



By-Product assessment report

BP048

Havsbrún

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

Issued April 2025 – Effective April 2025

Report code	BP048	Date of issue	April 2025
--------------------	-------	----------------------	------------

1. Application details		
Applicant	Havsbrún	
Applicant country	Faroe Islands	
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 or Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List, and none appears in the CITES appendices. Species are sourced from vessels from several countries, the highest risk level is classified as Medium Risk. Therefore all byproducts are Approved Source with Caution.	
3. Approval validity	Valid from 04/2025	Valid until 04/2026
4. Assessment cycle	Choose an item.	

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>Clupea harengus</i> - Herring	Faroe, EU, UK, Iceland, Norway, Greenland.		Approved source with caution
<i>Scomber scombrus</i> - Mackerel	Faroe, EU, UK, Iceland, Norway, Greenland.		Approved source with caution

<i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod	Faroe		Approved source with caution
<i>Pollachius virens</i> - Saithe	Faroe		Approved source with caution
<i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i> - Haddock	Faroe		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 <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>Clupea harengus</i> - Herring	Faroe, EU, UK, Iceland, Norway, Greenland.	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
<i>Scomber scombrus</i> - Mackerel	Faroe, EU, UK, Iceland, Norway, Greenland.	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
<i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod	Faroe	Vulnerable	Not listed	Medium risk	No
<i>Pollachius virens</i> - Saithe	Faroe	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
<i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i> - Haddock	Faroe	Vulnerable	Not listed	Medium risk	No

Step 3 Assessment Outcomes

By-product species name <i>Common and Latin names</i>	Flag country(ies)	Fishing Area	Stock name <i>(If applicable e.g. Eastern Pacific stock)</i>	Category C Assessment Outcome <i>Pass/Fail</i>	Traceability information <i>Path 1 – Yes OR Path 2 – Yes/No OR MT Approved Whole Fish</i>	Step 3 Risk Outcome <i>Risk downgraded to Medium Risk/ Remains High Risk</i>
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
Denmark	Medium	2	2.56	1.87	1	1	1	1	98.58%
United Kingdom	Medium	2.04	3.27	1.97	1	1	1	1	93.40%
Iceland	Low	1.58	1.78	1.83	1	1	1	1	88.21%
Norway	Medium	2.42	2.39	2.1	1	1	1	1	92.00%

Two byproduct species are also listed as sourced from the EU. The highest country risk rating among EU member states is Medium Risk. Faroes was written on the application, but this isn't included in the step 2 table as it is classified under Denmark.

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.