

## ASC Response to SeaChoice's Accountability in Seafood Sustainability Report ASC-specific recommendations

*Received from Simon Edwards, Marketing Communications Director, 19.02.21. Further clarification for recommendation 3 received 23.02.21.*

**Recommendation 1: Ensure stakeholders' comments are made public with a response.** While such responses have been published by ASC for some of the public consultations, this has not always been the case. Stakeholders should be able to see how consideration was given, or not, to comments submitted. This enables a transparent decision-making process with a rationale for how input influenced the outcome.

[ASC 16.02.2021] This is the intent of current ASC practice. We have asked the SeaChoice to provide all examples they found in the course of their research and we will make every effort to address missing responses.

**Recommendation 2: Fulfil the executive board regulation's public reporting requirements.** Currently, not all items listed under *Article 8, Openness and Accountability Externally*, are published on the ASC website. In particular, ASC should publish supervisory board meeting agendas and summaries of decisions, as well as disputes, their status and resolution.

[ASC 16.02.2021] This comment doesn't take into consideration the fact that ASC has been carrying out a legal restructure for the past three years, and we are about to enter the final phase which is a rewrite of the Executive Board regulations. Those regulations will thus be changed this year (2021). No decision has yet been made on whether there will be a requirement (or not) to post meeting summaries, under the new regulations.

**Recommendation 3: Adopt a third-party dispute-settlement mechanism for standard-holder complaints.** Internal and external stakeholders should be able to dispute and submit complaints that are investigated through a fair and independent third-party mechanism to ensure conflict of interest is removed.

[ASC 16.02.2021] The ASC has a 3<sup>rd</sup> party independent dispute mechanism via Assurance Services International (ASI). Whilst deemed sufficient for now, we are seeking to improve further this 3<sup>rd</sup> party mechanism.

*Further clarification regarding ASC's internal complaint procedure (i.e., a complaint about ASC as a standard holder) received 23.02.21: We recognise that the mechanism can be improved and it is already in our workplans for this year.*