

AIP Needs Assessment for Thailand Prachuap Province whiteleg shrimp, Intensive (Thai Union)

Overview:

This Needs Assessment has been based off on farm data collection in the form of a gap analysis against the ASC Shrimp Standard V1.2.1 and some Fairtrade criteria, by visiting 2 out of 2 farms that are going to be initial participants, with this number expected to increase over time. Internally the gap analysis will be used to track progress of the farms within the AIP, but for the purposes of public reporting the SFP Needs Assessment has been adapted and utilised. The Needs Assessment has been slightly modified from the SFP template to match the ASC Shrimp Standards V1.2.1 Principles 1-7, along with some specific Fairtrade requirements.

The Needs Assessment is also linked to a public Workplan for the AIP which can be found on the AIP profile and will be the document where progress updates are provided in six-monthly intervals.

Table 1. Needs assessment for the AIP 'Thailand Prachuap Province whiteleg shrimp, intensive (Thai Union)

Principle – ASC Shrimp Standard V1.2.1	Data challenges	Management challenges	Improvement Recommendation
1. Regulatory Framework	Relevant regulatory documentation, such as operating permits, licenses, and farm-level procedures, must be reviewed to confirm availability and completeness across all farm sites.	Understanding the extent to which regulatory requirements (e.g. waste management, worker documentation, use of antibiotics, etc.) are consistently implemented on-farm remains a priority. Farm-level systems for maintaining documentation and legal compliance need further development.	Support farms in developing and maintaining documentation systems aligned with national aquaculture regulations. Provide training and tools to ensure consistent implementation of farm-level procedures. Promote alignment with ASC Principle 1 through structured compliance tracking.
2. Site farms in environmentally suitable locations while conserving biodiversity and important natural ecosystems	Key documentation (e.g. risk assessments, land use history, species lists, and buffer measurements) is incomplete or not consistently available across sites (mostly due to the fact farmers have not tried to enter ASC assessment). Historical conversion of ecosystems such as wetlands and mangroves is unclear in some cases.	Farm-level understanding and implementation of environmental safeguards—including biodiversity conservation, habitat protection, and legal buffer zones—require strengthening. This includes the application of consistent zoning practices and verification of buffer widths and vegetation corridors.	Support farms in conducting site-level environmental risk assessments and gathering land use history. Promote mapping and monitoring of riparian zones, coastal buffers, and vegetation corridors. Develop mitigation procedures for endangered species protection, and support alignment with ASC and national environmental guidelines.

<p>3. Develop and operate farms with consideration for surrounding communities</p>	<p>Social impact assessments, feedback mechanisms, and community engagement processes are not yet systematically documented across farms. Employment and contract documentation (especially for local workers) is inconsistent.</p>	<p>Farms require clearer systems to engage local communities, document conflict resolution, and ensure transparent and fair hiring practices. Processes to manage contract discussions and employment agreements also require formalisation.</p>	<p>Establish localised community feedback and grievance systems. Strengthen transparency through documented worker profiles, merit-based hiring evidence, and written contracts for all workers. Encourage regular dialogue with local stakeholders and formalize contract discussions when applicable.</p>
<p>4. Operate farms with responsible practices</p>	<p>Consistent data on water quality, effluent discharge, chemical use, feed efficiency, and pathogen management is lacking or not fully documented across farms. There are also gaps in soil and sediment testing, and antibiotic usage records.</p>	<p>Farms require structured systems for tracking and minimizing environmental impacts (e.g. nitrogen/phosphorus discharge, dissolved oxygen fluctuations, chemical storage and disposal). There is a need for better documentation of chemical and antibiotic usage, as well as predator interaction management.</p>	<p>Support farms to establish monitoring protocols for effluent loads, sediment, and water quality. Develop training and documentation systems for responsible chemical handling, antibiotic use, and predator control. Promote adherence to ASC water management and animal welfare standards through regular measurement, record-keeping, and staff training.</p>
<p>5. Manage crustacea health and welfare in a responsible manner</p>	<p>Health plans, predator control documentation, survival rate records, and usage logs for antibiotics and chemicals are not consistently available across farms. Records of feed efficiency (eFCR) and chemical training are also incomplete.</p>	<p>Farms need structured approaches to document crustacean health management practices, ensure responsible use of inputs (e.g. antibiotics, chemicals), and maintain clear records of animal welfare indicators such as survival rates. Predator interaction and chemical usage protocols require clarification and training.</p>	<p>Support farms in formalizing operational health plans, pathogen control, and welfare monitoring. Establish robust documentation systems for antibiotic use, chemical handling, and predator interactions. Improve training and records for feed conversion, survival rate tracking, and safe input use to meet ASC crustacea welfare standards.</p>
<p>6. Manage broodstock origin, stock selection and effects of stock management</p>	<p>While farms consistently use approved species and certified postlarvae, routine documentation of escape prevention measures and infrastructure maintenance is incomplete. Records of inspections, repair actions, trapping, and recovery protocols are not yet fully established.</p>	<p>Farms need to strengthen traceability and preventative measures regarding escape events. Consistent implementation and documentation of escape response plans, inspection logs, and infrastructure repairs are critical. Some measures (e.g., mesh size, trap use) require formalization.</p>	<p>Support farms in formalising escape prevention and recovery protocols. Establish registers to log inspections, escape events, corrective actions, and container use. Promote full traceability for hatchery-sourced PLs and visual documentation of transport containers. Align stock selection and biosecurity with ASC and national guidelines.</p>

<p>7. Use resources in an environmentally friendly manner</p>	<p>Feed ingredient traceability, sourcing certifications (e.g., ISEAL, FishSource), and GMO declarations are not yet available on-farm. Calculations for feed efficiency indicators (FFDR, PRE) and energy usage (CED, carbon footprint) are also missing.</p>	<p>Farms will need to engage more actively with feed suppliers to obtain documentation verifying sustainable sourcing, traceability, and feed composition. Internally, farms must establish systems to record feed and energy use in order to calculate environmental impact indicators.</p>	<p>Collaborate with feed manufacturers to acquire full traceability and sustainability declarations. Establish farm-level record-keeping for feed use, fishmeal/oil sources, energy consumption, and production output. Use this data to calculate FFDR, PRE, CED, and explore low-carbon strategies such as renewable energy adoption.</p>
--	--	--	---

Contact information

If you would like to get in contact with the AIP for further information or to source from farms participating, please contact AIP coordinators Charlie Horsnell (c.horsnell@keytraceability.com), or Pink Jinjuta (pink@keytraceability.com).