



By-Product assessment report

BP040

Eskja fiskimjölsverks miðja (Eskja hf)

Report code	BP040	Date of issue	August 2026
--------------------	--------------	----------------------	--------------------

1. Application details		
Applicant	Eskja fiskimjölsverks miðja (Eskja hf)	
Applicant country	Iceland	
2. Certification Body details		
Name of Certification Body (CB)	NSF / Global Trust Certification Ltd.	
Contact information for CB	Fisheries@nsf.org	
Assessor name	Bev O’Kane	
CB internal peer reviewer name	Matthew Jew	
Internal peer review evaluation	Agree with evaluation	
Number of Assessment days	0.25	
Comments on the assessment	This assessment covers 3 byproduct species, all are scored as Approved. None of the byproduct species listed in this assessment meet the MarinTrust definition of an Endangered, Threatened, or Protected (ETP) species; therefore, all are eligible for byproduct assessment. Both species are not listed by CITES and are listed as ‘Least Concern’ by the IUCN Redlist. See Appendix 1. The flag state for this report is considered as a low-risk score. These products are approved without the need for step 3.	
3. Approval validity	Valid from 08/2026	Valid to 08/2027
4. Assessment cycle	Re-Approval	

5. By-product assessment outcomes			
By-product species name	Flag country(ies)	Fishing Area(s)	MarinTrust approval status
Capelin (<i>Mallotus villosus</i>)	Iceland	N/A	Approved
Herring (<i>Clupea harengus</i>)	Iceland	N/A	Approved
Mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>)	Iceland	N/A	Approved

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?
Capelin (<i>Mallotus villosus</i>)	Iceland	Least concern	Not listed	Low risk	No
Herring (<i>Clupea harengus</i>)	Iceland	Least concern	Not listed	Low risk	No
Mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>)	Iceland	Least concern	Not listed	Low 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 Step 3 Assessment: <i>Step 3 not required</i>						

Appendix 2 – detailed assessment outcomes

(step 2 and step 3 if applicable)

Step 2 outcomes

Flag state (dropdown)	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
Iceland	Low	1.58	1.78	1.83	1	1	1	1	88.21%

Step 3 outcomes

Category C assessment

Species name			
Fishing area and stock			
C1	Category C Stock Status - Minimum Requirements		
	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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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. N/A			
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. N/A			
References			

Traceability information

Information provided for Step 3 Path 1 or Path 2

Species name				
Path 1	Yes ☐ No ☐			
Confirm all KDEs are provided	Yes ☐ No ☐			
Path 2	Yes ☐ No ☐			
Path 2 outcome	Flag country	Coastal score	Port score	Risk outcome

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.