

Instructions



This template is intended for reporting greenhouse gas emissions results to ASC. The Feed Standard does not prescribe a specific standard or set of methods for generating GHG values. However, suppliers should be aware that the development of the Farm Standard requirements may necessitate the application of specific methods for feed emissions in the future.

Emissions can be reported in either or both columns using a biophysical or economic allocation approach. Emissions results must be provided according to scope (1-3) as well as by input/activity, being general feed ingredient categories and additional transport and milling emissions that aren't otherwise captured within ingredients. 'Transport and milling' emissions should be at least equal to the sum of scope 1 and scope 2 emissions. If possible, emissions should also be broken down by category (fossil, biogenic, or land use change), facilitated by certain databases and assessment methods. Any uncategorized emissions should be reported as 'Unspecified emissions' (If feed suppliers are unable to determine emissions by category, the total of all emissions can be reported as unspecified).

This template is also expected to reflect the resolution of data that feed suppliers will need to provide to farms to satisfy feed-related emissions modeling for the Farm Standard. Feed suppliers should be ready to adjust the composition of ingredients used in calculations to reflect typical compositions of feeds relevant to each producer, whether that is on a producer-level or a general species-level (e.g. average ASC-compliant salmon feed composition), so that relevant emissions estimates are available to aquaculture producers for their own calculations.

Only enter data in blue cells.

Table 1. Production year

Year of production (yyyy)

2025

Table 2. GHG emissions by scope

GHG emissions per tonne of ASC compliant feed (kg CO₂-eq/t)

Emissions scope

Scope 1

Scope 2

Scope 3

Total

Biophysical (mass) model	Economic model
37,78	37,78
24,95	24,95
1.116	1085,47
1178,45	1148,2

Table 3. GHG emissions by category

Emissions category

Fossil emissions

Biogenic emissions

Land use change emissions

Unspecified emissions

Total

Biophysical (mass) model	Economic model
0	0

Table 4. GHG emission by Input / Activity

Input / Activity

Soy crop inputs

Other crop inputs

Reduction fishery inputs

Fishery by-product inputs

Poultry / livestock inputs

Other feed inputs

Transport and milling

Total

Quantity (kg/t)	Biophysical (mass) model	Economic model
452,24	557,3	593,7
317,45	162,66	192,46
111,33	125,44	134,27
46,21	53,7	56,47
9,54	110,27	7,93
63,23	49,4	43,7
	119,68	119,68
1000	1178,45	1148,21

Notes

All emissions values must be reported in units of kg CO₂-equivalent per tonne of ASC compliant feed.

Emissions totals for each section should be equivalent.

Total feed input quantity (kg/t) must equal 1000. Use 'Other feed inputs' to make up any difference from 1000 kg. 'Other feed inputs' should also

Transport-related emissions may be difficult to separate from ingredient production and processing emissions, depending on the data source used.



INGREDIENTS LIST >1%

Indicator 2.2.3|2.2.4

[illegible]

Table 2. Outcomes due diligence pathways and low risk plant ingredients report[illegible]

Table 1. Summary of due diligence pathways 2 and 3 report

Pathway used	Type of Assessment	Date of Due Diligence Assessment (yyyy-mm-dd)	Primary Raw Material "common name (latin name)"	Risk Factor Assessed	Country of location/production (select Fishery if Marine primary raw material)	FAO Fishing area (if Marine primary raw material)	Summary description of risk assessment (max 1500 characters)	Links to any publicly available resources used	Summary description of any measures taken and their effectiveness (max 1500 characters)	Summary description of implemented monitoring program (max 1500 characters)
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2026-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Legal	United States		Risk Assessment Summary A sector-level (Pathway 2) risk assessment was conducted for soy produced in the United States, differentiating two regions: Corn Belt: classified as a low-risk area, given that over 97% of the area planned with soy corresponds to agricultural land established prior to 1990, with no evidence of deforestation or conversion after 2020. Great Plains: classified as a moderate-risk area, due to documented conversion of native grasslands over recent decades, albeit under state legal frameworks (legal conversion). i. Risk Assessment Outcome (risk by factor) Legality: Low risk (compliance)	Normativa internacional y estándares • Aquaculture Stewardship Council. (2023). ASC Feed Standard V1.01. Utrecht, Países Bajos: ASC. • FEFAC. (2021). Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2021. Brussels, Bélgica: European Feed Manufacturers' Federation. • ProTerra Foundation. (2025). ProTerra Standard v5.0. Rotterdam, Países Bajos: ProTerra Foundation. • RTRS – Round Table on Responsible Soy. (2021). RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production. Buenos Aires, Argentina: RTRS. • ISCC. (2023). ISCC PLUS Sustainability Requirements. Cologne, Alemania: ISCC System GmbH. • Legislación estadounidense • United States Congress. (2018). Agricultural Improvement Act of	Monitoring Programme implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.	Monitoring Programme implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2026-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Social	United States		Risk Assessment Summary A sector-level (Pathway 2) risk assessment was conducted for soy produced in the United States, differentiating two regions: Corn Belt: classified as a low-risk area, given that over 97% of the area planned with soy corresponds to agricultural land established prior to 1990, with no evidence of deforestation or conversion after 2020. Great Plains: classified as a moderate-risk area, due to documented conversion of native grasslands over recent decades, albeit under state legal frameworks (legal conversion). i. Risk Assessment Outcome (risk by factor) Legality: Low risk (compliance)	Normativa internacional y estándares • Aquaculture Stewardship Council. (2023). ASC Feed Standard V1.01. Utrecht, Países Bajos: ASC. • FEFAC. (2021). Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2021. Brussels, Bélgica: European Feed Manufacturers' Federation. • ProTerra Foundation. (2025). ProTerra Standard v5.0. Rotterdam, Países Bajos: ProTerra Foundation. • RTRS – Round Table on Responsible Soy. (2021). RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production. Buenos Aires, Argentina: RTRS. • ISCC. (2023). ISCC PLUS Sustainability Requirements. Cologne, Alemania: ISCC System GmbH. • Legislación estadounidense • United States Congress. (2018). Agricultural Improvement Act of	Monitoring Programme implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.	Monitoring Programme implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2026-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Environmental	United States		Risk Assessment Summary A sector-level (Pathway 2) risk assessment was conducted for soy produced in the United States, differentiating two regions: Corn Belt: classified as a low-risk area, given that over 97% of the area planned with soy corresponds to agricultural land established prior to 1990, with no evidence of deforestation or conversion after 2020. Great Plains: classified as a moderate-risk area, due to documented conversion of native grasslands over recent decades, albeit under state legal frameworks (legal conversion). i. Risk Assessment Outcome (risk by factor) Legality: Low risk (compliance)	Normativa internacional y estándares • Aquaculture Stewardship Council. (2023). ASC Feed Standard V1.01. Utrecht, Países Bajos: ASC. • FEFAC. (2021). Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2021. Brussels, Bélgica: European Feed Manufacturers' Federation. • ProTerra Foundation. (2025). ProTerra Standard v5.0. Rotterdam, Países Bajos: ProTerra Foundation. • RTRS – Round Table on Responsible Soy. (2021). RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production. Buenos Aires, Argentina: RTRS. • ISCC. (2023). ISCC PLUS Sustainability Requirements. Cologne, Alemania: ISCC System GmbH. • Legislación estadounidense • United States Congress. (2018). Agricultural Improvement Act of	Monitoring Programme implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.	Monitoring Programme implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2025-12-31	Peruvian anchoveta (Engraulis ringens)	Legal	Peru	FAO 87	All evidence submitted for each question in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social, legal and environmental. Weighted risk scores: Legal (questions 1-2): 2 (from question 2) Social (questions 3-15): 4 (from question 4) Environmental (questions 16-28): 10 (from questions 16 and 18) Total: 16 The full Pathway 3 due diligence assessment of the supplier Pesquera Miguel Ángel del Perú, for the ingredient fishmeal.		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Pesquera Miguel Ángel S.A.C. (Peru), any change or update to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The following tasks are planned for the next evaluation: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier. The purpose is to give feedback on the process and explain why the points with a weighted risk different from 0 matter. Timing: 6 months after this report is issued. Responsible: Quality Manager, Honduras. Review updated evidence documents. These include codes of conduct, policies, internal regulations, environmental impact study results, water, energy and GHG monitoring, training records.	
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2025-12-31	Peruvian anchoveta (Engraulis ringens)	Social	Peru	FAO 87	All evidence submitted for each question in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social, legal and environmental. Weighted risk scores: Legal (questions 1-2): 2 (from question 2) Social (questions 3-15): 4 (from question 4) Environmental (questions 16-28): 10 (from questions 16 and 18) Total: 16 The full Pathway 3 due diligence assessment of the supplier Pesquera Miguel Ángel del Perú, for the ingredient fishmeal.		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Pesquera Miguel Ángel S.A.C. (Peru), any change or update to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The following tasks are planned for the next evaluation: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier. The purpose is to give feedback on the process and explain why the points with a weighted risk different from 0 matter. Timing: 6 months after this report is issued. Responsible: Quality Manager, Honduras. Review updated evidence documents. These include codes of conduct, policies, internal regulations, environmental impact study results, water, energy and GHG monitoring, training records.	
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2025-12-31	Peruvian anchoveta (Engraulis ringens)	Environmental	Peru	FAO 87	All evidence submitted for each question in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social, legal and environmental. Weighted risk scores: Legal (questions 1-2): 2 (from question 2) Social (questions 3-15): 4 (from question 4) Environmental (questions 16-28): 10 (from questions 16 and 18) Total: 16 The full Pathway 3 due diligence assessment of the supplier Pesquera Miguel Ángel del Perú, for the ingredient fishmeal.		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Pesquera Miguel Ángel S.A.C. (Peru), any change or update to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The following tasks are planned for the next evaluation: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier. The purpose is to give feedback on the process and explain why the points with a weighted risk different from 0 matter. Timing: 6 months after this report is issued. Responsible: Quality Manager, Honduras. Review updated evidence documents. These include codes of conduct, policies, internal regulations, environmental impact study results, water, energy and GHG monitoring, training records.	

		2025-12-31	Peruvian anchoveta (Engraulis ringens)		Peru	FAO B7	This report responds to Indicator 2.2.1.1 and Appendix 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.2) through a sector assessment of Peruvian primary marine raw material (FAO Area 87, six species) supplied to Vitapra S.A. - Peru. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores (Rev. 1.1), it covers legal, social and environmental risk. Evaluated volume: 4,439.71 t of fishmeal in 2025 and 2,908.28 t in January-July 2026. Result: LOW RISK in all three factors, with low probability and relevance and medium-high uncertainty. Peru has active permits, quotas, closed seasons, inspection and sanctions; no species is IUCN ENCR or CITES listed, and Peru is not identified by NOAA or under an EU yellow card.		Monitoring program (summary): With all three factors and low risk, the applicable route is Step 5a of the Risk Management Framework: monitoring indicators to confirm the classification remains valid and each lot falls within the evaluated scope. Frequency: quarterly for legal and diversion indicators; semiannual for IUCN and sanctions; annual for CITES, TIP, USDOL, NOAA and ILO certifications; per lot for supply chain. Indicators (20): Legal (6): regulatory changes, SIRESAT controls, vessel permits, sanctions, illegal fishing or diversion evidence; NOAA or EU listings. Social (5): legal changes, TIP and USDOL reports, confirmed forced or child labor cases, ILO observations. Environmental (5): IUCN category, CITES listing, IUU reports, CAIT and SPREPNO resolutions, fishery status. Supply chain (4): new species, origin, manufacturer, fleet or gear, species
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Marine Primary Raw Material			Legal					
		2025-12-31	Peruvian anchoveta (Engraulis ringens)		Peru	FAO B7	This report responds to Indicator 2.2.1.1 and Appendix 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.2) through a sector assessment of Peruvian primary marine raw material (FAO Area 87, six species) supplied to Vitapra S.A. - Peru. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores (Rev. 1.1), it covers legal, social and environmental risk. Evaluated volume: 4,439.71 t of fishmeal in 2025 and 2,908.28 t in January-July 2026. Result: LOW RISK in all three factors, with low probability and relevance and medium-high uncertainty. Peru has active permits, quotas, closed seasons, inspection and sanctions; no species is IUCN ENCR or CITES listed, and Peru is not identified by NOAA or under an EU yellow card.		Monitoring program (summary): With all three factors and low risk, the applicable route is Step 5a of the Risk Management Framework: monitoring indicators to confirm the classification remains valid and each lot falls within the evaluated scope. Frequency: quarterly for legal and diversion indicators; semiannual for IUCN and sanctions; annual for CITES, TIP, USDOL, NOAA and ILO certifications; per lot for supply chain. Indicators (20): Legal (6): regulatory changes, SIRESAT controls, vessel permits, sanctions, illegal fishing or diversion evidence; NOAA or EU listings. Social (5): legal changes, TIP and USDOL reports, confirmed forced or child labor cases, ILO observations. Environmental (5): IUCN category, CITES listing, IUU reports, CAIT and SPREPNO resolutions, fishery status. Supply chain (4): new species, origin, manufacturer, fleet or gear, species
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Marine Primary Raw Material			Social					
		2025-12-31	Peruvian anchoveta (Engraulis ringens)		Peru	FAO B7	This report responds to Indicator 2.2.1.1 and Appendix 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.2) through a sector assessment of Peruvian primary marine raw material (FAO Area 87, six species) supplied to Vitapra S.A. - Peru. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores (Rev. 1.1), it covers legal, social and environmental risk. Evaluated volume: 4,439.71 t of fishmeal in 2025 and 2,908.28 t in January-July 2026. Result: LOW RISK in all three factors, with low probability and relevance and medium-high uncertainty. Peru has active permits, quotas, closed seasons, inspection and sanctions; no species is IUCN ENCR or CITES listed, and Peru is not identified by NOAA or under an EU yellow card.		Monitoring program (summary): With all three factors and low risk, the applicable route is Step 5a of the Risk Management Framework: monitoring indicators to confirm the classification remains valid and each lot falls within the evaluated scope. Frequency: quarterly for legal and diversion indicators; semiannual for IUCN and sanctions; annual for CITES, TIP, USDOL, NOAA and ILO certifications; per lot for supply chain. Indicators (20): Legal (6): regulatory changes, SIRESAT controls, vessel permits, sanctions, illegal fishing or diversion evidence; NOAA or EU listings. Social (5): legal changes, TIP and USDOL reports, confirmed forced or child labor cases, ILO observations. Environmental (5): IUCN category, CITES listing, IUU reports, CAIT and SPREPNO resolutions, fishery status. Supply chain (4): new species, origin, manufacturer, fleet or gear, species
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Marine Primary Raw Material			Environmental					
		2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)		Bolivia		Summary independent sectoral assessment - Pathway 2, Bolivia/ISA soy: This study is an independent sectoral assessment (Pathway 2) for soybeans produced in Bolivia and supplied by ISA to Vitapra's feed mills. Its purpose was to determine the level of legal, social, deforestation, and illegal conversion risk (Table 1 and Annex 6 of the ASC Feed standard) through a formal Due Diligence process, in accordance with Annex 7 (Figure 4). It covers Santa Cruz, Beni, and Tarija (2020-2025), integrating documentary, regulatory, and geospatial review of agricultural suppliers registered in ISA's database, validated through Global Forest Watch and CIAMPA/NA.		Monitoring Program Implemented The Monitoring and Continuous Improvement Program (Chapter 8 of the report) establishes the following: - Frequency: Updated every three years or immediately in the event of significant changes. - Indicators: Legal compliance (ABT/MMA/NA), geospatial traceability, and labor governance. - Responsible parties: ISA as the primary actor; independent review by an accredited technical consulting firm (Quovadis Consultores). - Tools: Global Forest Watch, CIAMPA/NA. - Objective: To maintain the low risk classification and strengthen transparency in the supply chain
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material			Legal					
		2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)		Bolivia		Summary independent sectoral assessment - Pathway 2, Bolivia/ISA soy: This study is an independent sectoral assessment (Pathway 2) for soybeans produced in Bolivia and supplied by ISA to Vitapra's feed mills. Its purpose was to determine the level of legal, social, deforestation, and illegal conversion risk (Table 1 and Annex 6 of the ASC Feed standard) through a formal Due Diligence process, in accordance with Annex 7 (Figure 4). It covers Santa Cruz, Beni, and Tarija (2020-2025), integrating documentary, regulatory, and geospatial review of agricultural suppliers registered in ISA's database, validated through Global Forest Watch and CIAMPA/NA.		Monitoring Program Implemented The Monitoring and Continuous Improvement Program (Chapter 8 of the report) establishes the following: - Frequency: Updated every three years or immediately in the event of significant changes. - Indicators: Legal compliance (ABT/MMA/NA), geospatial traceability, and labor governance. - Responsible parties: ISA as the primary actor; independent review by an accredited technical consulting firm (Quovadis Consultores). - Tools: Global Forest Watch, CIAMPA/NA. - Objective: To maintain the low risk classification and strengthen transparency in the supply chain
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material			Social					
		2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)		Bolivia		Summary independent sectoral assessment - Pathway 2, Bolivia/ISA soy: This study is an independent sectoral assessment (Pathway 2) for soybeans produced in Bolivia and supplied by ISA to Vitapra's feed mills. Its purpose was to determine the level of legal, social, deforestation, and illegal conversion risk (Table 1 and Annex 6 of the ASC Feed standard) through a formal Due Diligence process, in accordance with Annex 7 (Figure 4). It covers Santa Cruz, Beni, and Tarija (2020-2025), integrating documentary, regulatory, and geospatial review of agricultural suppliers registered in ISA's database, validated through Global Forest Watch and CIAMPA/NA.		Monitoring Program Implemented The Monitoring and Continuous Improvement Program (Chapter 8 of the report) establishes the following: - Frequency: Updated every three years or immediately in the event of significant changes. - Indicators: Legal compliance (ABT/MMA/NA), geospatial traceability, and labor governance. - Responsible parties: ISA as the primary actor; independent review by an accredited technical consulting firm (Quovadis Consultores). - Tools: Global Forest Watch, CIAMPA/NA. - Objective: To maintain the low risk classification and strengthen transparency in the supply chain
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material			Environmental					
		2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)		Argentina		All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 3, obtained from questions 1 and 2. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 11, obtained from questions 4, 11, 13 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 26) scored 6, obtained from questions 16 and 23. The total weighted risk is 24. Therefore, the full evaluation of		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Cargill S.A.C.I. of Argentina, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, sustainability reports, commitments, log, water and energy reports). Timing: 1 year. Review documentation unavailable on the cited websites (questions 14, 21, 24 and 26). Timing: 1 year. Reduce the weighted risk of questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 23 by working with the supplier on: legal permits and
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material			Legal					

Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Social	Argentina	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 3, obtained from questions 1 and 2. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 11, obtained from questions 4, 11, 13 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 26) scored 6, obtained from questions 16 and 23. The total weighted risk is 24. Therefore, the full evaluation of	As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Cargill S.A.C.I. of Argentina, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, sustainability reports, commitments, soy, water and energy reports). Timing: 1 year. Review documentation unavailable on the cited websites (questions 14, 21, 24 and 26). Timing: 1 year. Reduce the weighted risk of questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 23 by working with the supplier on: legal permits and
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Environmental	Argentina	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 3, obtained from questions 1 and 2. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 11, obtained from questions 4, 11, 13 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 26) scored 6, obtained from questions 16 and 23. The total weighted risk is 24. Therefore, the full evaluation of	As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Cargill S.A.C.I. of Argentina, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, sustainability reports, commitments, soy, water and energy reports). Timing: 1 year. Review documentation unavailable on the cited websites (questions 14, 21, 24 and 26). Timing: 1 year. Reduce the weighted risk of questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 23 by working with the supplier on: legal permits and
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Legal	Bolivia	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 3, obtained from questions 1 and 2. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 11, obtained from questions 4, 11, 13 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 26) scored 6, obtained from questions 16 and 23. The total weighted risk is 24. Therefore, the full evaluation of	As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Cargill S.A.C.I. of Argentina, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, sustainability reports, commitments, soy, water and energy reports). Timing: 1 year. Review documentation unavailable on the cited websites (questions 14, 21, 24 and 26). Timing: 1 year. Reduce the weighted risk of questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 23 by working with the supplier on: legal permits and
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Social	Bolivia	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 3, obtained from questions 1 and 2. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 11, obtained from questions 4, 11, 13 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 26) scored 6, obtained from questions 16 and 23. The total weighted risk is 24. Therefore, the full evaluation of	As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Cargill S.A.C.I. of Argentina, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, sustainability reports, commitments, soy, water and energy reports). Timing: 1 year. Review documentation unavailable on the cited websites (questions 14, 21, 24 and 26). Timing: 1 year. Reduce the weighted risk of questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 23 by working with the supplier on: legal permits and
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Environmental	Bolivia	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 3, obtained from questions 1 and 2. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 11, obtained from questions 4, 11, 13 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 26) scored 6, obtained from questions 16 and 23. The total weighted risk is 24. Therefore, the full evaluation of	As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Cargill S.A.C.I. of Argentina, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, sustainability reports, commitments, soy, water and energy reports). Timing: 1 year. Review documentation unavailable on the cited websites (questions 14, 21, 24 and 26). Timing: 1 year. Reduce the weighted risk of questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 23 by working with the supplier on: legal permits and
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Legal	Bolivia	This report summarizes compliance with Indicator 2.2.11 and Annex 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.01) through a sector assessment of Bolivian soy supplied by IASA to Vitapro. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores. It covers Santa Cruz, Beni and Tarija for 2020-2025, using document, regulatory and geospatial review. Following ASC Feed's five-step risk management approach, all four factors were classified as low risk. Legal: compliance with Law 1700 and DS 4337, valid ABI and MMAyA licenses, no sanctions. Social: compliance with labor code, no child or forced labor, active ILO-MTEPS programs. Illegal deforestation/conversion: no cover loss after 2020 (satellite analysis 2001-2024). Legal deforestation/conversion: no	This report summarizes compliance with Indicator 2.2.11 and Annex 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.01) through a sector assessment of Bolivian soy supplied by IASA to Vitapro. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores. It covers Santa Cruz, Beni and Tarija for 2020-2025, using document, regulatory and geospatial review. Following ASC Feed's five-step risk management approach, all four factors were classified as low risk. Legal: compliance with Law 1700 and DS 4337, valid ABI and MMAyA licenses, no sanctions. Social: compliance with labor code, no child or forced labor, active ILO-MTEPS programs. Illegal deforestation/conversion: no cover loss after 2020 (satellite analysis 2001-2024). Legal
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Social	Bolivia	This report summarizes compliance with Indicator 2.2.11 and Annex 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.01) through a sector assessment of Bolivian soy supplied by IASA to Vitapro. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores. It covers Santa Cruz, Beni and Tarija for 2020-2025, using document, regulatory and geospatial review. Following ASC Feed's five-step risk management approach, all four factors were classified as low risk. Legal: compliance with Law 1700 and DS 4337, valid ABI and MMAyA licenses, no sanctions. Social: compliance with labor code, no child or forced labor, active ILO-MTEPS programs. Illegal deforestation/conversion: no cover loss after 2020 (satellite analysis 2001-2024). Legal	This report summarizes compliance with Indicator 2.2.11 and Annex 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.01) through a sector assessment of Bolivian soy supplied by IASA to Vitapro. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores. It covers Santa Cruz, Beni and Tarija for 2020-2025, using document, regulatory and geospatial review. Following ASC Feed's five-step risk management approach, all four factors were classified as low risk. Legal: compliance with Law 1700 and DS 4337, valid ABI and MMAyA licenses, no sanctions. Social: compliance with labor code, no child or forced labor, active ILO-MTEPS programs. Illegal deforestation/conversion: no cover loss after 2020 (satellite analysis 2001-2024). Legal

Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Environmental	Bolivia	This report summarizes compliance with Indicator 2.2.11 and Annex 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.01) through a sector assessment of Bolivian soy supplied by AGSA to Vitapro. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores, it covers Santa Cruz, Beni and Tarija for 2020-2025, using document, regulatory and geospatial review. Following ASC Feed's five-step risk management approach, all four factors were classified as low risk. Legal: compliance with Law 1700 and DS 4327, valid ABT and MMA licenses, no sanctions. Social: compliance with labor code, no child or forced labor, active ILO-MTEPS programs. Illegal deforestation/conversion: no cover loss after 2020 (satellite analysis 2001-2024). Legal deforestation/conversion: no		This report summarizes compliance with Indicator 2.2.11 and Annex 3, point b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.01) through a sector assessment of Bolivian soy supplied by AGSA to Vitapro. Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores, it covers Santa Cruz, Beni and Tarija for 2020-2025, using document, regulatory and geospatial review. Following ASC Feed's five-step risk management approach, all four factors were classified as low risk. Legal: compliance with Law 1700 and DS 4327, valid ABT and MMA licenses, no sanctions. Social: compliance with labor code, no child or forced labor, active ILO-MTEPS programs. Illegal deforestation/conversion: no cover loss after 2020 (satellite analysis 2001-2024). Legal
Pathway 2 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Legal	Peru	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 0. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 4, obtained from question 4. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 28) scored 16, obtained from questions 16, 17 and 18. The total weighted risk is 20. Therefore, the full evaluation of the supplier Alicorp S.A.A. through Pathway 3 of the due		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Alicorp S.A.A. of Peru, any change or update to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation, with dates and responsible person, are: 1. Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback on the process and explain the importance of the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months after this report is generated. Responsible: Quality & SGI Manager. 2. Request documentary support for the evidence presented in the Pathway 3 ASC QO checklist answers, for all questions except 3, 8, 14, 16, 17 and 18. Timing: 1 year after
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Social	Peru	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 0. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 4, obtained from question 4. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 28) scored 16, obtained from questions 16, 17 and 18. The total weighted risk is 20. Therefore, the full evaluation of the supplier Alicorp S.A.A. through Pathway 3 of the due		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Alicorp S.A.A. of Peru, any change or update to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation, with dates and responsible person, are: 1. Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback on the process and explain the importance of the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months after this report is generated. Responsible: Quality & SGI Manager. 2. Request documentary support for the evidence presented in the Pathway 3 ASC QO checklist answers, for all questions except 3, 8, 14, 16, 17 and 18. Timing: 1 year after
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Environmental	Peru	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 0. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 4, obtained from question 4. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 28) scored 16, obtained from questions 16, 17 and 18. The total weighted risk is 20. Therefore, the full evaluation of the supplier Alicorp S.A.A. through Pathway 3 of the due		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Alicorp S.A.A. of Peru, any change or update to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation, with dates and responsible person, are: 1. Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback on the process and explain the importance of the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months after this report is generated. Responsible: Quality & SGI Manager. 2. Request documentary support for the evidence presented in the Pathway 3 ASC QO checklist answers, for all questions except 3, 8, 14, 16, 17 and 18. Timing: 1 year after
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Legal	Peru			As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Anita Food of Peru, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: 1. Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. 2. Review documents whose web links lead to blank pages (documents 2, 3, 8 and 8 of question 1, and the answer to question 26). Timing: 1 year. 3. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, records and documentary evidence for 2026). Timing: 1 year.
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Social	Peru	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 2, obtained from question 3. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 6, obtained from questions 4 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 28) scored 7, obtained from question 16. The total weighted risk is 15. Therefore, the full evaluation of the supplier Anita Food of Peru		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Anita Food of Peru, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: 1. Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. 2. Review documents whose web links lead to blank pages (documents 2, 3, 8 and 8 of question 1, and the answer to question 26). Timing: 1 year. 3. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, records and documentary evidence for 2026). Timing: 1 year.
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Environmental	Peru	All evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's Pathway 3 risk assessment was reviewed and evaluated. This confirmed that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway work to classify suppliers across the three risk areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation produced the following scores for the risks mentioned. Legal risk (questions 1 and 2) scored 2, obtained from question 3. Social risk (questions 3 to 15) scored 6, obtained from questions 4 and 15. Environmental risk (questions 16 to 28) scored 7, obtained from question 16. The total weighted risk is 15. Therefore, the full evaluation of the supplier Anita Food of Peru		As part of the risk assessment of the supplier Anita Food of Peru, any change to the information in this report must be monitored continuously. The main tasks for the next evaluation are: 1. Share the Pathway 3 results with the supplier to give feedback and explain the points with a weighted risk different from 0. Timing: 6 months. 2. Review documents whose web links lead to blank pages (documents 2, 3, 8 and 8 of question 1, and the answer to question 26). Timing: 1 year. 3. Review updates to the evidence documents (policies, records and documentary evidence for 2026). Timing: 1 year.

Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Legal	Canada		This report responds to Indicator 2.2.11 and Appendix 3, point (b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.2), through a sector assessment of Canadian wheat (CWRS) supplied to Vitagro S.A. (Peru) and Inbalnor S.A. (Ecuador). Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores (Rev. 01), it covers only the legal deforestation/conversion factor. Result: LOW RISK. Probability and relevance to supply are low, with medium-high uncertainty. Wheat area is shrinking in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, CWRS limits origin to western Canada, the agricultural base predates the 31/12/2020 cut-off date, and no material link to post-cut-off conversion was found. Evaluated volumes: Vitagro 61,842 MT (2025-2026); Inbalnor	1. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, ASC Feed Standard, ASC STD-002, Version 1.2. Utrecht: ASC; 19 de diciembre de 2025. Table 1 (pp. 98-99), Table 4 (p. 112), Appendix 7 y Figura 44 (pp. 113-115). 2. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, ASC Feed Standard Interpretation Manual, ASC-INT-002, Version 1.2. Utrecht: ASC, diciembre de 2025. 3. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, «ASC Feed Standard V1.2 Update». asc-aqua.org. Fecha de deforestación/conversión al 31 de diciembre de 2020; publicación 19-12-2025; entrada en vigencia 02-02-2026; excepción del indicador 2.2.9. Consultado el 16 de agosto de 2026.	The program detects sector, regulatory or supply changes that could modify the low-risk classification. The comprehensive review is annual, supply chain monitoring is semiannual, and regulatory changes are handled by event. Responsibilities: Procurement (Vitagro): supply chain follow-up, trader declarations and supplier or origin changes. Quality / Sustainability (Vitagro): record custody and the annual review. Inbalnor counterpart: reception records and Ecuador origin certificates. External consultant: sector and regulatory follow-up, and reassessment when triggers are activated.
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Social	Canada		This report responds to Indicator 2.2.11 and Appendix 3, point (b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.2), through a sector assessment of Canadian wheat (CWRS) supplied to Vitagro S.A. (Peru) and Inbalnor S.A. (Ecuador). Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores (Rev. 01), it covers only the legal deforestation/conversion factor. Result: LOW RISK. Probability and relevance to supply are low, with medium-high uncertainty. Wheat area is shrinking in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, CWRS limits origin to western Canada, the agricultural base predates the 31/12/2020 cut-off date, and no material link to post-cut-off conversion was found. Evaluated volumes: Vitagro 61,842 MT (2025-2026); Inbalnor	1. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, ASC Feed Standard, ASC STD-002, Version 1.2. Utrecht: ASC; 19 de diciembre de 2025. Table 1 (pp. 98-99), Table 4 (p. 112), Appendix 7 y Figura 44 (pp. 113-115). 2. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, ASC Feed Standard Interpretation Manual, ASC-INT-002, Version 1.2. Utrecht: ASC, diciembre de 2025. 3. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, «ASC Feed Standard V1.2 Update». asc-aqua.org. Fecha de deforestación/conversión al 31 de diciembre de 2020; publicación 19-12-2025; entrada en vigencia 02-02-2026; excepción del indicador 2.2.9. Consultado el 16 de agosto de 2026.	The program detects sector, regulatory or supply changes that could modify the low-risk classification. The comprehensive review is annual, supply chain monitoring is semiannual, and regulatory changes are handled by event. Responsibilities: Procurement (Vitagro): supply chain follow-up, trader declarations and supplier or origin changes. Quality / Sustainability (Vitagro): record custody and the annual review. Inbalnor counterpart: reception records and Ecuador origin certificates. External consultant: sector and regulatory follow-up, and reassessment when triggers are activated.
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Wheat (Triticum aestivum)	Environmental	Canada		This report responds to Indicator 2.2.11 and Appendix 3, point (b) of Pathway 2 (ASC Feed V1.2), through a sector assessment of Canadian wheat (CWRS) supplied to Vitagro S.A. (Peru) and Inbalnor S.A. (Ecuador). Prepared by Quo Vadis Consultores (Rev. 01), it covers only the legal deforestation/conversion factor. Result: LOW RISK. Probability and relevance to supply are low, with medium-high uncertainty. Wheat area is shrinking in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, CWRS limits origin to western Canada, the agricultural base predates the 31/12/2020 cut-off date, and no material link to post-cut-off conversion was found. Evaluated volumes: Vitagro 61,842 MT (2025-2026); Inbalnor	1. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, ASC Feed Standard, ASC STD-002, Version 1.2. Utrecht: ASC; 19 de diciembre de 2025. Table 1 (pp. 98-99), Table 4 (p. 112), Appendix 7 y Figura 44 (pp. 113-115). 2. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, ASC Feed Standard Interpretation Manual, ASC-INT-002, Version 1.2. Utrecht: ASC, diciembre de 2025. 3. Aquaculture Stewardship Council, «ASC Feed Standard V1.2 Update». asc-aqua.org. Fecha de deforestación/conversión al 31 de diciembre de 2020; publicación 19-12-2025; entrada en vigencia 02-02-2026; excepción del indicador 2.2.9. Consultado el 16 de agosto de 2026.	The program detects sector, regulatory or supply changes that could modify the low-risk classification. The comprehensive review is annual, supply chain monitoring is semiannual, and regulatory changes are handled by event. Responsibilities: Procurement (Vitagro): supply chain follow-up, trader declarations and supplier or origin changes. Quality / Sustainability (Vitagro): record custody and the annual review. Inbalnor counterpart: reception records and Ecuador origin certificates. External consultant: sector and regulatory follow-up, and reassessment when triggers are activated.

Instructions



This template is intended for reporting UoC volume of marine ingredients used and majority sustainability level (MSL) to ASC.
For initial audits, the calculation period is the 24 months prior to the initial audit. After initial certification, the calculation period is per calendar year (January to December).
Indicate the volume of whole fish and by-products in metric tonnes, used in aquafeed.
Indicate the volume of whole fish scoring at each category in aquafeed. Note that there may be whole-fish which does not score at any Category.
The MSL is then calculated.
Only enter data in blue cells.

Table 1. Volume of whole fish, by-products and whole fish by category

	Volume (metric tonnes)	
All marine	31671	
By-products	9770	Provide the volume of fishery by-products in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Whole fish	19335	Provide the volume of whole fish in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 1	0	Provide the volume of Category 1 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 2	0	Provide the volume of Category 2 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 3	19335	Provide the volume of Category 3 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 4	0	Provide the volume of Category 4 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)

Table 2. Percentage of whole fish marine ingredients per category

Category	Percentage (%)	
Category 1	0	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 1
Category 2	0	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 2
Category 3	100	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 3
Category 4	0	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 4

Majority Sustainability Level	Level 3
-------------------------------	---------