

# By-Product assessment report

**BP039** 

Scanbio Ingredients AS



Report code	BP039	Date of issue	June 2025
Neport code	DI 033	Date of issue	Julic 2025

1. Application details					
Applicant	Scanbio Ingredients AS				
Applicant country	Norway				
2. Certification Body details					
Name of Certification Body (CB)	NSF / Global Trust Certification Ltd	b			
Contact information for CB	Fisheries@nsf.org NSF-MarinTrust@nsf.org				
Assessor name	Léa Lebechnech				
CB internal peer reviewer name	Matt Jew				
Internal peer review evaluation	Agree with evaluation				
Number of Assessment days	0.2				
	None of the byproduct species list assessment meet the MarinTrust (Endangered, Threatened, or Protespecies; therefore, all are eligible assessment.	definition of an ected (ETP)			
Comments on the assessment	All species are not listed by CITES and are listed as 'Least Concern' or 'Vulnerable' by the IUCN redlist.				
	The flag states for this report are all considered as a low-risk score.				
	These products are approved with for step 3.	nout the need			
3. Approval validity	Valid from June 2025 Valid un	til June 2026			
4. Assessment cycle	Initial				



By-product species name	Flag country(ies)	Fishing Areas	MarinTrust approval status
Gadus morhua - Cod	Norway	N/A	Approved source with caution
Melanogrammus aeglefinus - Haddock	Norway	N/A	Approved source with caution
Pollachius virens - Saithe	Norway	N/A	Approved source with caution
Clupea harengus - Herring	Norway, Denmark	N/A	Approved source with caution
Sprattus sprattus - Sprat	Denmark, Poland, Germany, Sweden	N/A	Approved source with caution
Scomber scombrus - Mackerel	Norway	N/A	Approved source with caution
Mallotus villosus - Capelin	Norway	N/A	Approved source with caution
Micromesistius poutassou - Blue whiting	Norway	N/A	Approved source with caution
Ammodytes marinus - sand eel	Denmark, Poland, Germany, Sweden	N/A	Approved source with caution



#### **Guidance for on-site auditor**

For the audit, the auditor will check how the facility manages by-products deemed medium risk. Any by-products downrated from high to medium risk will require additional due diligence checks.

It is important that facilities check all raw materials from and verify their suppliers especially if there is a perceived risk of sourcing from known or suspected IUU fishing activity. This requires checking supplier records or procedures in place to understand how the supplier can ensure there is no IUU in the raw material they provide. For raw materials risk rated medium, additional or more frequent checks may be required until the facility is certain that the raw materials are not from IUU fishing activity.

The audit requirements are covered in clause 2.11.3 of the MarinTrust Global Standard for Responsible Supply of Marine Ingredients (the MarinTrust Standard) and associated interpretation guidance.

#### **Approved by-products**

No further checks are required beyond those included in the MarinTrust Standard.

### Additional checks of Approved Source with Caution by-products

• Review supplier records or procedures in place.

#### Additional checks of by-products Approved Source with Caution via Step 3 assessment

• In addition to checks for medium risk Approved Source with Caution by-products, by-products that have had risk downgraded from high to medium at Step 3 (use **Appendix 1** to identify these by-product species), confirm that the relevant traceability information continues to be collected for this by-product. During the audit, a traceability check on any by-products downgraded from high to medium risk shall be included as part of the required traceability checks (Section 4).

#### Guidance for the applicant/certificate holder

The applicant/certificate holder is responsible for ensuring the relevant actions are taken to comply with the MarinTrust Standard.

The certificate holder is responsible for communicating any changes to the by-products sourced by submitting a scope extension request through the MarinTrust online Application Portal.



# Appendix 1 – assessment outcomes

# **Step 2 Assessment Outcomes**

By-product species name	Flag country(ies)	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendices	Step 2 risk status	Step 3 required
Gadus morhua - Cod	Norway	Vulnerable	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Melanogrammus aeglefinus - Haddock	Norway	Vulnerable	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Pollachius virens - Saithe	Norway	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Clupea harengus - Herring	Norway, Denmark	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Sprattus sprattus - Sprat	Denmark, Poland, Germany, Sweden	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Scomber scombrus - Mackerel	Norway	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Mallotus villosus - Capelin	Norway	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Micromesistius poutassou - Blue whiting	Norway	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Ammodytes marinus - sand eel	Denmark, Poland, Germany, Sweden	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No



# **Step 3 Assessment Outcomes**

By-product species name	Flag country(ies)	Fishing Area	Stock name	Category C Assessment Outcome	Traceability information	Step 3 Risk Outcome		
Comments on Sten 3 Assessment: No species require sten 3 in the Ry-Product Assessment Process								

Comments on Step 3 Assessment: No species require step 3 in the By-Product Assessment Process



# Appendix 2 – detailed assessment outcomes

# Step 2 outcomes

Flag state	Risk rating	Flag score	Port score	General score	Flag State is contracting party or cooperating non- contracting party to all relevant RFMOs	'Carded' under EU Carding system	Flag state party to PSMA	Flag state mandatory vessel tracking for commercial seagoing fleet	WGI Governance rank
Norway	Medium	2.42	2.39	2.1	1	1	1	1	92.00%
Denmark	Medium	2	2.56	1.87	1	1	1	1	98.58%
Poland	Medium	2.08	2	2.07	1	1	1	1	74.53%
Sweden	Medium	1.33	2.22	1.77	1	1	1	1	96.23%
Germany	Medium	2.17	2.22	1.83	1	1	1	1	92.45%



# Step 3 outcomes

## **Category C assessment**

Species name		ie	No species require step 3 in the By-Product Assessment Pro	ocess					
Fishing area and stock			N/A						
<b>C1</b>	k Status - Minimum Requirements								
	C1.1	Fishery re	emovals of the species in the fishery under assessment are included	N/A					
		in the sto	ock assessment process, OR						
		are consi	dered by scientific authorities to be negligible.						
	C1.2	The spec	ies is considered, in its most recent stock assessment, to have a	N/A					
		biomass	above the limit reference point (or proxy), OR						
		removals by the fishery under assessment are considered by scientific							
		authoriti	es to be negligible.						
			Clause outcome:	N/A					
C1.1 Fishery removals of the species in the fishery under assessment are included in the stock assessment process OR are considered by scientific authorities to be negligible.									
limit	C1.2 The species is considered, in its most recent stock assessment, to have a biomass above the limit reference point (or proxy), OR removals by the fishery under assessment are considered by scientific authorities to be negligible.								
Refer	References								

### **Traceability information**

Information provided for Step 3 Path 1 or Path 2

Species name	No species require step 3 in the By-Product Assessment						
	Process						
Path 1		Yes □	No □				
Confirm all KDEs are p	Yes □ No □						
Path 2	Yes □ No						
	If yes for Pa	th 2, con	nplete the r	ext section			
Path 2 outcome	Flag country	Coas	tal score	Port score	Risk outcome		
Countries may be					Choose an item.		
different for Coastal				Choose an item.			
State and Port State.							



### Guidance for Applicants/Certificate holders on improved traceability

When by-product origin cannot be made more granular than major FAO Areas, or when the source fishery is taking place in the High Seas (i.e. outside of EEZs of all relevant nations), an assessor must evaluate the Coastal and Port scores for each nation that straddles that FAO Area. This may lead to higher risk outcomes for an applicant. To mitigate that risk, better practice involves securing KDEs from the source fishery of the by-products, thereby meeting Path 1 instead of Path 2.

#### What does better practices look like?

Comprehensive data collection and sharing: Collect detailed information using Key Data Elements (KDEs) including vessel identification and authorisation, species, catch areas, fishing method and dates. These are defined in the MarinTrust Standard clauses 2.11.2.2 and 3.2.5.

Supply chain transparency: Maintain detailed records at each step of the supply chain, from capture to final sale, to ensure traceability.

Interoperable systems and technologies to support the collection and transfer of this information.