



By-Product assessment report

BP087

*Association "Organization of Fishery
Producers of Kurzeme"*

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

Issued April 2025 – Effective April 2025

Report code	BP087	Date of issue	August 2025
--------------------	-------	----------------------	-------------

1. Application details		
Applicant	Association "Organization of Fishery Producers of Kurzeme"	
Applicant country	Latvia	
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	Blanca Gonzalez	
Internal peer review evaluation	Agree with evaluation	
Number of Assessment days	0.1	
Comments on the assessment	This byproduct assessment covers three byproduct species originating from two flag states. Both flag states are Medium Risk under Step 2, and therefore all three byproducts can be Approved source with caution without a Step 3 assessment.	
3. Approval validity	Valid from 08/25	Valid until 08/26
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>Sprattus sprattus</i> - Sprat	Latvia	N/A	Approved source with caution
<i>Clupea harengus</i> - Herring	Latvia	N/A	Approved source with caution

<i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod	Lithuania	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 <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>Sprattus sprattus</i> - Sprat	Latvia	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
<i>Clupea harengus</i> - Herring	Latvia	Least Concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
<i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod	Lithuania	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>
Comments on Step 3 Assessment: N/A						

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
Latvia	Medium	1.79	2	2.13	1	1	1	1	94.91%
Lithuania	Medium	2.33	1.89	2.03	1	1	1	1	87.74%

Step 3 outcomes

Category C assessment

Species name		No Step 3 assessments required	
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: N/A			

Traceability information

Information provided for Step 3 Path 1 or Path 2

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.