Setting The Standard for Seafood

List of certification schemes accepted under the ASC Feed Standard (Due Diligence Pathway 4)

Version 3.1

Contact Information:
Aquaculture Stewardship Council, Maliebaan 50-B, 3581 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands

Introduction & Purpose

The ASC Feed Standard requires feed mills to conduct Due Diligence on:

- Ingredient manufacturers (indicator 2.2.5) for various risk factors
- Primary marine and plant raw material production (indicator 2.2.6) for various risk factors
- Additional Due Diligence on its primary plant raw material production for the risk of legal deforestation or conversion (indicator 5.1.5).

The ASC Feed Standard provides four different Due Diligence pathways to determine the level of risk for each risk factor (Annex 3 and 6). If one pathway does not result in Low Risk, another pathway must be chosen. Pathway 4 is risk determination via the list of certified schemes accepted under the ASC Feed Standard (for ease, hereafter referred to as the **Accepted Schemes List**). This list consists of third-party schemes ASC has assessed and considered to demonstrate Low Risk for the various risk factors under this pathway option.

Table 1 lists these accepted schemes and states which risk factors they meet, as well as any additional checks the feed mill must undertake if not covered by the scheme (these may be described in footnotes). Each scheme is assessed across three levels:

- **Ingredient Manufacturer**
- **Marine-based Primary Raw Material**
- **Plant-based Primary Raw Material**

At each level, schemes are evaluated for their handling of **legal**, **environmental**, and **social** risks.

Key considerations to note:

- These schemes are not considered to be equivalent to each other, rather, they each meet a set of minimum criteria established by ASC for inclusion in the list.
- Successive versions of the same scheme are assessed independently and are not automatically included. The schemes list reflects only those versions that are currently active, effective and aligned with ASC Requirements.
- When a scheme version becomes superseded and is no longer valid it will be removed at the next revision of the Accepted Schemes List and shall no longer be used to demonstrate Low Risk.
    - For example, both MarinTrust Factory Standard v2.0 and v3.0 will be listed on the Accepted Schemes List for as long as they remain valid under the MarinTrust programme.

- Additionally, ASC does not dictate the transition timelines between versions of recognised schemes. UoCs must follow transition requirements as set out by each respective scheme.

- Feed mills may use any of the listed accepted schemes to demonstrate Low Risk only once the relevant version is effective **and** certification within the supply chain is in place, not from the date the scheme is added to this list. For example, a feed mill conducting Due Diligence in June 2025 could use Marin Trust v3.0 to demonstrate low risk (for applicable risk factors) for its marine ingredient supply chains from September 2024. This is provided v3.0 certification was in place at the ingredient manufacturer in which Due Diligence is being conducted.
- Please note that ASC Due Diligence applies per risk factor, per primary raw material or ingredient manufacturer. If a primary raw material or an ingredient manufacturer is certified under one of the accepted schemes, with all risk factors categorised as Low Risk, then Due Diligence has been passed. However, further Due Diligence is required under a different pathway for any risk factor not determined to be Low Risk.

For detail on how auditors will verify Due Diligence Pathway 4, please refer to the Feed Interpretation Manual within the ASC Feed Programme Centre .

Process for maintaining the Accepted Schemes List

- **Schemes** can apply to be assessed at any time by completing this template and sending to feed@asc-aqua.org. **Feed mills** are encouraged to send this document to any certification scheme, not listed below, which they are already using within their supply chain.
- Completed assessment forms will be reviewed by ASC on a rolling basis, and this table will be updated with any new accepted schemes.
- The schemes list will undergo full review and version updated bi-annually, subject to scheme submission and assessment volume.
- The criteria by which the schemes are assessed is presented in **Annex 1** of this document.

Please refer to the **Summary of Changes (Table 2)** for an overview of changes applied at v3.0 of the ASC Accepted Schemes List, and for a list of schemes assessed but not yet meeting criteria. Please note:

- If a scheme is not listed, it has not yet been assessed.
- If a scheme is listed as not meeting criteria, it means this was the case at the time of publication of this version of the ASC Accepted Schemes List; the scheme will however have the opportunity for re-assessment at the next version update, pending alignment with criteria.

Note that for certified ingredients, only Identity Preserved, Segregated and Mass Balance production/traceability chain of custody models are accepted. Certificate trading models e.g., credits, book and claim, are not accepted

Corresponding Chain of Custody certification must also be present throughout the supply chain as required by the scheme for traceability.

Purchasing raw materials certified or approved to the list of accepted certification schemes does not necessarily entitle the feed mill to make any claims relating to those standards. Feed mills wishing to make claims should contact the scheme owner for further information on their requirements.

Table 1: List of certification schemes accepted under ASC Feed Standard

Table Guidance:

YES – The risk is covered by the scheme, and it meets ASC's requirements.

NO – The risk is covered by the scheme, but it does **not** meet ASC's requirements.

N/A – The risk is **not covered by the** scheme (outside of scheme scope).

	Risk Factors addressed?									
Scheme name and standard version	**Ingredient Manufacturer**			**Marine-based primary raw material**			**Plant-based primary raw material**			
	Legal (Criteria 4.1.1 in Annex 1)	**Social** (Criteria 4.1.2 in Annex 1)	**Environmental** (Criteria 4.1.3 in Annex 1)	**Legal** (Criteria 4.2.1 in Annex 1)	**Social** (Criteria 4.2.2 in Annex 1)	**Environmental** (Criteria 4.2.3 in Annex 1)	**Legal** (Criteria 4.3.1 in Annex 1)	**Social** (Criteria 4.3.2 in Annex 1)	**Environmental – illegal D/C** (Criteria 4.3.2 in Annex 1)	**Environmental – legal D/C** (Criteria 4.4.1 in Annex 1)
Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) v2.01	**YES**[1]	**YES**[1]	**NO**	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) v3.1[2]	**YES**[1]	**YES**[1]	**NO**	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

[1] Through MSC Chain of Custody
[2] Includes MSC Fishery Improvement Programme (FIP)

ASC - MSC Seaweed v1.01	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marin Trust v2.0[3]	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marin Trust Factory Standard v3.0[3]	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marin Trust Improver Programme and Marin Trust Fishery Improvement Projects (FIPs)	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marine Eco-Label Japan Fisheries Management Standard v.2.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
G.U.L.F Responsible Fisheries Management Standard v1.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

[3] Includes Marin Trust Improver Programme accepted facilities and Marin Trust Fishery Improvement Projects (FIPs).

Alaska Responsible Fisheries Management Standard v2.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska Responsible Fisheries Management Standard v2.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iceland Responsible Fisheries Management Standard v2.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iceland Responsible Fisheries Management Standard v2.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Responsible Fishing Vessel Standard (RFVS) v2.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	**NO**	**YES**	**NO**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RSPO – Principles & Criteria 2018 & RSPO -	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**

Independent Smallholder Standard 2019										
RSPO – Principles & Criteria 2024 & RSPO - Independent Smallholder Standard 2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production v4.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
RTRS Corn Standard v1.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Donau Soja Standard (Version Sep 2021) & Europe Soya Standard (Version Sep 2021)	**YES[4]**	**YES[4]**	**YES[4]**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Donau Soja Standard (Version Feb 2025)	**YES[4]**	**YES[4]**	**YES[4]**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**

[4] If primary processor is certified

Europe Soya Standard (Version Feb 2025)	**YES[4]**	**YES[4]**	**YES[4]**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Proterra Certification Standard v4.1	**YES[5]**	**YES[5]**	**YES[5]**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Proterra Certification Standard v5.0	**YES[5]**	**YES[5]**	**YES[5]**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
International Sustainability and Carbon Certification - ISCC PLUS standard v3.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
International Sustainability and Carbon Certification - ISCC PLUS standard v3.4.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Rainforest Alliance 2020	**YES[6]**	**YES[6]**	**NO**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**

[5] If level III certified
[6] Through CoC

Sustainable Agriculture Standard & Supply Chain requirements										
Rainforest Alliance 2020 Sustainable Agriculture Standard (1.4) & Supply Chain requirements (1.4)	**YES**[6]	**YES**[6]	**NO**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Cargill 3S Program v8.1 **(Responsible Production Verified)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Social Accountability International - SA8000:2014	**NO**	**YES**	**NO**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SEDEX SMETA (must be conducted by 3rd	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**[7]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

[7] If 4-pillar SMETA

party accredited entity)										
amfori BSCI (must be conducted by 3rd party accredited entity)	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bunge Certification Program for Sustainable Agricultural Sourcing (Pro-S) v2025.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
LDC Program for Sustainable Agriculture 2025 v4.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**
Proterra Monitoring & Verification (MRV) Standard v1.0	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	N/A	N/A	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**

Table 2: Summary of changes to schemes accepted under ASC Feed Standard

Change category	Scheme	Details
New scheme included	Bunge Certification Program for Sustainable Agricultural Sourcing (Pro-S)	Scheme version 2025.0 assessed and included
	Louis Dreyfus Company (LDC) Program for Sustainable Agriculture	Scheme version 4.0 assessed and included
	ProTerra Monitoring and Verification (MRV) Standard	Scheme version 1.0 assessed and included
Scheme version updated	RSPO – Principles & Criteria & RSPO - Independent Smallholder Standard	Scheme version 2024 assessed and included
	Donau Soja Standard	Scheme now assessed and listed separately to Europe Soja standard. Scheme version February 2025 assessed and included.
	Europe Soja Standard	Scheme now assessed and listed separately to Donau Soja standard. Scheme version February 2025 assessed and included.
	Rainforest Alliance 2020 Sustainable Agriculture Standard & Supply Chain requirements	Scheme version 1.4 assessed and included

The following schemes have been assessed but do not meet ASC criteria at this time:

Scheme	Reason for non-compliance
ADM Responsible Soya Standard v4.0	V4.0 was not included due to gaps in compliance criteria 1, 2 & 3, including: - Standard-setting procedure not publicly available - No public consultation or multi-stakeholder governance - Unclear non-conformance & assurance process
Bunge PRO-S Sustainable Sourcing Certification v2023.1	V2023.1 was not included due to gaps in compliance criteria 1, including: - Public consultation disclosed in standard - Governance procedure confirmed as multi-stakeholder and disclosed in standard V2025.0 was assessed and found to have addressed the above gaps.
Louis Dreyfus Company - Program for Sustainable Agriculture v2.0	V2.0 was not included due to gaps in compliance criteria 1, namely publicly disclosing the standard consultation process. V4.0 of the scheme was assessed and found to have addressed this gap.
Sustentar Caramuru	Scheme was not included due to gaps in compliance criteria 1 & 2, including:

	- No public consultation on standard development - No multi-stakeholder/external governance - Audit system is not 3rd party or ISO accredited
USSEC Soy Sustainability Assurance Protocol v4.1	Scheme was not included due to gaps in compliance criteria 2, namely that USSEC auditors are not required ISO/IEC accreditations and the scheme does not follow a 3rd party certification model.

Annex 1: Assessment criteria for ASC Feed Standard accepted schemes

Certification schemes are assessed by the following criteria, which was approved by the Feed Standard Steering Committee.

Note 1: All criteria are required and are considered equally important.

Note 2: The normative scope of a standard which addresses the risk factors must also be included in the scope of the audit of the standard to be accepted as 'low risk'. For example, if a standard prohibits both deforestation and child labour, but the child labour requirement is not subject to an audit (e.g. only a self-declaration) then the standard will only be considered low risk for deforestation, not child labour.

Criteria	ASC Requirement	Justification
1. Standard Setting	(ISEAL code compliant members automatically meet the Standard Setting Criteria).	It is important that the development of a standard is transparent and that it reflects a balance of stakeholder interests as per ISEAL Standard-Setting Code of Good Practice.
1.1 Is a standard setting procedure made available?	Yes, this should be publicly available on the website or available on request.	
1.2 Is the standard publicly consulted on?	Yes, for at least 60 days.	
1.3 Is a multi-stakeholder group involved in the governance process of the standard?	Yes, this should include stakeholders that are directly affected.	
2. Auditing		It is important that the verification process for a standard is credible.

2.1 Is the conformity assessment/audit performed by a person or body that is independent of the scheme owner?	Yes.	Third-party verification provides a higher level of confidence and credibility that a given level of compliance or progress has been achieved through an independent, external assessment.
2.2 Is the conformity assessment/audit performed by a person or body that is accredited to ISO/IEC 17065:2012 or ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015?	Yes.	Third-party verification is more credible if it is subject to a governance or oversight mechanism that helps to ensure the quality and legitimacy of the verification process. Accreditation is independent third-party recognition that an organisation has the competence and impartiality to perform specific technical activities such as certification, testing and inspection.
2.3 Is an initial audit required to achieve certification?	Yes, practices are checked at each unit of certification. Self – declaration or external verification of an internal control system is not accepted. Group/multi-site certification is accepted if assurance procedures are defined (see https://www.isealalliance.org/defining-credible-practice/iseal-codes-good-practice)	An initial audit is required to determine conformance with the scheme requirements.
2.4 How often is a full re-assessment audit required?	Must be at least every 5 years, with surveillance audits in-between.	A periodic re-assessment is required to determine conformance with the scheme requirements.
3. Traceability		To determine the level of risk, the material must be traced back to specific areas, producers, or intermediate suppliers for which

		performance against the risk factors is known. Achieving adequate traceability is therefore an essential component of establishing and managing a responsible supply chain.
3.1 Which traceability / CoC model is used? (for plant/marine raw material production only)	Must be either: • Identity Preserved • Segregated • Mass Balance Certificate trading models are not accepted. For definitions of the different models see ISEAL.	Identity Preservation models provide the greatest level of connection and transparency between the product and the sustainability claim, then segregated, then mass balance and certificate trading models the least The ASC Feed Standard requirements were developed to align with the principles of the Accountability Framework initiative. Purchase of certified materials or credits using a mass-balance or book-and-claim system signifies a contribution to supporting ethical commodities. However, it might not demonstrate that materials in the supply chain are deforestation or conversion-free, or produced with respect for human rights as envisaged by the AFi. They usually do not provide information about environmental or social performance for the non-certified physical materials in the supply chain. ASC recognises that it would be difficult for feed mills to source only IP or segregated materials in a short time frame and at the volumes required. Therefore mass-balance traceability models are accepted by the ASC for this version of the Feed Standard. We will review this in line with the next Standard update. Certificate trading models are not accepted as there is no physical link to the product in the supply chain.

3.2 Does the scheme have traceability requirements? (for plant/marine raw material production only)	Must be traceable back to a geographical area in which all farms that may be the source of a defined primary raw material are located. OR Must be traceable back to a fishery.	ASC Feed Standard indicator 2.2.4 requires feed mills to annually publish the primary raw material and the country(ies)/fishery(ies) of primary raw material production. From the start of the second certificate cycle onwards, feed mills must publish the production region(s) within the country(ies) of primary raw material production on an annual basis. This only applies to terrestrial plant-derived ingredients (indicator 2.2.4).
4. Standard Content **(related to risk factors)**		
4.1.1 Does it address the ingredient manufacturer legal risk?	Must require the ingredient manufacturer to be in possession of all required legal licenses and permits.	The normative scope of a standard must address the risk factors as required by the ASC Feed Standard.
4.1.2 Does it address the ingredient manufacturer social risk?	Must require the ingredient manufacturer to: • comply with all applicable labour laws & regulations • not be engaged in, or support, forced labour • protect children & young workers • not discriminate against its employees • provide an effective grievance mechanism	

4.1.3 Does it address the ingredient manufacturer environmental risk?	Must require the ingredient manufacturer to: • comply with all applicable environmental laws & regulations • use water responsibly • handle waste responsibly • handle effluent responsibly • disclose the presence of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO), or ingredients produced from GMO • disclose the active compound and inclusion levels of added antibiotics or other added medicinal additives.	
4.2.1 Does it address the marine-based primary raw material legal risk?	Must require the fishery to comply with all national and international law and not be engaged in illegal fishing by conducting well documented, well managed harvest practices. For example, illegal catch estimates are taken into account to adequately evaluate the status of the fished population.	
4.2.2 Does it address the marine-based primary raw material social risk?	Must require the fishery and/or the vessels within a fishery to not be engaged in, or support forced labour or worst forms of child labour.	

4.2.3 Does it address the marine-based primary raw material environmental risk?	Must require the fishery to: - not be engaged in unreported or unregulated fishing. For example, through ensuring reporting of retained or discarded catches with legally mandated monitoring; transparent decision-making through well-documented advice on stock status or clear conflict resolution processes; effective Monitoring Control & Surveillance mechanisms. • not fish species that are IUCN endangered or critically endangered species. • - not fish species that appear in the CITES appendices.	
4.3.1 Does it address the plant-based primary raw material legal risk?	Must require the farm to comply with all applicable environmental laws & regulations, particularly those related to land use. Soy schemes that are compliant with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2023 meet this requirement.	
4.3.2 Does it address the plant-based primary raw material social risk?	Must require the farm to not be engaged in, or support forced labour or worst forms of child labour. Soy schemes that are compliant with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2023 meet this requirement.	

4.3.3 Does it address the plant-based primary raw material environmental risk?	Must require the farm to not be engaged in illegal deforestation/conversion. Soy schemes that are compliant with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2023 meet this requirement.	
4.4.1 Does it address the plant-based primary raw material environmental risk?	Must require the farm to not be engaged in legal deforestation / conversion. Soy schemes that are compliant with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2023 and the specific essential criterion on conversion-free soy meet this requirement.	