



## By-Product assessment report

*BP140*

*Blue Fish Factory*

<b>Report code</b>	BP140	<b>Date of issue</b>	April 2026
--------------------	-------	----------------------	------------

1. Application details	
<b>Applicant</b>	Blue Fish Factory
<b>Applicant country</b>	Morocco
2. Certification Body details	
<b>Name of Certification Body (CB)</b>	NSF / Global Trust Certification Ltd
<b>Contact information for CB</b>	Fisheries@nsf.org
<b>Assessor name</b>	Sam Peacock
<b>CB internal peer reviewer name</b>	Matthew Jew
<b>Internal peer review evaluation</b>	Agree with evaluation
<b>Number of Assessment days</b>	0.2
<b>Comments on the assessment</b>	This assessment covers three byproduct species, none of which meet the MT definition of an ETP species. All three are caught exclusively by Morocco-flagged vessels, meaning they are Medium Risk in Step 2 and can be Approved source with caution without the need for a Step 3 assessment.
<b>3. Approval validity</b>	Valid from 04/2026      Valid until 04/2027
<b>4. Assessment cycle</b>	Initial

5. By-product assessment outcomes			
By-product species name	Flag country(ies)	Fishing Areas	MarinTrust approval status
European pilchard, <i>Sardina pilchardus</i>	Morocco	n/a	Approved source with caution
Horse mackerel, <i>Trachurus trachurus</i>	Morocco	n/a	Approved source with caution
Atlantic chub mackerel, <i>Scomber colias</i>	Morocco	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	Flag country(ies)	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendices	Step 2 risk status	Step 3 required
European pilchard, <i>Sardina pilchardus</i>	Morocco	Least concern	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Horse mackerel, <i>Trachurus trachurus</i>	Morocco	Vulnerable	Not listed	Medium risk	No
Atlantic chub mackerel, <i>Scomber colias</i>	Morocco	Least Concern	Not listed	Medium 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
No Step 3 byproducts						
<b>Comments on Step 3 Assessment:</b>						

## 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
Morocco	Medium	2.29	1.78	2.17	1	1	1	1	49.06%

## 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. N/A
	<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. N/A
<b>Clause outcome:</b>		N/A
<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>N/A</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>N/A</p>		
<b>References</b>		

### Traceability information

Information provided for Step 3 Path 1 or Path 2

<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>Risk outcome</b>
	<b>Coastal score</b>	<b>Port score</b>
		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.