



By-Product assessment report

BP047

Lunar FPR Ltd

Document TEM-003 (prev. FISH-1) - Version 3.1

Issued April 2025 – Effective April 2025

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------|----------------------|------------|
| Report code | BP047 | Date of issue | April 2025 |
|--------------------|-------|----------------------|------------|

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------|
| 1. Application details | | |
| Applicant | Lunar FPR Ltd | |
| Applicant country | UK | |
| 2. Certification Body details | | |
| Name of Certification Body (CB) | LRQA | |
| Contact information for CB | mt-ca@lrqa.com | |
| Assessor name | Sam Peacock | |
| CB internal peer reviewer name | Jose Peiro Crespo | |
| Internal peer review evaluation | Agree with evaluation | |
| Number of Assessment days | 0.2 | |
| Comments on the assessment | All listed byproduct species are Least Concern, Vulnerable or Data Deficient on the IUCN Red List, and none appears in the CITES appendices. All species are sourced from UK, Ireland or Sweden-flagged vessels, all of which are Medium Risk. Therefore all byproducts are Approved Source with Caution. | |
| 3. Approval validity | Valid from 04/2025 | Valid until 04/2026 |
| 4. Assessment cycle | Initial | |

| 5. By-product assessment outcomes | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| By-product species name <i>Common and Latin names</i> | Flag country(ies) | Fishing Areas <i>Only applicable to Step 3 assessed species</i> | MarinTrust approval status |
| <i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i> - Haddock | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Merluccius merluccius</i> - European hake | UK | | Approved source with caution |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|------------------------------|
| <i>Lepidorhombus spp.</i> - Megrim | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Pleuronectes platessa</i> - Plaice | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Pollachius virens</i> - Saithe | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Sprattus sprattus</i> - Sprat | UK, Ireland, Sweden | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Merlangius merlangus</i> - Whiting | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Clupea harengus</i> - Herring | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Scomber scombrus</i> - Mackerel | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Trachurus trachurus</i> - Horse mackerel | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Chelidonichthys cuculus</i> - Red gurnard | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Scyliorhinus canicula</i> - Lesser-spotted dogfish | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Loligo vulgaris</i> - Squid | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Molva molva</i> - Ling | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Brosme brosme</i> - Tusk | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Lophius piscatorius</i> - Anglerfish/monkfish | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <i>Glyptocephalus cynoglossus</i> - Witch flounder | UK | | Approved source with caution |

| | | | |
|---|----|--|------------------------------|
| <i>Micromesistius poutassou</i> – Blue whiting | UK | | Approved source with caution |
| <p>Guidance for on-site auditor</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Approved by-products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further checks are required beyond those included in the MarinTrust Standard. <p>Additional checks of Approved Source with Caution by-products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review supplier records or procedures in place. <p>Additional checks of by-products Approved Source with Caution via Step 3 assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <p>Guidance for the applicant/certificate holder</p> <p>The applicant/certificate holder is responsible for ensuring the relevant actions are taken to comply with the MarinTrust Standard.</p> <p>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.</p> | | | |

Appendix 1 – assessment outcomes

Step 2 Assessment Outcomes

| By-product species name <i>Common and Latin names</i> | Flag country(ies) | IUCN Red List <i>Select IUCN red list category from dropdown</i> | CITES Appendices <i>Select CITES appendix status from dropdown</i> | Step 2 risk status <i>Low risk/ Medium risk/ High risk</i> | Step 3 required <i>Yes / No</i> |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| <i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i> - Haddock | UK | Vulnerable | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Merluccius merluccius</i> - European hake | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Lepidorhombus spp.</i> - Megrim | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Pleuronectes platessa</i> - Plaice | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Pollachius virens</i> - Saithe | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |

Marine Ingredients Certifications Ltd (09357209) | TEM-003 (previously FISH1) - Issued April 2025 – Version 3.1

| Approved by MarinTrust Fisheries Manager

Controlled Copy- No unauthorised copying or alteration permitted

© Marine Ingredients Certifications Ltd., for authorised use only

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------|------------|-------------|----|
| <i>Sprattus sprattus</i> - Sprat | UK, Ireland, Sweden | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Merlangius merlangus</i> - Whiting | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Clupea harengus</i> - Herring | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Scomber scombrus</i> - Mackerel | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod | UK | Vulnerable | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Trachurus trachurus</i> - Horse mackerel | UK | Vulnerable | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Chelidonichthys cuculus</i> - Red gurnard | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Scyliorhinus canicula</i> - Lesser-spotted dogfish | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Loligo vulgaris</i> - Squid | UK | Data Deficient | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Molva molva</i> - Ling | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |

Marine Ingredients Certifications Ltd (09357209) | TEM-003 (previously FISH1) - Issued April 2025 – Version 3.1

| Approved by MarinTrust Fisheries Manager

Controlled Copy- No unauthorised copying or alteration permitted

© Marine Ingredients Certifications Ltd., for authorised use only

| | | | | | |
|--|----|---------------|------------|-------------|----|
| <i>Brosme brosme</i> - Tusk | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Lophius piscatorius</i> - Anglerfish/monkfish | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Glyptocephalus cynoglossus</i> - Witch flounder | UK | Vulnerable | Not listed | Medium risk | No |
| <i>Micromesistius poutassou</i> – Blue whiting | UK | Least Concern | Not listed | Medium risk | No |

Step 3 Assessment Outcomes

Assessor note: All species identified as requiring Step 3 in Table above, will have additional assessment information presented here.

| By-product species name Common and Latin names | Flag country(ies) | Fishing Area | Stock name (If applicable e.g. Eastern Pacific stock) | Category C Assessment Outcome Pass/Fail | Traceability information Path 1 – Yes OR Path 2 – Yes/No OR MT Approved Whole Fish | Step 3 Risk Outcome Risk downgraded to Medium Risk/ Remains High Risk |
|--|-------------------|--------------|--|--|---|--|
| No Step 3 Species | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Comments on Step 3 Assessment: Assessor note: Optional, write N/A if not applicable. Can include details on information provided by the client, reasons for outcomes, clarifications on by-products stemming from MT Approved Whole Fish which allows adjustments of Risk Outcomes and any other details related to the assessment as applicable. | | | | | | |

Appendix 2 – detailed assessment outcomes

(step 2 and step 3 if applicable)

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 |
|----------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| United Kingdom | Medium | 2.04 | 3.27 | 1.97 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 93.40% |
| Ireland | Medium | 2.08 | 2.11 | 1.73 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 95.28% |
| Sweden | Medium | 1.33 | 2.22 | 1.77 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 96.23% |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Step 3 outcomes

Category C assessment

Assessor note: Duplicate for each species/stock

| | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------|
| 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. | |
| | 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. | |
| | | | Clause outcome: |
| <p>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.</p> <p>Add rationale here</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Add rationale here</p> | | | |
| References | | | |

Traceability information

Information provided for Step 3 Path 1 or Path 2

Assessor note: Duplicate for each species/stock

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| Species name | | | | |
| Path 1 | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| Confirm all KDEs are provided | | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Path 2 | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>If yes for Path 2, complete the next section</i> | | | |
| Path 2 outcome <i>Countries may be different for Coastal State and Port State.</i> | Flag country | Coastal score | Port score | Risk outcome |
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |

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.