.</p> <p>Naturland mandates inspection bodies to perform regular inspections of farmers and processors at least once every year. In addition to the annual tours of inspection, unannounced spot checks are also made. Inspection is performed by external, expert, state-approved inspection bodies. Naturland co-operates primarily with the following respected inspection bodies:</p> <p>BCS-Öko-Garantie GmbH IMO Institute of Marketecologie Lacon GmbH and Ökop-Zertifizierungsgesellschaft mbH</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2b Question 1 because Naturland identifies which inspection bodies they work with and that farms are inspected on a yearly basis</p>
<p>The basis for the decision of the certification committee is the results determined by and facts presented in the inspection report. In cases of non-conformity with the standards, any of a list of penalties ranging from a warning to withdrawal of the right to use the logo and disqualification of the farm may be imposed. Every year the farms receive a new notice of certification and a certificate from Naturland's certification committee. These confirm that the farm is managed in conformity with Naturland's standards.</p> <p>Processing enterprises which process raw goods certified by Naturland and require their suppliers to produce corresponding proof of Naturland quality may receive corresponding confirmation that they do so from Naturland, on request.</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2b Question 2 because if Naturland standards are not being met then there are number of potential penalties including disqualification of the farm</p>
<p>6. Documentation and inspection</p> <p>The currently valid details (i.e. type and size of the stock, large-scale transport of stock, e.g. to net cages located some distance away) shall be reported to Naturland. Regarding product flow (e.g. additional purchases of feed as well as the sale of farm products), likewise, records shall be kept in accordance with Naturland's standards. Furthermore, a farm diary shall be kept (e.g. on the incidence of diseases, mortality rates, implementation of special hygienic measures such as dewatering, liming etc.). An obligation for an immediate reporting shall exist in respect of all such factors</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2b Question 3 because enforcement covers the entire production cycle.</p>

<p>that can negatively affect the quality of the products (e.g. contamination of water sources, occurrence of toxic algae blooms or „red tides“). Previously announced (at least once a year) and unannounced visits and inspections by personnel authorized by Naturland shall monitor adherence to the standards. They shall be provided with unrestricted access and scrutinizing opportunities into all the relevant areas of the farm. Upon request, all the documents relating to the managing of the farming operation as well as any other relevant information shall be made available. All stages of the value chain have to be recorded when the farm is inspected, although, in the case of co- operatives, for example, individual areas can be organized to conform with the internal control system (ICS).</p>	
<p>The basis for the decision of the certification committee is the results determined by and facts presented in the inspection report. In cases of non-conformity with the standards, any of a list of penalties ranging from a warning to withdrawal of the right to use the logo and disqualification of the farm may be imposed. Every year the farms receive a new notice of certification and a certificate from Naturland’s certification committee. These confirm that the farm is managed in conformity with Naturland’s standards.</p> <p>Processing enterprises which process raw goods certified by Naturland and require their suppliers to produce corresponding proof of Naturland quality may receive corresponding confirmation that they do so from Naturland, on request.</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2b Question 4 because if Naturland standards are not being met then there are number of potential penalties including disqualification of the farm.</p>
<p>The basis for the decision of the certification committee is the results determined by and facts presented in the inspection report. In cases of non-conformity with the standards, any of a list of penalties ranging from a warning to withdrawal of the right to use the logo and disqualification of the farm may be imposed. Every year the farms receive a new notice of certification and a certificate from Naturland’s certification committee. These confirm that the farm is managed in conformity with Naturland’s standards.</p> <p>Processing enterprises which process raw goods certified by Naturland and require their suppliers to produce corresponding proof of Naturland quality may receive corresponding confirmation that they do so from Naturland, on request.</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F2.2b Question 5 because if Naturland standards are not being met then there are number of potential penalties including disqualification of the farm.</p>

Factor 2.2b score is 5 out of 5.

The final effluent score is a combination of the waste discharged and the effectiveness of the management to control the total and cumulative impacts. The table on page 12 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria document shows how this score is calculated, producing a final C2 score of 6 out of 10.

Criterion 3: Habitat

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: Aquaculture farms can be located in a wide variety of aquatic and terrestrial habitat types and have greatly varying levels of impact to both pristine and previously modified habitats and to the critical “ecosystem services” they provide.*
- *Sustainability unit: The ability to maintain the critical ecosystem services relevant to the habitat type.*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations are located at sites, scales and intensities that cumulatively maintain the functionality of ecologically valuable habitats.*

Criterion 3 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for C3 can be found on pages 13-16 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Habitat parameters	Value	Score	
F3.1 Habitat conversion and function		7.00	
F3.2a Content of habitat regulations	3.50		
F3.2b Enforcement of habitat regulations	4.00		
F3.2 Regulatory or management effectiveness score		5.60	
C3 Habitat Final Score		6.53	YELLOW
Critical?	NO		

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions:

- Assume farm is in high-value (or former high-value) habitat unless standards specify otherwise
- The cumulative impacts questions on regulations and enforcement were assessed according to the standards requirements in this respect

Factor 3.1. Habitat conversion and function

Factor 3.1 assesses the impact on ecosystem services at the farm site, or within an allowable zone of effect (AZE). Explanatory tables and calculations can be found on page 14 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Section I 1.1. By selection of site and the method of	Score of 7 due to worst-case

<p>management of the farm, the surrounding ecosystems shall not be adversely affected. In particular, negative impact caused by effluents as well as by escape of animals shall be prevented by adopting suitable preventive measures.</p> <p>Section I 1.3. Through appropriate design and management of the farm areas it shall be ensured that the water bodies inside the operation retain their ecological functions depending on the respective geographical conditions (e.g. breeding ground for amphibians and water insects, resting place for migratory birds, migration routes for fish).</p> <p>Section II 2.1 The inflowing water shall reveal none or only slight contamination of anthropogenic origin. The pH- value shall be between pH 6.0 and 9.0.</p>	<p>moderate impacts while retaining all ecological functions.</p>
---	---

Factor 3.2. Habitat and farm siting management effectiveness (appropriate to the scale of the industry)

Factor 3.2a assesses the content of the management measures to manage site-specific and cumulative habitat impacts. See Appendix 1 for scoring questions.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Section I 1.1 and 1.3 as above	Score of 0.75 out of 1 for F3.2a Question 1 because an EIA is not required by this initiative, however siting standards require farming operations to maintain full ecosystem function.
<p>Is the industry's total size and concentration based on its cumulative impacts and the maintenance of ecosystem function?</p> <p>Not addressed by initiative</p>	Score of 0 out of 1 for F3.2a Question 2 because the standards are farm-specific and therefore have no control over the cumulative impacts of neighboring or regional farms.
Section I 1.1 and 1.3 as above	Score of 0.75 out of 1 for F3.2a Question 3 because although ongoing and future expansion are not significantly spoken to directly within the initiatives, it is expected that any growth of a farm would comply with all previously set standards.
Section I 1.1 and 1.3 as above	Score of 1 out of 1 for F3.2a Question 4 because habitats with high levels of ecosystem functionality must be avoided.
Do control measures include requirements	Score of 1 out of 1 for F3.2a Question 5 because

for the restoration of important or critical habitats or ecosystem services? Not addressed by initiative	although the standards do not speak to restoration, F3.2a Question 4 indicates that important or critical habitats are avoided and as such no restoration is necessary.
--	---

Factor 3.2a score is 3.5 out of 5.

Factor 3.2b assesses the enforcement of the above measures. See Appendix 1 for scoring questions.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
<p>Naturland mandates inspection bodies to perform regular inspections of farmers and processors at least once every year. In addition to the annual tours of inspection, unannounced spot checks are also made. Inspection is performed by external, expert, state-approved inspection bodies. Naturland co-operates primarily with the following respected inspection bodies:</p> <p>BCS-Öko-Garantie GmbH IMO Institute of Marketecologie Lacon GmbH and Ökop-Zertifizierungsgesellschaft mbH</p> <p>Naturland provides inspection bodies with inspection documents and develops specific guidelines for complex areas like inspection of grower groups or the Naturland standards on social responsibility.</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F3.2b Question 1 because farm inspections occur at least once every year. Inspection Bodies are listed on the Naturland website.</p>
<p>Section I 1.1 as above</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F3.2b Question 2 because if siting does not function based on the ecosystem-based management plans included in the standards then farm are ineligible for certification.</p>
<p>Does the farm siting or permitting process take account of other farms and their cumulative impacts? Not addressed by initiative</p>	<p>Score of 0 out of 1 for F3.2b Question 3 because the standards are farm-specific and therefore have no control over the cumulative impacts of neighboring or regional farms.</p>
<p>Naturland Association, along with Naturland's marketing organisation, FiBL Research Institute of Organic Agriculture and the trading firm tegut...“ are offering buyers of organic produce a new service. By means of a reliable tracing system, the customer can refer to the internet to find out where, by whom and how the organic product he or she has purchased was cultivated</p>	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F3.2b Question 4 because Naturland has an extensive system that allows full traceability of any product throughout its lifecycle.</p>

<p>and processed.</p> <p>This is how “Bio mit Gesicht” works: each article purchased bears a number. This enables the customer to “visit” the producer on the internet, where he or she is presented under Bio mit Gesicht (www.bio-mit-gesicht.de): Where is the farm/manufacturer? Who works there? What standards do they have to comply with? What else is there of interest?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of standards and their implementation are the core mission of any certified association for organic agriculture. Standards have to be proven to be workable. They have to adapt to changing conditions and extended to cover new areas. • These standards are regularly revised and updated, taking into account new technical or political insights. On numerous occasions, we present the standards to international audiences, and we are in a permanent communication about the content with technical experts, NGOs, scientific institutions, and consumers. • Naturland is one of the major global certification organizations for organic agricultural produce. Just as Naturland’s farmers and processors are subject to annual inspection, Naturland too is inspected once a year by neutral, qualified organizations, thereby proving that Naturland’s certification system fulfills the most stringent internationally recognized standards. 	<p>Score of 1 out of 1 for F3.2b Question 5 because farms must comply with the standards in order to achieve certification.</p>

Factor 3.2b score is 4 out of 5.

When combined with the Factor 3.2a score, the score for Factor 3.2 is 5.6 out of 10. The final score for Criterion 3 (C3) combines Factors 3.1 and 3.2 (see Seafood Watch assessment criteria document page 16 for calculation) to give a final score of 6.53 out of 10.

Factor 3.3X: Wildlife and predator mortalities

A measure of the effects of deliberate or accidental mortality on the populations of affected species of predators or other wildlife.

This is an “exceptional” factor that may not apply in many circumstances. It generates a negative score that is deducted from the overall final score. A score of zero means there is no impact.

Factor 3.3X Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for F3.3X can be found on pages 17-18 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Wildlife and predator mortality parameters	Score	
F3.3X Wildlife and predator mortality Final Score	-4.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO	

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions:

- Assume score of -4 unless standards specify otherwise. This is based on an assumption that wildlife mortalities will occur if the standards do not specifically require non-lethal controls, but that in the large majority of cases, the mortality numbers will not significantly impact the predator populations.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Part B Section I 1.4. While protecting the farm areas from predatory birds and other animal species, measures not harming the animals physically shall be preferred (e.g. nets, dummy raptors).	Score of -4 out of -10 based on the above assumption because the standards do not specifically prohibit lethal predator control.

Criterion 4: Evidence or Risk of Chemical Use

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: Improper use of chemical treatments impacts non-target organisms and leads to production losses and human health concerns due to the development of chemical-resistant organisms.*
- *Sustainability unit: non-target organisms in the local or regional environment, presence of pathogens or parasites resistant to important treatments*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations by design, management or regulation avoid the discharge of chemicals toxic to aquatic life, and/or effectively control the frequency, risk of environmental impact and risk to human health of their use*

Criterion 4 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for C4 can be found on pages 19-20 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Chemical Use parameters	Score	
C4 Chemical Use Score	4.00	
C4 Chemical Use Final Score	4.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO	

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions:

- Assume un-restricted use of critically important antibiotics unless specifically prohibited in the standards
- If antibiotics are prohibited but other chemicals are permitted, the score was based on any further standards limitations, or the typical use for the species and production system (whichever was lower).

Explanatory tables can be found on page 20 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
<p>Section II-4) If hygienic measures (e.g. for controlling leeches) are necessary, then quick lime (CaO) is permitted to be applied on to the humid pond bottom (max. 200 kg/ha). Its application into the pond (max. 150 kg/ha) for the purposes of pH-stabilization and for precipitating of suspended organic matter is permitted in critical weather situations.</p> <p>Part B Section I 5.1. The health of the organisms is, primarily, to be ensured by adopting preventive measures (e.g. optimized husbandry, rearing, feeding). Natural curative methods (ref. also 5.2.) shall be preferred in case of a disease. Use of conventional medicine is only permitted in vertebrates and after detailed diagnosis and remedial prescription by a veterinarian. In this case, at least twice the legally prescribed waiting period must be observed. Routine and prophylactic treatment with chemo-synthetic drugs as well as hormones is not permitted. All regulatory and statutory regulations shall be fulfilled. If more than three treatments in the total life cycle or two treatments per year are applied with conventional medication or antiparasitic agents, the affected animals may not be sold with reference to Naturland.</p> <p>Part B Section I 5.2. Permitted treatments, also as</p>	<p>"If more than three treatments in the total life cycle or two treatments per year are applied with conventional medication or antiparasitic agents, the affected animals may not be sold with reference to Naturland." The initiative sets maximum limits on use of conventional medication and parasiticides, suggesting they allow the potential use of chemicals, but only at restricted use (Score of 4). The initiative also provides a list of alternative treatments that are approved for use under their standards.</p>

<p>prophylactics or routine (within the framework of statutory regulations): use of natural physical methods (in particular drying out, freezing out) use of not residue-building, inorganic compounds (e.g. hydrogen peroxide H₂O₂, common salt NaCl, lime CaCO₃, quicklime CaO, sodium hypochlorite NaOCl) use of naturally occurring, not residue-building organic compounds (e.g. per-acetic acid, citric acid, formic acid, alcohol) use of naturally occurring vegetable substances (in particular Labiatae and Allium species; further rotenone from Derris spp., Lonchocarpus spp. or Terphrosia spp., preparations of Azadirachta indica (neem), oil emulsions (free of synthetic chemical insecticides) on the basis of paraffin oils, mineral oils and vegetable oils, preparations of viruses, fungi and bacteria (e. g. Bacillus thuringensis), pyrethrum extracts from Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium (synthetic pyrethroids and synergists are prohibited) and quassia from Quassia amare. use of homeopathic products use of stone powder</p>	
--	--

Criterion 4 (chemicals) score is 4 out of 10.

Criterion 5: Feed

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: feed consumption, feed type, ingredients used and the net nutritional gains or losses vary dramatically between farmed species and production systems. Producing feeds and their ingredients has complex global ecological impacts, and their efficiency of conversion can result in net food gains, or dramatic net losses of nutrients. Feed use is considered to be one of the defining factors of aquaculture sustainability.*
- *Sustainability unit: the amount and sustainability of wild fish caught for feeding to farmed fish, the global impacts of harvesting or cultivating feed ingredients, and the net nutritional gains or losses from the farming operation.*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations source only sustainable feed ingredients, convert them efficiently and responsibly, and minimize and utilize the non-edible portion of farmed fish.*

Criterion 5 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables and calculations can be found on pages 21-26 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria. Breakdown of calculations and data points can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

Feed parameters	Value	Score
F5.1a Fish In: Fish Out ratio (FIFO)	0.08	9.80
F5.1b Source fishery sustainability score		-6.00

F5.1: Wild Fish Use		9.75	
F5.2a Protein IN	21.05		
F5.2b Protein OUT	13.48		
F5.2: Net Protein Gain or Loss (%)	-35.99	6	
F5.3: Feed Footprint (hectares)	0.80	9	
C5 Feed Final Score		8.63	GREEN
Critical?	NO		

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions

- If un-specified in the standards, assume the 2011 species-average FCR, fishmeal and oil levels from FAO (Tacon et al, 2011).
- Assume all non-aquatic feed ingredients are from edible crops (this generates the overall worst-case scenario score for feed in the criteria).
- If standards have some requirements for fishery sustainability but insufficient to deserve a better score, the sustainability score is -6 which assumes the very worst fisheries will be avoided. If there are no fishery sustainability standards then the score is -10.
- Assume a fishmeal protein content of 66.5% from FAO Technical paper 540 (2009). Assume remaining non-fishmeal protein comes from edible crops.
- Assume by-product ingredients in feed is zero unless specified in the standards
- For all species, assume 50% of by-products from harvested fish are utilized unless otherwise specified in the standards.

Explanatory score tables and calculations can be found on pages 22-26 of the assessment criteria. Breakdown of calculations and data points can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

Factor 5.1. Wild Fish Use

Factor 5.1 combines a Fish In:Fish Out ratio (F5.1a) with a source sustainability factor (F5.1b) to give a “wild fish use” score. Explanatory tables and calculations can be found on page 22 of the assessment criteria.

Factor 5.1a Fish In: Fish Out ratio (FIFO)

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Fishmeal inclusion level Not addressed by initiative	No limits set. Used 22% from Tacon et al (2011)
Fishmeal from by-products Not addressed by initiative	No limits set. Assumed zero
Fish oil inclusion level Not addressed by initiative	No limits set. Used 12 % from Tacon et al (2011)
Fish oil from by-products Not addressed by initiative	No limits set. Assumed zero
FCR	0.9 (1.8 for carp taken from Tacon et

Not addressed by initiative	al [2011] however eFCR was halved in the calculations because Naturland standards require 50% of feed from natural productivity)
------------------------------------	--

Using these values in the criteria calculations generates a FIFO value of 0.08 which equates to a score of 9.80 out of 10 for F5.1a.

Factor 5.1b Fishery source sustainability

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
<p>Appendix 1: Requirements regarding fishmeal/-oil used as feed</p> <p>All feed originating from wild marine fauna has to be harvested in compliance with internationally established sustainability standards (e. g. FAO Code of Conduct²⁸, ICES²⁹). Wherever possible, this should be confirmed by producing proof of independent certification.</p> <p>Principally, fishmeal/-oil shall originate from the same geographical region as the aquaculture operation is located in. The following sources are permitted:</p> <p>Fishmeal/-oil from fisheries certified independently as sustainable, taking into account as well impact on target species as on by-catch species and the ecosystem</p> <p>Fishmeal/-oil from trimmings of fish processed for human consumption (not from conventional aquaculture)</p> <p>Fishmeal/-oil from by-catches of captures for human consumption. The use of fishmeal/-oil from other sources may be applied for the solely purposes of safeguarding quality and only up to a limited amount (maximum 30% of total fishmeal/-oil, referring to total life-span of fish).</p>	<p>Score of -6 out of -10 for F5.1b because fish meal and fish oil must be from fishery certified by FAO code of conduct or ICES.</p>

The source sustainability score (F5.1b) is -6 out of -10.

Factor 5.1b adjusts the score from 5.1a according to the Seafood Watch criteria calculations to give a final wild fish score (Factor 5.1) of 9.75 out of 10.

Factor 5.2. Net Protein Gain or Loss

Explanatory tables and calculations can be found on page 24 of the assessment criteria.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Protein content of feed Not addressed by initiative	Used 32.5% from FAO (2010)
Percentage of crop or animal ingredients in feed Not addressed by initiative	Assumed all non-marine ingredients are edible crop ingredients
FCR Not addressed by initiative	0.9 (1.8 for carp taken from Tacon et al [2011] however eFCR was halved in the calculations because Naturland standards require 50% of feed from natural productivity)
Protein content of harvested carp Not addressed by initiative	Used 17.5% from Boyd et al (2007)
Edible yield of harvested carp Not addressed by initiative	Used 54% from Gjedrem et al (2009)
Percentage of non-edible byproducts from harvested carp utilized Not addressed by initiative	Used 50% across all standards for consistency as not addressed in standards.

Protein input in feeds is 21.1

Protein output in harvested carp is 13.5

Net edible protein loss is 36.0 % which equates to a score of 6 out of 10 for the 30-40% category.

Factor 5.3. Feed Footprint

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Inclusion of aquatic ingredients Not addressed by initiative	22% FM + 12% FO = 34%
Inclusion level of crop ingredients Not addressed by initiative	Assumed all non-marine ingredients are from crops as not addressed in standards, i.e. 66%
Inclusion level of land animal ingredients Not addressed by initiative	Assumed zero as not addressed in standards.

Inclusion levels are translated to footprint areas using scoring calculations explained on page 25 of the Seafood Watch criteria document.

Final feed footprint is 0.34 hectares per ton which equates to a score of 9 out of 10.

The final feed criterion (C5) score is a combination of the three feed factors with a double weighting on FIFO. The final score is 8.63 out of 10.

Criterion 6: Escapes

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

Naturland Carp

- *Impact: competition, genetic loss, predation, habitat damage , spawning disruption, and other impacts on wild fish and ecosystems resulting from the escape of native, non-native and/or genetically distinct fish or other unintended species from aquaculture operations*
- *Sustainability unit: affected ecosystems and/or associated wild populations.*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations pose no substantial risk of deleterious effects to wild populations associated with the escape of farmed fish or other unintentionally introduced species.*

Criterion 6 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for C6 can be found on pages 27-30 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Escape parameters	Value	Score	
F6.1 Escape Risk		2.00	
F6.1a Recapture and mortality (%)	0		
F6.1b Invasiveness		2	
C6 Escape Final Score		2.00	RED
Critical?	NO		

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions

- Assume high exchange ponds and cages are high escape risk unless the standards require realistically effective prevention measures above industry norms.
- Assume worst case scenario species/location (e.g. non-native or heavily domesticated native)

Factor 6.1a. Escape risk

Explanatory score table can be found on page 28 of the assessment criteria.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
Part B Section I 1.1. By selection of site and the method of management of the farm, the surrounding ecosystems shall not be adversely affected. In particular, negative impact caused by effluents as well as by escape of animals shall be prevented by adopting suitable preventative measures.	Score of 2 out of 10 for F6.1a because the initiative highlights that escapes of animals shall be prevented by adopting suitable preventative measures, however it does not set out specific limits or management practices in the standards. The initiative standards are specific to carp farmed in ponds. It was assumed here that the highlighted initiative criteria would speak to appropriate siting of the pond (i.e. not in flood plain) but due

	to the lack of details on exchange rates this factor was scored as worst case scenario.
--	---

The score for Factor 6.1a is 2 out of 10

Recaptures and mortality

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
No relevant standards	Scored zero

The recaptures and mortality score can improve the escape risk score. The final escape risk score (Factor 6.1) remains 2 out of 10.

Factor 6.1b. Invasiveness

See criteria document page 29 for explanation of the factors and scoring questions for native and non-native species.

Part B used for non-native species

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
2.1. As stock, species naturally occurring in the region shall be preferred. In particular, possibility for cooperation with regional breeding/conservation programs should be examined (e.g. autochthonous strains of Atlantic salmon, Adriatic trout species). The risk of escaping or introduction of species not naturally occurring in the region in open waters (e.g. by marketing as livestock) must be prevented.	Score of 2.5 because the standards suggest that all currently certified species must be native to the region of culture or fully established non-native species. As negative interactions within native carp populations are unlikely, but the culture of non-native carp is common practice, the score of 2.5 is based on a fully established non-native species as a realistic worst case scenario.

Part B score is 2.5 out of 2.5.

Part C

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
There are no standards to limit the direct impact of escapees (e.g. competition for food, predation on wild species, disturbance of breeding sites or other habitat modification)	Factor 6.1b PART C scored 2 out of 5 based on basic species life history (see scores in Appendix 1)

Part C score is 2 out of 5.

Final invasiveness (Factor 6.1b) score combines Part A or B, and Part C and is 2 out of 10.

The final score for Criterion 6 (Escapes) is 2 out of 10 (an explanatory score matrix can be found on page 30 of the assessment criteria).

Factor 6.2X: Escape of unintentionally introduced species

A measure of the escape risk (introduction to the wild) of alien species other than the principle farmed species unintentionally transported during live animal shipments.

This is an “exceptional criterion that may not apply in many circumstances. It generates a negative score that is deducted from the overall final score.

Factor 6.2X Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for F6.2X can be found on pages 31-32 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Escape of unintentionally introduced species parameters	Score	
F6.2Xa International or trans-waterbody live animal shipments (%)	0.00	
F6.2Xb Biosecurity of source/destination	10.00	
C6 Escape of unintentionally introduced species Final Score	0.00	GREEN

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions

- Assume zero international shipping of livestock for finfish and shrimp

Factor 6.2Xa International or trans-waterbody live animal shipments

Explanatory score table can be found on page 31 of the assessment criteria.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
International or transwaterbody movements of live fish or ova Not addressed by initiative	Assumed zero reliance on shipments of international or transwaterbody movements of live fish or ova

Factor 6.2Xb Biosecurity of source/destination

Not relevant with zero shipment assumption

The final score for Factor 6.2X is a deduction of 0 out of -10.

Criterion 7. Disease; pathogen and parasite interactions

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: amplification of local pathogens and parasites on fish farms and their retransmission to local wild species that share the same water body*
- *Sustainability unit: wild populations susceptible to elevated levels of pathogens and parasites.*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations pose no substantial risk of deleterious effects to wild populations through the amplification and retransmission of pathogens or parasites.*

Criterion 7 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

Explanatory score tables for C7 can be found on pages 33-34 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Pathogen and parasite parameters	Score	
C7 Biosecurity	4.00	
C7 Disease; pathogen and parasite Final Score	4.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO	

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions

- Unless standards robustly specify otherwise, assume a score of 4 for species other than salmon based on the Seafood Watch criteria definition: *“Amplification of pathogens or parasites on the farm results in increased infection of wild fish, shellfish or other populations in the farming locality or region”*

As a worst-case scenario, ponds with daily water exchange were assessed as the production system for these Naturland Carp standards. For these production systems, disease-related mortalities are known to occur and the operation discharges water without relevant treatment multiple times per production cycle. As such a score of 4 out of 10 is applied to Criterion 7 (Disease), indicating a ranking of “Yellow”.

Relevant Content of Standards	How we applied it
If hygienic measures (e.g. for controlling leeches) are necessary, then quick lime (CaO) is permitted to be applied on to the humid pond bottom (max. 200 kg/ha). Its application into the pond (max. 150 kg/ha) for the purposes of pH-stabilization and for precipitating of suspended organic matter is permitted in critical weather situations. 5.1. The health of the organisms is, primarily, to be ensured by adopting preventive measures (e.g. optimized husbandry, rearing, feeding). Natural curative methods (ref. also 5.2.) shall be preferred in case of a disease. Use of conventional medicine is only permitted in vertebrates and after detailed diagnosis and remedial prescription by a veterinarian. If more than three treatments in the total life cycle or two treatments per year are applied with conventional medication or antiparasitic agents, the affected animals may not be sold with reference to Naturland.	Score of 4 because the initiative does not set out standards specific to pathogen rates, however the Naturland chemical use standards can be applied to this factor. They suggest that no more than 3 treatments in the total life cycle or two treatments per year can be applied with conventional medication and that preventative measures are preferred. This suggests some BMPs must be in place. Typical rearing systems for carp are ponds and no maximum exchange rate is identified by the initiative, as such this factor scored 4.

Criterion 8. Source of Stock – independence from wild fisheries

Impact, unit of sustainability and principle

- *Impact: the removal of fish from wild populations for on-growing to harvest size in farms*
- *Sustainability unit: wild fish populations*
- *Principle: aquaculture operations use eggs, larvae, or juvenile fish produced from farm-raised broodstocks thereby avoiding the need for wild capture*

Criterion 8 Summary of scores for Naturland Carp

An explanatory score table for C8 can be found on page 35 of the Seafood Watch assessment criteria.

Source of stock parameters	Score	
C8 % of production from hatchery-raised broodstock or natural (passive) settlement	100	
C8 Source of stock Final Score	10.00	GREEN

Justification of Ranking

Assumptions

- For the species covered by the standards in this assessment, assume 100% is source from hatcheries (because almost all are) except shrimp standards that do not specifically prohibit capture of wild postlarvae.

As all commercial carp production originates from hatcheries or from natural reproduction, 100% of the industry is said to be independent from wild stocks, resulting in a score of 10 out of 10 for this Criterion.

Overall Recommendation

The overall recommendation is as follows:

The overall final score is the average of the individual criterion scores (after the two exceptional scores have been deducted from the total). The overall ranking is decided according to the final score, the number of red criteria, and the number of critical scores as follows:

- **Best Choice** = Final score ≥ 6.6 AND no individual criteria are Red (i.e. < 3.3)
- **Good Alternative** = Final score ≥ 3.3 AND < 6.6 , OR Final score ≥ 6.6 and there is one individual “Red” criterion.
- **Red** = Final score < 3.3 , OR there is more than one individual Red criterion, OR there is one or more Critical score.

Naturland Standards for Organic Aquaculture - Carp

Criterion	Score (0-10)	Rank	Critical?
C1 Data	8.61	GREEN	
C2 Effluent	6.00	YELLOW	NO
C3 Habitat	6.53	YELLOW	NO
C4 Chemicals	4.00	YELLOW	NO
C5 Feed	8.63	GREEN	NO
C6 Escapes	2.00	RED	NO
C7 Disease	4.00	YELLOW	NO
C8 Source	10.00	GREEN	
3.3X Wildlife mortalities	-4.00	YELLOW	NO
6.2X Introduced species escape	0.00	GREEN	
Total	45.77		
Final score	5.72		

Final Score	5.72
Initial rank	YELLOW
Red criteria	1
Final rank	YELLOW
Critical Criteria?	NO

FINAL RANK
YELLOW

Guiding Principles

Seafood Watch™ defines sustainable seafood as originating from sources, whether fished² or farmed, that can maintain or increase production in the long-term without jeopardizing the structure or function of affected ecosystems.

The following **guiding principles** illustrate the qualities that aquaculture must possess to be considered sustainable by the Seafood Watch program:

Seafood Watch will:

- Support data transparency and therefore aquaculture producers or industries that make information and data on production practices and their impacts available to relevant stakeholders.
- Promote aquaculture production that minimizes or avoids the discharge of wastes at the farm level in combination with an effective management or regulatory system to control the location, scale and cumulative impacts of the industry’s waste discharges beyond the immediate vicinity of the farm.
- Promote aquaculture production at locations, scales and intensities that cumulatively maintain the functionality of ecologically valuable habitats without unreasonably penalizing historic habitat damage.
- Promote aquaculture production that by design, management or regulation avoids the use and discharge of chemicals toxic to aquatic life, and/or effectively controls the frequency, risk of environmental impact and risk to human health of their use
- Within the typically limited data availability, use understandable quantitative and relative indicators to recognize the global impacts of feed production and the efficiency of conversion of feed ingredients to farmed seafood.
- Promote aquaculture operations that pose no substantial risk of deleterious effects to wild fish or shellfish populations through competition, habitat damage, genetic introgression, hybridization, spawning disruption, changes in trophic structure or other impacts associated with the escape of farmed fish or other unintentionally introduced species.
- Promote aquaculture operations that pose no substantial risk of deleterious effects to wild populations through the amplification and retransmission of pathogens or parasites.
- promote the use of eggs, larvae, or juvenile fish produced in hatcheries using domesticated broodstocks thereby avoiding the need for wild capture
- recognize that energy use varies greatly among different production systems and can be a major impact category for some aquaculture operations, and also recognize that improving

² “Fish” is used throughout this document to refer to finfish, shellfish and other invertebrates.

practices for some criteria may lead to more energy intensive production systems (e.g. promoting more energy-intensive closed recirculation systems)

Once a score and rank has been assigned to each criterion, an overall seafood recommendation is developed on additional evaluation guidelines. Criteria ranks and the overall recommendation are color-coded to correspond to the categories on the Seafood Watch pocket guide:

Best Choices/Green: Are well managed and caught or farmed in environmentally friendly ways.

Good Alternatives/Yellow: Buy, but be aware there are concerns with how they're caught or farmed.

Avoid/Red: Take a pass on these. These items are overfished or caught or farmed in ways that harm other marine life or the environment.

References

Boyd, C.E., C. Tucker, A. McNevin, K. Bostick, and J. Clay. 2007. Indicators of Resource Use Efficiency and Environmental Performance in Fish and Crustacean Aquaculture. *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, 15: 327-360.

Food and Agriculture Organization. 1989. Yield and nutritional value of the commercially more important fish species. [Internet] Accessed 7 June 2012 from <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/T0219E/T0219E00.HTM>

Food and Agriculture Association. 2009. Aquaculture feed and fertilizer resources information system - Silver Carp. [internet] Accessed 7 June 2012 http://affris.org/silver_carp/habits.php AND Food and Agriculture Association. 2009. Aquaculture feed and fertilizer resources information system - Grass Carp. [internet] Accessed 7 June 2012 from http://affris.org/grass_carp/nutri.php AND Rai, A.K, and Bista, J.D. 2001. Effect of Different Feed Ingredients on the Growth of Caged Common Carp. *Nepal Agricultural Resource Journal* (4): pp. 60-63.

Gjedrem, T. and Baranski, M. 2009. Reviews- Methods and Technologies in Fish Biology and Fisheries. *Selective Breeding in Aquaculture: An Introduction*. DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-2773-3. p.76

Larraín, C, Leyton P & Almendras F. 2005. Aquafeed country profile – Chile and salmon farming. *International Aquafeed*, 8(1):22-27. (In Tacon A. 2005. State of information on salmon aquaculture feed and the environment. Report prepared for the WWF US Initiated Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue. 80p.)

Tacon, A.G.J., and Metian, M. 2008. Global Overview on the Use of Fish Meal and Fish Oil in Industrially Compounded Aquafeeds: Trends and Future Prospects. *Aquaculture*(285): pp.146-158

Appendix 1 - Data points and all scoring calculations

This is a condensed version of the criteria and scoring sheet to provide access to all data points and calculations. See the Seafood Watch Aquaculture Criteria document for a full explanation of the criteria, calculations and scores. Yellow cells represent data entry points.

Criterion 1: Data quality and availability

Data Category	Relevance (Y/N)	Data Quality	Score (0-10)
Industry or production statistics	yes	10	10
Effluent	yes	7.5	7.5
Locations/habitats	yes	10	10
Predators and wildlife	yes	10	10
Chemical use	yes	10	10
Feed	yes	7.5	7.5
Escapes, animal movements	yes	7.5	7.5
Disease	yes	7.5	7.5
Source of stock	yes	7.5	7.5
Other – (e.g. GHG emissions)	no	n/a	n/a
Total			77.5

C1 Data Final Score	8.61	GREEN
----------------------------	------	--------------

Criterion 2: Effluents

Factor 2.1a - Biological waste production score

Protein content of feed (%)	32.5
eFCR	0.9
Fertilizer N input (kg N/ton fish)	0
Protein content of harvested fish (%)	17.5
N content factor (fixed)	0.16
N input per ton of fish produced (kg)	46.8
N in each ton of fish harvested (kg)	28
Waste N produced per ton of fish (kg)	18.8

Factor 2.1b - Production System discharge score

Basic production system score	1
-------------------------------	---

Adjustment 1 (if applicable)	0
Adjustment 2 (if applicable)	0
Adjustment 3 (if applicable)	0
Discharge (Factor 2.1b) score	1

2.2 – Management of farm-level and cumulative impacts and appropriateness to the scale of the industry

Factor 2.2a - Regulatory or management effectiveness

Question	Scoring	Score
1 - Are effluent regulations or control measures present that are designed for, or are applicable to aquaculture?	Yes	1
2 - Are the control measures applied according to site-specific conditions and/or do they lead to site-specific effluent, biomass or other discharge limits?	No	0
3 - Do the control measures address or relate to the cumulative impacts of multiple farms?	No	0
4 - Are the limits considered scientifically robust and set according to the ecological status of the receiving water body?	Yes	1
5 - Do the control measures cover or prescribe including peak biomass, harvest, sludge disposal, cleaning etc?	No	0
		2

Factor 2.2b - Enforcement level of effluent regulations or management

Question	Scoring	Score
1 - Are the enforcement organizations and/or resources identifiable and contactable, and appropriate to the scale of the industry?	yes	1
2 - Does monitoring data or other available information demonstrate active enforcement of the control measures?	Yes	1
3 - Does enforcement cover the entire production cycle (i.e. are peak discharges such as peak biomass, harvest, sludge disposal, cleaning included)?	Yes	1
4 - Does enforcement demonstrably result in compliance with set limits?	yes	1
5 - Is there evidence of robust penalties for infringements?	yes	1
		5

F2.2 Score (2.2a*2.2b/2.5)	4
-----------------------------------	----------

C2 Effluent Final Score	6.00	YELLOW
	Critical?	NO

Criterion 3: Habitat

3.1. Habitat conversion and function

F3.1 Score	7
------------	---

3.2 Habitat and farm siting management effectiveness (appropriate to the scale of the industry)

Factor 3.2a - Regulatory or management effectiveness

Question	Scoring	Score
1 - Is the farm location, siting and/or licensing process based on ecological principles, including an EIAs requirement for new sites?	mostly	0.75
2 - Is the industry's total size and concentration based on its cumulative impacts and the maintenance of ecosystem function?	No	0
3 - Is the industry's ongoing and future expansion appropriate locations, and thereby preventing the future loss of ecosystem services?	mostly	0.75
4 - Are high-value habitats being avoided for aquaculture siting? (i.e. avoidance of areas critical to vulnerable wild populations; effective zoning, or compliance with international agreements such as the Ramsar treaty)	Yes	1
5 - Do control measures include requirements for the restoration of important or critical habitats or ecosystem services?	Yes	1
		3.5

Factor 3.2b - Siting regulatory or management enforcement

Question	Scoring	Score
1 - Are enforcement organizations or individuals identifiable and contactable, and are they appropriate to the scale of the industry?	Yes	1
2 - Does the farm siting or permitting process function according to the zoning or other ecosystem-based management plans articulated in the control measures?	Yes	1
3 - Does the farm siting or permitting process take account of other farms and their cumulative impacts?	No	0
4 - Is the enforcement process transparent - e.g. public availability of farm locations and sizes, EIA reports, zoning plans, etc?	Yes	1
5 - Is there evidence that the restrictions or limits defined in the control measures are being achieved?	Yes	1
		4

F3.2 Score (2.2a*2.2b/2.5)	5.60
----------------------------	------

C3 Habitat Final Score	6.53	YELLOW
	Critical?	NO

Exceptional Factor 3.3X: Wildlife and predator mortalities

Wildlife and predator mortality parameters	Score	
F3.3X Wildlife and Predator Final Score	-4.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO	

Criterion 4: Evidence or Risk of Chemical Use

Chemical Use parameters	Score	
C4 Chemical Use Score	4.00	
C4 Chemical Use Final Score	4.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO	

Criterion 5: Feed

5.1. Wild Fish Use

Factor 5.1a - Fish In: Fish Out (FIFO)

Fishmeal inclusion level (%)	2
Fishmeal from by-products (%)	0
% FM	2
Fish oil inclusion level (%)	0
Fish oil from by-products (%)	0
% FO	0
Fishmeal yield (%)	22.5
Fish oil yield (%)	5
eFCR	0.9
FIFO fishmeal	0.08
FIFO fish oil	0.00
Greater of the 2 FIFO scores	0.08
FIFO Score	9.80

Factor 5.1b - Sustainability of the Source of Wild Fish (SSWF)

SSWF	-6
SSWF Factor	-0.048

F5.1 Wild Fish Use Score	9.75
---------------------------------	-------------

5.2. Net protein Gain or Loss

Protein INPUTS

Protein content of feed		32.5
eFCR		0.9
Feed protein from NON-EDIBLE sources (%)		0
Feed protein from EDIBLE CROP sources (%)		98
Protein OUTPUTS		
Protein content of whole harvested fish (%)		17.5
Edible yield of harvested fish (%)		54
Non-edible by-products from harvested fish used for other food production		50
Protein IN		21.05
Protein OUT		13.475
Net protein gain or loss (%)		-35.9913
	Critical?	NO
F5.2 Net protein Score	6.00	

5.3. Feed Footprint

5.3a Ocean area of primary productivity appropriated by feed ingredients per ton of farmed seafood

Inclusion level of aquatic feed ingredients (%)		2
eFCR		0.9
Average Primary Productivity (C) required for aquatic feed ingredients (ton C/ton fish)		69.7
Average ocean productivity for continental shelf areas (ton C/ha)		2.68
Ocean area appropriated (ha/ton fish)		0.47

5.3b Land area appropriated by feed ingredients per ton of production

Inclusion level of crop feed ingredients (%)		98.67
Inclusion level of land animal products (%)		0
Conversion ratio of crop ingredients to land animal products		2.88
eFCR		0.9
Average yield of major feed ingredient crops (t/ha)		2.64
Land area appropriated (ha per ton of fish)		0.34

Value (Ocean + Land Area)	0.80
----------------------------------	-------------

F5.3 Feed Footprint Score	9.00
----------------------------------	-------------

C5 Feed Final Score	8.63	GREEN
----------------------------	-------------	--------------

Critical?	NO
-----------	----

Criterion 6: Escapes

6.1a. Escape Risk

Escape Risk	2
-------------	---

Recapture & Mortality Score (RMS)	
Estimated % recapture rate or direct mortality at the escape site	0
Recapture & Mortality Score	0
Factor 6.1a Escape Risk Score	2

6.1b. Invasiveness

Part A – Native species

Score	0
-------	---

Part B – Non-Native species

Score	2.5
-------	-----

Part C – Native and Non-native species

Question	Score
Do escapees compete with wild native populations for food or habitat?	yes
Do escapees act as additional predation pressure on wild native populations?	yes
Do escapees compete with wild native populations for breeding partners or disturb breeding behavior of the same or other species?	no
Do escapees modify habitats to the detriment of other species (e.g. by feeding, foraging, settlement or other)?	yes
Do escapees have some other impact on other native species or habitats?	no
	2

F 6.1b Score	2
---------------------	----------

Final C6 Score	2.00	RED
	Critical?	NO

Exceptional Factor 6.2X: Escape of unintentionally introduced

species

Escape of unintentionally introduced species parameters	Score	
F6.2Xa International or trans-waterbody live animal shipments (%)	0.00	
F6.2Xb Biosecurity of source/destination	10.00	
F6.2X Escape of unintentionally introduced species Final Score	0.00	GREEN

Criterion 7: Diseases

Pathogen and parasite parameters	Score	
C7 Biosecurity	4.00	
C7 Disease; pathogen and parasite Final Score	4.00	YELLOW
Critical?	NO	

Criterion 8: Source of Stock

Source of stock parameters	Score	
C8 % of production from hatchery-raised broodstock or natural (passive) settlement	100	
C8 Source of stock Final Score	10	GREEN