



## By-Product assessment report

*BP132*

*Grøntvedt Nutri*

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

*Issued April 2025 – Effective April 2025*

<b>Report code</b>	BP132	<b>Date of issue</b>	November 2025
--------------------	-------	----------------------	---------------

1. Application details		
<b>Applicant</b>	Grøntvedt Nutri	
<b>Applicant country</b>	Norway	
2. Certification Body details		
<b>Name of Certification Body (CB)</b>	LRQA	
<b>Contact information for CB</b>	mt-ca@lrqa.com	
<b>Assessor name</b>	Blanca Gonzalez	
<b>CB internal peer reviewer name</b>	José Peiró Crespo	
<b>Internal peer review evaluation</b>	Agree with evaluation	
<b>Number of Assessment days</b>	0.2	
<b>Comments on the assessment</b>	The byproduct species listed in this report are not considered ETP species under the Marin Trust definition, thereby fulfilling this requirement for the assessment. All of them are caught by Norway-flagged vessels. Norway has a Medium Risk result in Step 2; therefore, Step 3 is not required, and all listed byproducts are approved but may be sourced with caution.	
<b>3. Approval validity</b>	Valid from 11/2025	Valid until 11/2026
<b>4. Assessment cycle</b>	Initial	

5. By-product assessment outcomes			
<b>By-product species name</b> <i>Common and Latin names</i>	<b>Flag country(ies)</b>	<b>Fishing Areas</b> <i>Only applicable to Step 3 assessed species</i>	<b>MarinTrust approval status</b>
Herring - <i>Clupea harengus</i>	Norway	NA	Approved source with caution

Capelin - <i>Mallotus villosus</i>	Norway	NA	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>
Herring - <i>Clupea harengus</i>	Norway	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Capelin - <i>Mallotus villosus</i>	Norway	Least concern	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>
<b>Comments on Step 3 Assessment:</b> <i>Assessor note: N/A</i>						

## 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
Norway	Medium	2.42	2.39	2.30	1	1	1	1	92.00%

## Step 3 outcomes

### Category C assessment

<b>Species name</b>		
<b>Fishing area and stock</b>		
<b>C1</b>	<b>Category C Stock Status - Minimum Requirements</b>	
	<b>C1.1</b>	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.
	<b>C1.2</b>	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.
		<b>Clause outcome:</b>
<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Add rationale here</p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Add rationale here</p>		
<b>References : N/A</b>		

**Traceability information**

Information provided for Step 3 Path 1 or Path 2

Assessor note: Duplicate for each species/stock

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