FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0026			Date of visit: 24/02/2020
Time spent on site:	5 hours	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0007 Business No: FB0018	Site Name: Business Name:	Rothiemurchus Ponds Rothiemurchus Estate	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3.5	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

First input of 2020 due in March. Some remaining stock left on site from previous season (finished October 2019)

Only one pond on site is stocked with fish, pond is equipped with netted cage in which fish are held, this makes it easier to remove fish as required.

Fish held in ponds for short period before being stocked into neighbouring fishery, or sent to farm shop for human consumption.

Less than 20 mortalities observed over last season, some more will have been lost due to predation. Mortality records in place. Water in pond very dark, fish not visible in pond.

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ied by: FHI		[Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0	026	Site No:	FS0007	7			
Date of Visit:	24/02/20)20		Inspector(s)]
Registration/Authorisation 1. Business/site details sum 2. Changes made to details	mary checked b	y site representa	ative?			Y Y	
Site Details					_		
Total No facilities	18	Facilities sto	ocked	1	No facilities	inspected	18
Species RTR							
Age group Mix							
No Fish Unkno	wn						
Mean Fish Wt Mix							
Next Fallow Date (Site)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease If yes, detail:	problems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last vi	sit)?	N
Movement Records							
Movement records availa	ble for inspectio	n?					Y
2. Date of last inspection:					C	07/12/2017	
 Are records complete and Are movement records as 	•		,				Y
5. Are records complete and			•				Y
6. Are health certificates for	•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	· ·	•					
Are any movements carri	ed out by (or on	behalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a system in p		•		_			Y
Mortality Records							
Mortality records available	e for inspection?	•					Y
2. How are mortalities dispo	•			Domestic wa	aste - <25kg		
Mortality records complet	e and correctly o	entered?					Υ
4. Recent mortality (last 4 w		None observ	ved				
5. Evidence of recent increa							N
If yes, facility nos/no mortali			/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in morta	lity during period	I checked?					N/A
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplain)	ined) mortalities	heen reported to	o vet or FHI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	nea) mortanties	been reported to	o vet or i i ii:				14//
8. Have 'mortality events' be	en reported to F	HI? If no, add M	IRT case and	enter on morta	ality events sh	eet.	N/A

If no. detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

07/12/2017 - 24/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0026		Site No:	FS0007		Insp:	
Date of Visit	24/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	C	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		9	18	26	П
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m			3	6	10	10
WOVERNETIES ON	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contact	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	С				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	s C	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		С				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	4					
		n from Category III farm	8	3			
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	C				\Box
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	- 1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	3			ш
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			1
CoGP/Regulator			_	J			
Practices in accordance	Yes						
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		1 0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		25 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0026	;	Site No:	FS0007	
•	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the pre	vious 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm I	Management Area (or equivalent)	fallowed synchronously on	a single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and em	access to a range of licenced in-fenamectin benzoate) as well as accept in a reasonable period of time?	cess to suitable biological a	nd/or mech	hanical control measure	es, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count r	records available for inspection? (l	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequa	tely reflect the required standard s	specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)
7. Are sea lice (L. sali records are inspected	monis) record levels below the sug ? (CoGP Annex 6)	ggested criteria for treatmer	nt in the Co	oGP during the period to	hat
_	t female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) nur 10/6/19) during the period that rec	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6	/19) or
If yes, have these bee	en reported to the Fish Health Insp	ectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is conside	red to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)
	treatments been administered or o treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> i				
11. Has any other act	ion been taken (where applicable)	?			
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the actions taken ha	d a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, w	here conducted, carried out in coo	peration between participat	ing farms?	•	
14. Is there a harvesti sea lice?	ing strategy for the site, where few	er populations or part popu	lations are	held without treatment	for
	cific written lice management proc escalation of a sea lice infestation?		ribing set a	ctions to deal with reco	gnised
16. Do the sea lice lev	vels observed on stocks reflect sea	a lice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspec	tion				
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment damage due to p	predators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against the predati	on experienced on site? (De	etail below)	Υ
Top nets, fence aro	und ponds				
If other, detail below	<i>/</i> :				
					N
	ents or events been experienced of	•	te since the	e last FHI inspection?	IN
	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to question eported to Scottish Ministers?	on 10			
4. Have these been re	sported to ocottism will instens:				
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (wheel)	here they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local fish	eries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)
7. Were methods (if a	ny) used to recover escapees? If	yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were den	ployed was this action agreed with	local wild fish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, Co			, , , ,		
9. What action was ta	ken to prevent and minimise the ri	sk of further escapes? (Not	covered ir	n code but could	
be considered under	er satisfactory measures of the	Act)			
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please of	detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0026			Date of visit:	24/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0007			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI,CNI	09/03/2020							





Rothiemurchus Estate Rothiemurchus Estate Aviemore Inverness-shire PH22 1QH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0018
SITE NO FS0007
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 24/02/2020
SITE NAME Rothiemurchus Ponds
CASE No 20200026

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Date: 09/03/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0027			Date of visit: 24/02/2020
Time spent on site:	5 hours	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS1119 Business No: FB0018	Site Name: Business Name:	Rothiemurchus Fishery Rothiemurchus Estate	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.2	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

First input of 2020 due March 2019. Some remaining stock left on site from previous season (finished October 2019) Fish stocked from neighbouring pond site

Small amount of mortality recorded from last season, some more fish will have been lost due to predation. Mortality records in place.

Fishery separated into different ponds - Fly Pond, Bait Pond East and West, Otter Pond, Osprey Pond and Novice Pond No fish were visible during inspection of fishery.

Site does have a small level of predation from otters and cormorants.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ıed by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0027]	Site No:	FS1119	•			
Date of Visit:		24/02/2020	<u>י</u>		Inspector(s)):]
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site detaction 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	3
Site Details								
Total No facilities		3	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	es inspected	3
Species	RTR							
Age group	2019							
No Fish	Unknown							
Mean Fish Wt	Mix							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 202	20	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease proh	lems?		N	Any escape	e (since last	visit\?	N
If yes, detail:	uisease probi	CITIS:			Arry escape	5 (Sirice last	visit):	
Movement Record	s							
Movement record	_	or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i iliopositi					07/12/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				0	Y
4. Are movement re		•		,				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	,							
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Domestic w	/aste - <25kg		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		None observ	ved				
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no				/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:	Il Illortanty du	illig period ci	leckeu:					
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been re	ported to FHI	i? If no, add M	IRT case and c	enter on mor	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

- 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

07/12/2017 - 24/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0027		Site No:	FS1119		Insp:	
Date of Visit	24/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	·	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off	I 0	3	6	10	0
	Number of des		0		6	10	0
Exposure via water		Site contact	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	r from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	4					
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	Ī			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				1
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				$\overline{}$
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		T 0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		10 LOW

Case No: Site No: FS1119	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	
Management Area (or equivalent)?	
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?	
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	
Containment Inspection	
Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	
Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	
Screens in place at outflows	
If other, detail below:	
Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail	
9. If gill note were deployed was this action agreed with least wild fish interests and was a single large by Continu	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	
	\Box

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0027			Date of visit:	24/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1119			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI,CNI	09/03/2020							





Rothiemurchus Estate Rothiemurchus Estate Aviemore Inverness-shire PH22 1QH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0018
SITE NO FS1119
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 24/02/2020
SITE NAME Rothiemurchus Fishery
CASE NO 20200027

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: Date: 09/03/2020
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2020-0028			Date of visit: 25/02/2020			
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Main Ins	pector:			
Site No: SS0150 Business No: SB0099	Site Name: Business Name:	Raven Rock Raven Rock Sea Product	s Ltd.			
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 5.8	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Mixture of wild caught spat and spat moved on site from other sites. Stock on site appeared in good condition, some sea squirts present on ropes.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0028		Site No:	SS0150				
Date of Visit:		25/02/2020	1		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		9	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	es inspected	9
Species	MED	MED	MED					
Age group	2019	2018	2017					
No Fish	2 lines	~25 tonnes	~75 tonnes					
Mean Fish Wt	spat	30mm	50mm					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A	•	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Summer	spat fall	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease nrohl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit\2	N
If yes, detail:	disease probi	cilis:		- '	Ally escapes	(Sirice last	visit):	IV
Movement Record	s							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					28/07/2015	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	,				20/01/2010	Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				N/A
5. Are records comp								N/A
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records		`	,					
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the hu	isiness (not lis	ing a STR\2			
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)		
If other detail:	Empty shells	fall to seabe	d		<u> </u>			
3. Mortality records								N/A
4. Recent mortality ((last 4 wks):		No mortality	observed				
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
								NI/A
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N/A
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,		,					
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

Results of Surveillance

If no. detail:

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

Records checked between: 28/07/2015 - 25/02/2020

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2020-0028 Site No: SS0150 Date of Visit 25/02/2020 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 0 3 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 10 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 5 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 3 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area 0 Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2020-0028			Date of visit:	25/02/2020				
Site No:	SS0150			Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notification				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
					-				
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI	09/03/2020								





Raven Rock Sea Products Ltd. 9 Holm Stornoway Isle of Lewis HS2 0AZ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0099 SITE NO SS0150 INSPECTOR
 DATE OF VISIT
 25/02/2020

 SITE NAME
 Raven Rock

 CASE NO
 20200028

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: Date: 09/03/2020

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12	ls	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0029			Date of visit: 25/02/2020
Time spent on site:	hour	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: SS0802 Business No: SB0099	Site Name: Business Name:	Keose Raven Rock Sea Products Ltd	d.
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 5.8	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Wild caught spat on site

Stock on site appeared in good condition, some sea squirts present on ropes.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0029		Site No:	SS0802	<u>.</u>			
Date of Visit:		25/02/2020	·]		Inspector(s)):]
Registration/Authori 1. Business/site detail 2. Changes made to o	ils summary		ite representa	ative?				-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		1	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilitie	es inspected	1
	MED							
9 - 9	2019							
No Fish	1 line							
Mean Fish Wt	Spat							
Next Fallow Date (Site	e)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Summer	spat fall	
Recent (last 4 wks) di	isease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	ocaco pro	JII. 3.			/ sily 0000p	o (onico la	vicity.	
Movement Records								
Movement records		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspect							29/07/2015	
3. Are records comple		ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement reco		•						N/A
5. Are records comple	ete and corre	ectly entered?	?					N/A
6. Are health certificat	tes for introd	uctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement	ts carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syste			•	•	_			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records av	vailable for in	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail	il)		
_		fall to seabe	d					
3. Mortality records co								N/A
4. Recent mortality (la	ast 4 wks):		None observ	/ed				
5. Evidence of recent	increased/a	typical mortal	lities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no r				/reason:				
C. Ann. other peaks in	برام براناه د مارد							N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	mortality dui	ing period cri	ескеа?					N
7. Have increased (ur	nexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality eve	nts' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on mort	ality events	sheet.	N/A

Results of Surveillance

If no. detail:

1.	Has any animal he	alth surveillance beer	carried out by, o	or on behalf of.	the business?
•					

is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?

5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher

Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

health status, certification if required)?

aquaculture animals held on site?

3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

29/07/2015 - 25/02/2020

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2020-0029 Site No: SS0802 Date of Visit 25/02/2020 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 0 3 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 10 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 5 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 n Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 2 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 3 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area 0 Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No: Site No: SS0802	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?	
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?	
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	
Containment Inspection	
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	
If other, detail below:	
Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail	
If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0029			Date of visit:	25/02/2020			
Site No:	SS0802			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.				tion			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI	09/03/2020							





Raven Rock Sea Products Ltd. 9 Holm Stornoway Isle of Lewis HS2 0AZ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0099 SITE NO SS0802 INSPECTOR

 DATE OF VISIT
 25/02/2020

 SITE NAME
 Keose

 CASE NO
 20200029

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 09/03/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Iss	sued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018
			Date of visit: 13/02/2020
	_	Main Inspecto	r:
Site Name: Business Name:	Mill of Elrick Mill of Elrick Fis	h Farm	
CNI 3	4	5	6
Thermometer No:	T274		FHI 045 completed
Region: GR	Water type	: F	CoGP MA
sh present?	N If yes, see	additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
ut intended visit detail r	eason below:		
F	Site Name: Business Name: CNI 3 Thermometer No: Region: GR h present?	Business Name: Mill of Elrick Fis A Thermometer No: Region: GR Water type N If yes, see If yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes,	Main Inspecto Mill of Elrick Business Name: Mill of Elrick Fish Farm Mill of Elrick Fish Farm Thermometer No: Region: GR Water type: If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform

No mortalities observed on site, stocking densities very low and water flow/quality is good. Even in hottest temps, water flow is never a problem.

No treatments are required, due to low stocking densities.

Site and adjacent fishery will be closed at the end of this summer and will no longer be operational. Owner will contact FHI and a visit will be arranged to deregister.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0040]	Site No:	FS0367]			
Date of Visit:		13/02/202	0		Inspector(s)]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								_
Total No facilities		3	Facilities sto	ocked	3	No facilitie	es inspected	3
Species	RTR	RTR						
Age group	2018	2019						
No Fish	750	2,500						
Mean Fish Wt	800g	200g						
Next Fallow Date (S	site)	September	2020	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	None	<u> </u>	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	s							
1. Movement record	ds available fo	r inspection?	•					Y
2. Date of last inspe	ection:						6/12/2017 V	VJM
3. Are records comp	olete and corr	ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availab	le for dead fi	sh and waste?	?				N/A
Are records comp		•						N/A
Are health certific	ates for intro	ductions (out	with GB) avail	able?				N/A
Transport Records	6							
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys					_			
Mortality Records			·					
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detai	1)		
If other detail:	No mortalitie				outer (dotain	'/		
3. Mortality records			tered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): None								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?						N/A		
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		//reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality dι	ıring period c	hecked?					N/A
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	een reported t	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		L	10.16	IST.		111		
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.							N/A	

Treatments and Medicines Records	
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	.,
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	<u> </u>
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Paparda shocked between: 6/12/2017 13/2/20	

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0040		Site No:	FS0367		Insp:	
Date of Visit	13/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Mayamanta off							
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	3
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts		_			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				\vdash
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					-
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		$\overline{}$
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8		
	iaims upstream	TOT WITHIN T HOUR EXCUISION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	1			
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		-
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				\vdash
CoGP/Regulator				,			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				\vdash
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				
	No		2				
					Total		7
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2020-0040		S	Site No:	FS0367	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years	?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm N	Management Area (or equiv	valent) fallowed syn	chronously on	a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and emccan these be deployed	access to a range of licence amectin benzoate) as well I in a reasonable period of cumented farm manageme	as access to suitab time?	le biological ar	nd/or mecl	hanical control measu	ures, and
	ecords available for inspec	tion? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)			
	ely reflect the required star		Ť	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criter	ia for treatmen	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	I that
	female sea lice (<i>L. salmon</i> 0/6/19) during the period the	•		el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Heal	th Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see cor	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is c	considered to cause	significant wel	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)
	reatments been administer reatment or where <i>C. elon</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where appl	icable)?				
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the actions ta	ken had a significan	t impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out	in cooperation betw	een participat	ing farms?	,	
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, whe					
	cific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infes		aypoints descr	ibing set a	ections to deal with re	cognised
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks refl	ect sea lice count da	ata? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion					
•	nced equipment damage o	lue to predators in th	ne current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
	ce to mitigate against the p	•			•	N/A
If other, detail below	:					
Have escape incide	ents or events been experie	enced on or in the vio	cinity of the sit	e since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to					
	ported to Scottish Ministers	•				
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forthy	with (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and lo	cal fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escape	es? If yes give detai	il			
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Co	oyed was this action agree GP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	ed with local wild fish	interests and	was perm	ission given by Scotti	sh
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimis	e the risk of further e	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures	of the Act)				
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with rega	rds to containment?	If no, please d	letail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0040			Date of visit:	13/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0367	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
5	_							
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	13/02/2020							





Mill of Elrick Fish Farm Auchnagatt Ellon Aberdeenshire AB41 8US

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0214
SITE NO FS0367
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 13/02/2020 SITE NAME Mill of Elrick CASE NO 20200040

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Date: 13/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2020-0047			Date of visit: 11/02/2020			
Time spent on site:		Main Inspect	or:			
Site No: SS0740 Business No: SB0473	Site Name: Business Name:	Scottish Marine Institute (SAM Scottish Marine Institute (SAM	7 .			
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	55	6			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:				

CDN 2020002 placed on Sgier Liath for Bonamia ostrea to include a protection zone. This site falls within the protection zone.

Case No:	2020-0047			Date of visit:	11/02/2020			
Site No:	SS0740	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D 10								
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
INF no report	12/02/2020							

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0048			Date of visit: 11/02/2020
Time spent on site:		Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: SS0547 Business No: SB0358	Site Name: Business Name:	South Ardnaclach Farm Creran Oysters	
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

CDN 2020002 placed on Sgier Liath for Bonamia ostrea to include a protection zone. This site falls within the protection zone.

Site No: SS0547 Inspector: Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp
Penort Summany
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp
INF -no report 12/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2020-0049			Date of visit: 11/02/2020			
Time spent on site:		Main Inspecto	or:			
Site No: SS0346 Business No: SB0366	Site Name: Business Name:	Rubha Mor The Caledonian Oyster Compa	any			
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	nil reason below:				

CDN 2020002 placed on Sgier Liath for Bonamia ostrea to include a protection zone. This site falls within the protection zone.

Case No:	2020-0049			Date of visit:	11/02/2020				
Site No:	SS0346			Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.				ate of Notification				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
INF - no report	12/02/2020								

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2020-0054			Date of visit: 19/02/2020		
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspec	etor:		
Site No: SS0917 Business No: SB0544	Site Name: Business Name:	John Muir Building Heriot Watt University			
Case Types: 1 DIS	2 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: LO	Water type: S	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	il reason below:			

CT room G36 being used at present. G37, G40 and G41 (all located on ground floor) could potentially be used for holding oysters. The site location on the site details sheet states "Controlled temperature room G", G refers to the ground floor.

Some ancillary equipment (e.g. spare tubing etc), including shelving left in Virkon solution (1%) in the tanks whilst the tanks were being disinfected.

PHS used as waste disposal company. Incinerator based in Glasgow.

Consignment of 6,000 animals to be taken from Little Loch Broom on March 16th, to deploy in Dornoch East site on 26, 27 and 28th of March. FHI are welcome to come along on these dates to visit the site and take samples.

Scallops found in Dornoch in past diver survey. King scallops are a vector for Bonamia

C+D record signed off by Heriot-Watt staff as complete on 20/12/19.

Biological waste disposal record signed off by Heriot-Watt staff on 23/10/19.

Clinical waste disposal record signed off by Heriot-Watt staff on 23/10/19.

Lochnell will no longer be used to supply DEEP.

Corridor between CT room and JM yard about 20m of tiled floor cleaned and disinfected.

Room and ancillary equipment appear clean and disinfected, smell of disinfectant present. Some ancillary equipment (e.g. pens, gloves, tape etc) placed in plastic boxes that were placed in tanks whilst they were being disinfected with Virkon. Project manager may remove oysters from Dornoch Firth West in summer. Will depend on how many oysters survived after increase in mortality confirmed in winter (2019) of 70%.

Heriot-Watt has a field station in Loch Creran. Samples very rarely moved from the site e.g. flame shells.

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0054	Site No:	SS0917				
Date of Visit:	19/02/	2020		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ils summary checked	by site represent	ative?			Y N]
Site Details Total No facilities	6	Facilities sto	ocked	0	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species Age group No Fish	Fallow						
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Si	te) N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	16/03/202		
Recent (last 4 wks) of the state of the stat	disease problems?		Y	Any escape	es (since last	visit)?	
 Date of last inspect Are records comp Are movement records. Are records comp 	s available for inspect	ered? ad fish and waste? ered?				22/10/2019	Y Y Y Y
•	ats carried out by (or o	•		_			
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records available for inspection? 2. How are mortalities disposed of? If other detail: 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?							
Recent mortality (Evidence of recent	ast 4 wks): t increased/atypical m	nortalities?	ulra a a a a a				
	mortality per facility/n		reason:				
If yes, detail:	n mortality during perio		, =::::				
If yes, detail action:	inexplained) mortalitie ents' been reported to			enter on mor	tality events s	sheet.	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
4. Decembly and Audio 2		
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection	on?	
3. Are records complete and correctly enter	red?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		_
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection		
• •	lity removal, recording and safe disposal bee	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinar	y professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the sit	te been included?	
	vent that the presence or suspicion of the present that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture anir health status, certification if required)?	mals being stocked on the farm site been cov	vered (equal or higher
•	asures implemented between each epidemio	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	vement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or de	
/. Is documentation available regarding the aquaculture animals held on site?	e measures in place to maintain the physical	containment of
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been a	dequately implemented on site?	
lf no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		

22/10/2019 - 19/02/2020

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Case No:	2020-0054			Date of visit:	19/02/2020			
Site No:	SS0917	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Inen	and Incom					
DIS	02/03/2020	Insp	2 nd Insp					
DIO	02/03/2020							





Heriot Watt University
John Muir Building
Heriot Watt University
Riccarton Campus, Edinburgh
EH14 4AS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0544 SITE NO SS0917 INSPECTOR

17 SITE NAME
CASE NO

DATE OF VISIT 19/02/2020
SITE NAME John Muir Building

20200054

Cleaning and disinfection inspection of a site subject to movement restrictions

The above site was inspected to confirm that fallowing, cleaning and disinfection had taken place. The site met the standard approved by Marine Scotland. The movement restrictions have been revoked.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 02/03/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0055			Date of visit: 19/02/2020
Time spent on site:	.5 hours	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS1292 Business No: FB0561	Site Name: Business Name:	EPPE Centre EPP Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: LO	Water type: B	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Site visited to discuss authorisation requirements if some of the facilities are used by another scientific research company, Moredun.

Home office license to hold fish revoked last year.

Site fallow since May 2019.

Six rooms available to hold fish. Moredun unlikely to use more than 4 rooms (under home office license)

Projects will look into chemical safety and bioaccumulation of fish medicines and/or other chemicals. Unsure of which projects will be approved, therefore they are unsure of exactly what chemicals will be used yet.

Most of the disease challenge work will be conducted in Aberdeen lab, as Moredun have a connection with colleagues there.

No notifiable disease work will be conducted at EPPE centre.

Hope to start the work around the start of May 2020.

Projects usually last about 5 years, unsure of exact length of project at the moment.

The facilities/labs will be let from EPPE.

Unsure of the route of mortality disposal at present. Incinerator on site that can be used if required, although a contract is already set up with a specialist waste disposal company to dispose of whole fish.

Only likely to use one room at once to hold fish. A disinfectant foot bath will be used at the entrance to each room. Room specific PPE for each room will be used (footwear, lab coats, eye protection etc.).

Each room has a separate water supply from a borehole. The water supply for each room can be linked but that will only happen in an emergency situation. Each room also has a separate UV filter and charcoal filter. Waste water discharged into mains sewage.

Moredun likely to be using Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout in experiments.

No change in contact details for the business, but the site manager has been changed. These will be reviewed by Moredun and EPPE after stocking and changed if necessary.

At present fish are frozen if they are moved off the site whole or incinerated on site. A company called "Lab waste" currently dispose of the mortalities. The mortalities are bagged on site and the disposal company provide plastic containers to hold the bagged waste.

FHI 059, Version 12			Iss	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0055]	Site No:	FS129	2			
Date of Visit:		19/02/2020			Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite represent	tative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		Fallow	Facilities st	ocked	0	No facilitie	s inspected	0
Species	Fallow							
Age group								
No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A		Next Input D	ate (Site)	Approx. M	ay 2020	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?			N Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record								
1. Movement record		r inspection?					4.4/00/0040	Y
Date of last inspeAre records comp		actly entered?	,				14/02/2018	
4. Are movement re		•		?				Ý
5. Are records comp				•				Y
6. Are health certific				lable?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the b	usiness (not u	sing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpo	ortation records	s?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Incinerated -			
If other detail:					ialist contractor	used to dis	pose of waste	e (disposal
3. Mortality records				d out on the ar	nimais).			Y
4. Recent mortality (•	correctly eric	N/A					
5. Evidence of recer	•	tvpical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		••		y/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i								Y
If yes, detail:	·			·	6). All fish euth	anised after	experiment of	on 25/02/19.
7. Have increased (unexplained)							Y
If yes, detail action:					ty in Feb 2019 (NI/A
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.						N/A		

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4	wks)?			
If yes, detail: If other, detail:				
Medicines records availab	le for inspection?			
3. Are records complete and	•			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal pe	•			
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?				
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stored appr	ropriately?			
Biosecurity Records				
Biosecurity records availal	ble for inspection?			
•	iency of mortality removal, recor	ding and safe disposal be	en considered?	
3. Has the manner and perio	d in which the APB will notify Sc	ottish Ministers or veterin	ary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mo	rtality at the site been included?			
	taken in the event that the prese			
	nd how and when that will be not			
	quaculture animals being stocke	d on the farm site been o	overed (equal or higher	
health status, certification if r	equirea)?			
6. Have the husbandry and b	piosecurity measures implemente	ed between each epidemi	iological unit to minimise	
•	n covered (movement of staff, vi	•	_	
7. Is documentation available	e regarding the measures in place	ce to maintain the physica	Il containment of	
aquaculture animals held on	site?			
	edures been adequately impleme	ented on site?		
If no, detail:				
Results of Surveillance				
1. Has any animal health sur	veillance been carried out by, or	on behalf of, the busines	s?	

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

14/02/18 - 19/02/20

Case No:	2020-0055			Date of visit:	19/02/2020			
Cubb No.	2020 0000			Date of Visit.	10/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1292			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification				
Í		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D								
Report Summary	5 /		nd					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	02/03/2020							





EPP Ltd EPP Environmental Centre Bush Estate Penicuik EH26 0PH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0561
 Date of Visit
 19/02/2020

 Site No
 FS1292
 Site Name
 EPPE Centre

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200055

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow.

Records

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.



Date: 02/03/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0056			Date of visit: 20/02/2020
Time spent on site:	0 mins	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS1238 Business No: FB0544	Site Name: Business Name:	Fife Scotland	
Case Types: 1 OTH	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: FI	Water type: B	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Oysters were received in first half of year 2017. Oysters remained on site for about 3 months. No record kept of this movement Dead oysters were bagged and disposed of in local council bins outside the lab. Local council to dispose of waste bins. All oysters were killed before disposal. No live animals left lab.

Aquarium was bleached as a form of disinfection after both experiments. No disinfection record kept

Natural seawater filtered before use in aquarium. Waste water disposed of down mains sewage.

Aquarium (40 litre storage box) kept in small cupboard in the office.

One batch of native oysters received in 2017 and another batch received in 2018. Aquarium used in both experiment. Small oysters (maybe 1-2 year old) used and held to conduct eDNA work in 2018. Only on site for about a week in July 2018 and fed on algae paste.

No plans to accept native oysters in the near future.

Filter cartridges disposed of in council waste bins at front of building.

Xelect moved from Scottish Ocean Institute in 2016, before oysters moved on the site.

Xelect lab (in St Andrew's) inspected as they received native oysters from a site confirmed with Bonamia. Site currently fallow.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issued by: FHI		Date of	fissue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0056	Site No	p: FS123	38		
Date of Visit:		20/02/2020		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary	ails checked by site repre	esentative?			3
Site Details Total No facilities Species		Facilitie	es stocked		No facilities inspec	ted
Age group No Fish						
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S	ite)		Next Input I	Date (Site)		
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease proble	ems?		Any escapes	(since last visit)?	
5. Are records comp	s available for ction: lete and corre cords availabl lete and corre	ectly entered? le for dead fish and w				
_	nts carried out	t by (or on behalf) of t or maintenance of tra	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records a 2. How are mortalitie If other detail: 3. Mortality records a 4. Recent mortality (es disposed of complete and	f?				
5. Evidence of recently yes, facility nos/no		typical mortalities? facility/no stock per fa	acility/reason:			
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period checked?				
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action:		mortalities been repor		enter on morta	lity events sheet.	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last	4 wks)?			
If yes, detail:				
If other, detail:				
2. Medicines records avail	•			
3. Are records complete a	•			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal	•			
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?			
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stored a	opropriately?			
Biosecurity Records				
1. Biosecurity records ava	lable for inspection?			
•	equency of mortality removal, recor	rding and safe disposal	been considered?	
3. Has the manner and pe	riod in which the APB will notify So	cottish Ministers or vete	rinary professional of any	
•	mortality at the site been included?			
4. Has the action that will I	be taken in the event that the pres	ence or suspicion of the	presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included	and how and when that will be no	otified to Scottish Ministe	ers?	
5. Has the health status of	aquaculture animals being stocke	ed on the farm site been	covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification	if required)?			
6. Have the husbandry and	d biosecurity measures implement	ted between each epide	miological unit to minimise	

If no, detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

Case No:	2020-0056			Date of visit:	20/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1238	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	Ì							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
No report	04/03/2020							

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0057			Date of visit: 27/02/2020
Time spent on site:		Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: SS0900 Business No: SB0544	Site Name: Business Name:	Dornoch Firth East Heriot Watt University	
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Bonamia ostreae confirmed at Dornoch Firth West and Dornoch Firth protection zone created including Dornoch Firth East. Controlled by CDN2020001. Dornoch Firth East has not been tested as we were unable to get samples due to the weather. It is proposed that the site will be sampled in Autumn. As the site is covered by CDN2020001 the IDN placed on the site will be revoked.

Case No:	2020-0057			Date of visit:	27/02/2020			
Site No:	SS0900	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Penort Summany								
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	lnen	ond .					
Case Type	Date 19/03/2020	Insp	2 nd Insp					
INF	18/03/2020							
			-					
			—					

FHI 059, Version 12	ls	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0058			Date of visit: 17/02/2020
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Insp	pector:
Site No: FS0504 Business No: FB0557	Site Name: Business Name:	Girlsta Hatchery Grieg Seafood Shetland L	td (Hatchery)
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 11.2	Thermometer No:	site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Recent smolts stocked to DMA 3a went to sea at a reported average weight of 190g, site manager reported that movements went well, but were delayed due to adverse weather. No issues observed or reported on site. Grading operations were ongoing during the inspection, with the large grade due to go to sea in April 2020 to DMA 3a. Fish sampled for VMD appeared in good conditions and were of uniform size.

No treatments have been required with exception of salt due to increasing nitrate levels. Site is examining possibility to move intake pipe work to deeper water, it was reported that by doing this the intake water temperature could be reduced by upto 6oC.

An input of ova is due for delivery on Thursday 20/02/20, from Stofnfisker.

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity procedures on site. Water temperature in the parr/smolt unit was 11.2oC, temperatures in fry unit are higher, but kept at 14oC or below.

Mortalities on site very low and fish showed good shoaling behaviour and feed response.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018			
Case No:	2020-0058]	Site No:	FS0504							
Date of Visit:		17/02/2020	5		Inspector(s)):]			
Registration/Authorn 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N				
Site Details											
Total No facilities		39	Facilities sto	cked	19	No facilitie	s inspected	39			
Species	SAL	SAL									
Age group	Fry	Parr									
No Fish	1,629,084	1,232,234									
Mean Fish Wt	1.3g	50.5g									
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Never fully fa	allow	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	20/02/20 -	ova input				
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? If yes, detail: Movement Records											
1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspe 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	ovement Records Movement records available for inspection? Date of last inspection: Are records complete and correctly entered? Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? Are records complete and correctly entered? Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?										
If other detail:	s disposed d	JI !			Michierated	- Siletianu vv	asie io Lifeig	Jy			
3. Mortality records	·	d correctly ent	WK 4 (20/01 262 (0.13%) WK 6 (03/02	1/20) - Fry Unit), WK 5 (27/01/ 2/20) - Fry Unit Fry Unit 1,136	20) - Fry Uni 4,110 (0.25	it 8,007 (0.499%), Parr Unit	%), Parr Unit 190 (0.01%),	58 (0.005%),			
4. Recent mortality (•										
Evidence of recerIf yes, facility nos/no		• •		reason.				N			
II yes, lacility 1103/110	mortality per	Tacility/110 St	JCK per racinty	ICason.							
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality du	uring period cl	hecked?					N			
7. Have increased (to If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A			

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
		M
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: The state of		N
If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspection	on?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly ente	red?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		'
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspect		Y
• •	lity removal, recording and safe disposal be APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterina	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the si	•	ary professional of any
moreusea (unexplamea) merianty at the co	to book moradou.	
	vent that the presence or suspicion of the presence that will be notified to Scottish Ministers'	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture ani health status, certification if required)?	mals being stocked on the farm site been co	overed (equal or higher Y
• •		
	asures implemented between each epidemio evement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or o	
	e measures in place to maintain the physical	
aquaculture animals held on site?	The project of the pr	
8. Have the biosecu <u>rity procedures been a</u>	dequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		

July 2019 to 17/02/20

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI	Г	HI 059, Version 12							ISS	suea by: F	ΗI			
Priority samples:		Case no:	2020-00)58	Site No:		FS0504					17/0	02/2020	17/0
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species SAL		Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG					
Summary samples	ı	starts/ends:				0:00		Inspect	or:		_	VMD No	o. [18
Pool/Fish No	٠	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	_	5			
Pool/Fish No Fish nos Fish nos Fish nos Fool Group Species SAL	ı	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	P	Α		Total Sa	mples
Fish nos	4													
Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL Average weight Sex Water Type Water Hatchery (Fry H	Н		4.40	44.00	04.05	00.00	04.05	00.40	44.45					
Species Interpretation of the state of the	L		1-10	11-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	_				
Average weight Interpretation of the state	L													
A Details rista Hatchery (Fry Matchery (Fry														
Mater Latchery (Fry Mit) - Stofnfisker Nit) - Stofn			50g	50g	50g	50g	50g	50g	50g					
rista Hatchery (Fry nit) - Stofnfisker														
rista Hatchery iit) - Stofinfiske		Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW					
			Girlsta Hatchery Unit) - Stofnfiske	Girlsta Hatchery Unit) - Stofnfiske		Girlsta Hatchery Unit) - Stofnfiske	Girlsta Hatchery Unit) - Stofnfiske							

02/2020	2/2020 Additional Sample Information:													
0]	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	1								

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0058		Site No:	FS0504		Insp:	
Date of Visit	17/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible		novements on from equivalent zone or		_			
species		ncluding third country	0		18	26	0
	Number of sup	pilers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
	Number of des		0		6	10	6
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		0
		or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of	4				0
		from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	from Category ∀ farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0]			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator	lv.			,			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				0
					Total		29
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2020-0058	Si	ite No:	FS0504	
•	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the previous 4	4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm I	Management Area (or equivalent) fallow	ed synchronously on a	single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and em	access to a range of licenced in-feed and namectin benzoate) as well as access to d in a reasonable period of time? ocumented farm management agreemen	suitable biological and	d/or mech	nanical control measur	es, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count r	records available for inspection? (Legal S	SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequa	tely reflect the required standard specifie	ed in the SSI and the C	CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. sali</i> records are inspected	monis) record levels below the suggested? (CoGP Annex 6)	d criteria for treatment	in the Co	GP during the period	that
	t female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers _l 10/6/19) during the period that records ar		l of 3 or a	bove (prior to w/b 10/6	6/19) or
If yes, have these bee	en reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate	te? If no, FHI see com	ment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is considered to	cause significant welfa	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50)
	treatments been administered or other actreatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is cons				
11. Has any other acti	ion been taken (where applicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic t	treatments or the actions taken had a sig	nificant impact upon th	he lice lev	els recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wi	here conducted, carried out in cooperation	on between participatin	ng farms?		
14. Is there a harvesti sea lice?	ing strategy for the site, where fewer popular	ulations or part popula	tions are	held without treatmen	t for
	cific written lice management procedure escalation of a sea lice infestation?	with waypoints describ	oing set a	ctions to deal with reco	ognised
16. Do the sea lice lev	vels observed on stocks reflect sea lice c	ount data? If no please	e detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	tion				
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment damage due to predato	ors in the current or pre	evious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against the predation exp	erienced on site? (Det	ail below))	Y
Indoors					
If other, detail below	r.				
0 11			-1 41		N
•	ents or events been experienced on or in	the vicinity of the site	since the	e last FHI Inspection?	14
	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 eported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (where th	ey exist)? (CoGP - 4.	4.37, 5.4.	.17)	
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local fisheries to	rusts forthwith (where t	they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)
7. Were methods (if a	ny) used to recover escapees? If yes giv	e detail			
8. If gill nets were den	ployed was this action agreed with local w	/ild fish interests and w	vas permi	ssion given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, Co			,		
9. What action was ta	ken to prevent and minimise the risk of fu	urther escapes? (Not o	covered in	code but could	
be considered under	er satisfactory measures of the Act)				
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with regards to contain	ment? If no, please de	etail reasc	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0058			Date of visit:	17/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0504			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD	21/02/2020		2 11130					





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd (Hatchery)
Gremista
Lerwick
Shetland
ZE1 0PX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0557 SITE NO FS0504 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 17/02/2020
SITE NAME Girlsta Hatchery
CASE NO 20200058

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as high. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted annually. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 21/02/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date o	of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0060			Date of visit:	19/02/2020
Time spent on site:	hrs	Ma	ain Inspector:	
Site No: FS0608 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Vidlin North Scottish Sea Farms	s Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6	1
Water Temp (°C): 7.1	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 com	pleted
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	S CoGP MA	S-5
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see add	itional information/clinical itional information/clinical itional information/clinical	score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Excellent visibility on site at time of inspection, >6m. Fish observed shoaling well and showed good feeding response. Fish sampled for VMD in excellent condition. Sea lice numbers had been elevated, a thermolicer treatment was completed near the end of wk 7, there was an issue with the thermolicer and the treatment in cage 8 was stopped.

Site has been experiencing an increased problem with seal predation which began in August 2019, the site has Sapphire seal pro nets on all cages, weighted nets and an OTAQ ADD, they also have an Airmar ADD available. The cages are due to be replaced before next cycle and plan to have sinker tubes next cycle. Seal predation accounts for 32.5% of mortalities this cycle, this has not been an issue previous generations of fish.

Site was stocked, 7 out 12 cages, with lumpfish in December from Otterferry, lumpfish mortaity is currently 13% since input. No moribund fish observed during inspection, 2 dead, both with predation damage were removed during the inspection. Some lethargic fish were observed in the cages that had recently finished physical treatment, however they looked in good condition and were shoaling.

Site has 6m sea lice sheilds installed on all cages. Only bath treatment this cycle has been a hydrogen peroxide treatment for AGD, only other theraputant treatment has been SLICE. Site had been due to receive an additional input of lumpfish to stock the remaining cages.

Stock was also observed on camera system at shorebase, showing excellent shoaling behaviour.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0060]	Site No:	FS0608				
Date of Visit:		19/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	19 S1	2019						
No Fish	435,447	24,597						
Mean Fish Wt	3.065 kg	50g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	July 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Jan 2021		
Recent (last 4 wks) (disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		r increation?						
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					31/08/2017	'
3. Are records comp		actly entered?	2				31/00/2017	Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				Ý
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)			
		ssay) - fish m	neal					
3. Mortality records of								Y
	·	,	wk 4 - 1,684	(0.38%) for sit		` '	for site, wk 6	- 5,337
4. Recent mortality (•			site, wk 7 - 1,60	37 (0.37%) for	site		
Evidence of recen		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

Results of Surveillance

3. Any significant results?

Advanced AGD apparent - October 2019

Records checked between:

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

August 2017 to 19/02/20

	11 009, Version 12							155	ueu by. r	TII			
	Case no:	2020-00	060	Site No:		FS0608			Date of v		19/0	02/2020	19/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		y. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. 	16
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	3 kg	3 kg	3 kg									
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
<u>s</u>													
Details	l	~	~										
		Knock	00	oc									
Stock	Stock Origin	조	Knock	Knock									
Stc	Facility No	5	11	20									

02/2020	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:									
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 08						
Case Number:	2020-0060 Site No: FS0608 Insp:						
Date of Visit	19/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26	
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	0
			<u> </u>				
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	10
Exposure via water	Number of des	Site contacts				10	
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	T v	1-5 	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or		0				0
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	_	4		
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	'		4		—
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	tarms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			0
the fales of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
		from zone or compartment of					
	equivalent state		4				0
		from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing list	from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	-			0
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	1			0
				1			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				0
					Total		14
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2020-0060		S	ite No:	FS0608		
•	Seawater Sites Only)	s in the previous 4 years	۶۶				N
•	•	quivalent) fallowed syn		a single ve	ear class basis?		Y
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of lic	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medica	ations (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	ures, and	Y
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or		ement agreement or sta	atement relevar	nt to the si	ite and CoGP Farm		Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Y
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the (CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	*	low the suggested criter	ria for treatment	t in the Co	oGP during the period	that	N
		<i>monis</i>) numbers per fishod that records are insp		el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or	Υ
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If n	no, FHI see com	nment.			Υ
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infe	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welf	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 9	5.3.50)	N
		stered or other actions telongatus is considered					Υ
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where a	applicable)?					Υ
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the action	is taken had a significan	nt impact upon t	the lice lev	vels recorded?		Υ
•		out in cooperation betw					Υ
		where fewer population		_		nt for	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?						Y	
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	se detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	ion						
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in th	he current or pr	evious pro	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against t	the predation experience	ed on site? (De	tail below	·)		Υ
Sapphire seal pro ne	ets, top nets, tensione	ed nets, ADD, M.M.L.					
If other, detail below:							
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site	e since the	e last FHI inspection?	•	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip	p to question 10					
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Minis	sters?					
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP - 4	.4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	ny) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give deta	il				
8 If all nots were deal	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and	was nerm	ission given by Scotti	ish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)						
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and mini	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could		
	r satisfactory measu	· ·					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment?	If no, please d	etail reaso	on(s)		Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0060	Site No: FS0608	
Date of Visit: 19/02/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 Is the current FMAg/S available for it Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fance Does the FMAg/S identify the date on Does the FMAg/S identify the date on 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statemer f review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Managements	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or
 Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin Does the FMAg/S identify the special 	nation requirements for stocks held in the area on ies of fish which may be stocked into the area on mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	r farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ad fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available trarms?	reatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and cl farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable I	harvest practices on farms in the area or ind	ividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	y which the area or individual farm will be falled?	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether bro covered by the agreement or statement?	oodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Managen	nent Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	nt include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and op	perated in accordance with the agreement or	r statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	f the FMAg/S? 18/04/2019	

Case No: 2020-0060 Site No: FS0608 Date of visit: 19/02/2020

Start date:		Size of fish:	weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
03/02/20	09/02/2020	≥750g	3 KG	SAL	2019 S1	Weekly	1.21	Explained	Treatment
									+

If unexplained, select observations:		Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	5,337		Collected during site inspection 19/02/20

Case No:	2020-0060			Date of visit:	19/02/2020					
Site No:	FS0608	l		Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification								
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	+									
		-			-					
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	21/02/2020		2 11135							
, , ,										





Scottish Sea Farms Ltd Laurel House Laurelhill Business Park Polmaise Road Stirling FK7 9JQ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 SITE NO FS0608 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 19/02/2020 SITE NAME Vidlin North CASE NO 20200060

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Date: 21/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of is	sue: 08/10/2018	
Case No: 2020-0061				Date of visit: 1	9/02/2020	
Time spent on site:	hrs		Main Inspector:	: =		
Site No: FS0407 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Wick of Vatsette Cooke Aquacult		i		
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD	5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 7.7	Thermometer No:	T148	–	FHI 045 complete	ed 🔲	
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	S-3	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Current stock arrived on site 22 - 24/01/2020. Fish hard to see from walkway around pen as they were keeping low in the water due to recently being transferred to site and it also being a sunny day. Those that I could see appeared in good condition and were coming up for feed. Sea lice levels have been above reporting level over the last few weeks but below the intervention level. Treatment has been delayed due to persistent bad weather but no physical damage was noted. The fish taken for VMD sampling appeared in very good condition externally and internally upon examination.

Mortality levels above reporting level in 2019 on wk 37 (3.13%) & wk 39 - 43 (1.49%, 1.55%, 3.83%, 1.77%, 2.54%) across whole site. This was due to gill health issues. Levels dropped below 1% wk 44 and remained below for remainder the production cycle. Company health manager notified and FHI also notified of situation.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018		
Case No:	2020-0061]	Site No:	FS0407]					
Date of Visit:		19/02/2020	0		Inspector(s):]		
Registration/Authornal Business/site details. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	}		
Site Details										
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	16		
Species .	SAL									
Age group	19 S1									
No Fish	201,000 2.6 Kg									
Mean Fish Wt		0-4-0000		New tolerand De	t- (Cit-)	N/D	2000			
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Oct. 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site) -	Nov/Dec.	2020			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N		
If yes, detail:										
Movement Record	s									
Movement record		r inspection?						Y		
2. Date of last inspe		a athu a mtara d	2				28/06/2016			
 Are records comp Are movement re 		•		,				Y		
5. Are records comp								Ÿ		
6. Are health certific		-		able?				N/A		
Transport Records			·							
Are any movement		t by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N		
If yes, is there a sys					_					
Mortality Records	•									
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y		
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)			
If other detail:										
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ent						Y		
4. Recent mortality	•			0.17%), wk 6 -	583 (0.29%), י	wk 7 - 340 ((0.17%)			
5. Evidence of recer								N		
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	racility/no sto	ock per facility	reason:						
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?							
If yes, detail:		al comments						'		
7. Have increased (vet or FHI?				Y		
If yes, detail action:	,		company hea							
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been re	ported to FH	l? If no, add M	Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.						

FHI 059, Version 12	ŀ	Issued by: FHI	Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
				N
1. Recent treatments (la	ast 4 wks)?			N
If yes, detail:				
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records av	vailable for inspection?			V
	e and correctly entered?			Ÿ
4. Are fish in a withdraw	•			Y
5. If yes, what treatmen	•	T.M.S.		
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stored	d appropriately?			Y
Biosecurity Records				
-	available for inspection?			Y
•	I frequency of mortality removal, re	ecording and safe dispos	al been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and	I period in which the APB will notify	y Scottish Ministers or ve	terinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained	 d) mortality at the site been includ 	led?		Y
				V
	vill be taken in the event that the p led and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be	•	•	'
	s of aquaculture animals being sto			Y
health status, certification		ocked on the fairn site be	en covered (equal of higher	
modiff olding, commoditi	en ir required).			
6. Have the husbandry	and biosecurity measures implem	nented between each epi	demiological unit to minimise	Y

If no, detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried	out by, or on behalf of, the business?
----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

28/06/2016 - 18/02/2020

	ni 059, version 12							153	sueu by. i	111			
	Case no:	2020-00	061	Site No:		FS0407			Date of Samplin		19/0	02/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:1	0:00	12:4	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	14
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
П	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	2.6000	2.6000	2.6000									
	Sex	N/A		N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	Ness of Copister (FS1043)	Ness of Copister (FS1043)	Ness of Copister (FS1043)									
S	l acility NO	2	3	12									

	Additional Sample Information:														
0 Total Tests assigned 0															

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0061		Site No:	FS0407		Insp:	
Date of Visit	ate of Visit 19/02/2020			ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Species .	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off			0			10	
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	0
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				igwdow
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III						\vdash
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		igsquare
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iaims upstream	TOT WILLIAM FACULSION	<u>'</u>	-	°		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				ш
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status						
	Processing fish from Category III farm						
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ī			$\overline{}$
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				-
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			-
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	1			┝─┤
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		q
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2020-0061		Site No	o:	FS0407			
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)							
•	• •	s in the previous 4 years	?				N	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a sing	jle ye	ear class basis?		N	
azamethiphos and ema	mectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab				ıres, and	Υ	
can these be deployed 4. Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e	umented farm manag	ement agreement or sta	tement relevant to th	ne sit	te and CoGP Farm		Υ	
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ia for treatment in the	e Co	GP during the period	that	N	
		<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish od that records are insp		or a	bove (prior to w/b 10/	/6/19) or	Υ	
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comment	t.			Υ	
9. Is C. elongatus infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare pr	roble	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)	N	
•		istered or other actions t elongatus is considered					Υ	
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?					N/A	
12. Have therapeutic tre	eatments or the action	is taken had a significan	t impact upon the lice	e lev	els recorded?		Υ	
13. Are treatments, whe	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation betw	een participating far	ms?			Υ	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? You have a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?								
15. Is there a site specification of the second of the		ement procedure with wa infestation?	aypoints describing s	set ac	ctions to deal with red	cognised	Υ	
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count da	ata? If no please deta	ail re	easons.		Υ	
							=	
Containment Inspection	on							
1. Has the site experien	ced equipment dama	ge due to predators in th	ne current or previous	s pro	oduction cycles?		N	
2. Are measures in place	e to mitigate against t	the predation experience	ed on site? (Detail be	elow)			Υ	
Seal Pro netting, Ten	sioned Nets, Top Ne	ets						
If other, detail below:								
	-tu -v-u-t- huv-u		aimite of the aite aime	a 4la a	last Ellimonastiano		N	
f Yes proceed with que		perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site since	e me	last Fni inspection?			
4. Have these been rep	•	•						
		orthwith (where they exis						
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they e	exist))? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)		
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detai	il					
B. If aill nets were deplo	oved was this action ac	greed with local wild fish	interests and was no	ermi	ssion given by Scotti	sh		
Ministers? (Legal, CoGI	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)							
		imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not covere	ed in	code but could			
be considered under 10. Is the site inspected	•	res of the Act) egards to containment?	If no. please detail re	easo	on(s)		Υ	
		J	, poster world it		\-/			

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0061	Site No: FS0407	
Date of Visit: 19/02/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for it4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fat	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or stateme	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimfarm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introd	uced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	nation requirements for stocks held in the area of ies of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm i	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any dearm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cover	red by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available t	
	mstances under which biological controls and o	cleaner fish are to be
	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or ingements for the movement of live fish on and	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates b date when a farm or area may be restock	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow ked?	/ and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether on agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	tes covered by the Y
_	oodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ment Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ent include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and o	operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	of the FMAg/S? 17/01/2020	

Site No: FS0407

Case No: 2020-0061

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0061			Date of visit:	19/02/2020				
Site No:	FS0407	l	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	24/02/2020		2 11150						
		Ì							
	1		1						





Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd Crowness Road Hatston Kirkwall, Orkney KW15 1RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0095Date of Visit18/02/2020Site NoFS0407Site NameWick of VatsetterInspectorCase No20200061

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Date: 24/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2020-0062			Date of visit: 18/02/2020				
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspec	tor:				
Site No: FS1335 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe Scottish Sea Farms Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 7.3	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-5				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

Recent mortalities due to physical damage from bad weather and seals scaring fish, making them burrow. On inspection of stock on site, could see mild physical damage on the heads and on the flanks, but vast majority of the fish appeared in good condition. One to two moribund fish close to the surface per pen but were swimming away on closer inspection.

Morts disposed of by Pelagia Shetland Ltd. Allowed to use Waste to Energy incinerator in Lerwick if less than 1 tonne/week. Arrangements and storage of dead fish not in FMS but is in waste management plan. Nothing in FMS regarding sensitivity testing but is in VHP. Biological controls are in FMS but doesn't include under what circumstances they will be used under. Site manager says that they are planned to be used as a routine prevention measure and will be introduced at the start of each cycle.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0062		Site No:	FS1335	5			
Date of Visit:		18/02/2020	0		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	ł
Site Details								
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	ocked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL	LUM		T				
Age group	19 S0	2019						
No Fish	891,357	~44000						
Mean Fish Wt	181 g	20g						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	Jun/July 202	21	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Oct/Nov. 2	.021	
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records								y ion N Y Y N/A
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed of	f?			Other (detail)			
	see additiona							
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Wk. 4 - 1829 (0.4%), wk 5 - 6886 (0.75%), wk 6 - 11,936 (1.31%), wk 7 - 13,055 (1.45%). All put down to physical damage (see additional comments). 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
II yes, idolity 1100/115	mortanty per	Taomty/110 ots	ock per lacing.	neason.				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:	- Valeined			t an EUIS				NI/A
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FH	I? If no, add N	IRT case and	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

2. Medicines records available for inspection?	ľ
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? SLICE, TMS	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	Y
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	ı
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	Y
Results of Surveillance	
 Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? If yes, are results available for inspection? 	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	- 1
ii yes, detaii (ii not detailed didei fedent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 1/12/2019 - 18/02/2020	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue: (
Case Number:	2020-0062		Site No:	FS1335		Insp:		
Date of Visit	18/02/2020		No of m	No of movements/supp./dest.				
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0	
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0	
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	10	
IVIOVEITIETIUS OII	Number of des		0		6	10	3	
Exposure via water		Site contacts	s 0	1-5	6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	*	0					
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2	
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8			
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0	
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2					
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status							
		from Category III farm	8					
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3	
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5					
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Το	1			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1					
CoGP/Regulator				J				
Practices in accordance	Yes		1 0	1			0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3					
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0	
	No		2					
					Total Rank		19 MEDIUM	

Case No:	2020-0062	Site No: FS1335						
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •							
Has the site experien	iced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N					
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Y					
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?								
4. Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y					
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ					
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Y					
_	•	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?	N					
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A					
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N					
•		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	N/A					
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ					
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ					
		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ					
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y					
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	Y					
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ					
Containment Inspection	on							
 Has the site experien 	ced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in place	e to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ					
ADD, Lice Shields, Te	ensioned Nets, Top	Nets						
If other, detail below:								
3. Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N					
If Yes proceed with que	stions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10						
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	sters?						
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail						
8 If all note were deale	wed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish						
Ministers? (Legal, CoGI	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)							
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could						
be considered under	•	·						
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Y					

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0062	Site No: FS1335	
Date of Visit: 18/02/202	0 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date o 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date o 	int farm management area? irm site(s) to which it applies? if commencement of the agreement or statemer of review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	iced to the area or Y
 Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin Does the FMAg/S identify the spec 	nation requirements for stocks held in the area o lies of fish which may be stocked into the area o imum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	r farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual f	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ad fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arranger	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the avail of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available tr arms?	reatments for sea
	mstances under which biological controls and cl	
	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify accepta	able harvest practices on farms in the area or individual	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the date date when a farm or area may be rest	es by which the area or individual farm will be fallow cocked?	v and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether agreement or statement?	r one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	tes covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether covered by the agreement or statement	r broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept nt?	on any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Mana	agement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agree parties to the agreement?	ement include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed an	nd operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issu	ue of the FMAg/S? Issued 15/01/2019	

Site No: FS1335
Case No: 2020-0062
Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0062			Date of visit:	18/02/2020			
0430 110.	2020 0002			Date of Visit.	10/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1335			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
ŕ	· ·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	 							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/ CNI/ SLI	24/02/2020							





Scottish Sea Farms Ltd Laurel House Laurelhill Business Park Polmaise Road Stirling FK7 9JQ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0125 SITE NO FS1335 INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 18/02/2020

SITE NAME Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe

CASE NO 20200062

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and found to be inadequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

 FS numbers must be recorded in the source/destination section of the movement record book, to allow for better traceability of stocks. It was discussed with the site manager that this would be recorded in future. No further action is required.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed: Date: 24/02/2020
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0063			Date of visit: 18/02/2020
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0033 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Dury Voe Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-5
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	I reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site been fallow since September 2019, is no longer in use and is to be made inactive/de-registered. No equipment currently in the water Site is to be used as an equipment holding facility.

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued	by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0063	Site No:	FS0033	
Date of Visit:	18/02/2020	Inspector(s):	
Registration/Authorisation De 1. Business/site details summar 2. Changes made to details?		ve?	Y Y
Site Details Total No facilities Species fallow	Facilities stock	red	No facilities inspected
Age group No Fish			
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site)		Next Input Date (Site)	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease pro	blems?	N/A Any escapes	(since last visit)? N/A
Movement Records 1. Movement records available 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and co 4. Are movement records availa 5. Are records complete and co 6. Are health certificates for intra	rrectly entered? ble for dead fish and waste? rrectly entered?	le?	Y 22/05/2019 Y N/A N/A N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried of the second of the sec			
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records available for 2. How are mortalities disposed	•		N/A
If other detail: 3. Mortality records complete ar 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			N/A
5. Evidence of recent increased If yes, facility nos/no mortality p	• •	eason:	N/A
6. Any other peaks in mortality	luring period checked?		N/A
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplained lif yes, detail action:) mortalities been reported to v		N/A lity events sheet. N/A

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI Date of i	ssue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments	s (last 4 wks)?		
If yes, detail:			
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records			
3. Are records comp		ly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withd	•		
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)?		
If other, detail:			_
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriate	y?	
Biosecurity Record	ls		
1. Biosecurity record		nspection?	
2. Has the manner a	nd frequency of	mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner a	nd period in whi	ch the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplain	ned) mortality a	t the site been included?	
		n the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disea	ase
is detected been incl	uded and how	and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
	•	ire animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certific	ation if required)?	
	•	ity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	;
		ed (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
		ling the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals			
	ity procedures b	peen adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	ance		

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

22/05/2019 - 18/02/2020

Site No: FS0033

Case No: 2020-0063

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0063			Date of visit:	18/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0033	l	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Poport Cummon				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Data	lnen	ond .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	04/03/2020							





Scottish Sea Farms Ltd Laurel House Laurelhill Business Park Polmaise Road Stirling FK7 9JQ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 SITE NO FS0033 INSPECTOR
 DATE OF VISIT
 18/02/2020

 SITE NAME
 Dury Voe

 CASE NO
 20200063

In accordance with The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, the site was inspected as fallow and an amendment form completed to change the status of the site to inactive as there are no plans to restock this site at this time. If the site is to be restocked in the future you must notify the Fish Health Inspectorate at least 30 days prior so the status can be amended.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/03/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12	Issu	ied by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2020-0064			Date o	f visit: 18/02/2020			
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Ma	ain Inspector:				
Site No: FS0699 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Loura Voe Scottish Sea Farms	s Ltd				
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6	\Rightarrow			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 04	5 completed			
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	S Coo	GP MA S-5			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	ason below:					

Additional Case Information:

Site fallow since September 2019 and is no longer in use. It is to be made inactive/de-registered. No equipment in the water. Whole mooring grid said to have been removed as well.

FHI 059, Version 12	•	Issu	ued by: FHI		Date of	fissue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0064	Site No:	FS0699			
Date of Visit:	18/02/202	20		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Authoral Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary checked by	site representa	ative?		Y	=
Site Details Total No facilities Species	fallow	Facilities sto	ocked		No facilities inspec	ited
Age group No Fish						
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S	Site)		Next Input Da	ate (Site)		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease problems?		N/A	Any escapes	s (since last visit)?	N/A
 Date of last inspects Are records complete. Are movement responses. Are records complete. 	ds available for inspection?	d? ïsh and waste? d?			22/05/2	Y 2019 Y N/A N/A N/A
-	s ents carried out by (or on b stem in place for maintena	•	•	_		
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. How are mortaliti	available for inspection?					N/A
If other detail: 3. Mortality records 4. Recent mortality	complete and correctly en (last 4 wks):	ntered? N/A				N/A
	nt increased/atypical morta o mortality per facility/no st		/reason:			N/A
	in mortality during period o	checked?				N/A
If yes, detail action:						N/A
8. Have mortality e	vents' been reported to FF	II ? IT no. add IV	IKI case and e	enter on morta	ality events sneet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
TH 000, Version 12	issued by. I I ii	Date of 193ue. 00/10/2010
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
 Biosecurity records available for inspection? Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, 	recording and safe disposal been considered	12
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will not		
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been inclu	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	ar or arry
,,		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will	•	sted disease
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being s		or higher
health status, certification if required)?	Noonou on the familiant one book covered (oqual)	or mgmor
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures imple		
transmission of disease been covered (movement of st		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures i aquaculture animals held on site?	in place to maintain the physical containment	or
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately im	unlemented on site?	
If no, detail:	pionionica diffate.	
Results of Surveillance		

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

22/05/2019 - 18/02/2020

Site No: FS0699

Case No: 2020-0064

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0064			Date of visit:	18/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0699	l	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Papart Summan				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	I	and .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	04/03/2020							
	I							





Scottish Sea Farms Ltd Laurel House Laurelhill Business Park Polmaise Road Stirling FK7 9JQ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 SITE NO FS0699 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 18/02/2020 SITE NAME Loura Voe CASE NO 20200064

Date: 04/03/2020

In accordance with The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, the site was inspected as fallow and an amendment form completed to change the status of the site to inactive as there are no plans to restock this site at this time. If the site is to be restocked in the future you must notify the Fish Health Inspectorate at least 30 days prior so the status can be amended.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0065			Date of visit: 17/02/2020
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS0501 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Taing of Railsbrough Catfirth Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-9
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	I reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site currently fallow and has been since wk 21, 2018. Site may be used as a nursery site this autumn, after which there are no future plans to use again so to be made inactive. Site still has 10 pens in the water at location but no nets.

FHI 059, Version 12		lssu€	ed by: FHI		Γ	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	020-0065	Site No:	FS0501				
Date of Visit:	17/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authoris							
1. Business/site details	s summary checked by site	e representat	tive?			Y	
2. Changes made to d						١	
Site Details							
Total No facilities		Facilities stoc	ked		No facilities	inspected	
Species fa	allow						
Age group							
No Fish							
Mean Fish Wt							
Next Fallow Date (Site	.)		Next Input Dat	ite (Site)			
Description of the state of the			N/A		(-in-a loot vi	****	N1/A
Recent (last 4 wks) dis	sease problems?		IN/A	Any escapes	s (since last vis	sit)?	N/A
_							
Movement Records							
1. Movement records a	available for inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspection	on:				C	06/11/2017	
3. Are records complete	te and correctly entered?						Y
4. Are movement reco	ords available for dead fish	and waste?					N/A
	te and correctly entered?						N/A
	es for introductions (outwit	h GB) availal	ble?				N/A
Transport Records							
•	s carried out by (or on beha	alf) of the bus	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			
-	m in place for maintenance	•	•	_			
Mortality Records							
Mortality records available	ailable for inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities				Whole fish -	TWMA (Shetla	and)	
If other detail:							
3. Mortality records con	mplete and correctly enter	red?					Y
		inal 4 weeks	site had stock	c, mortality lev	el across who	ole site aver	aged 0.22%
4. Recent mortality (las							
	increased/atypical mortaliti						N/A
If yes, facility nos/no m	nortality per facility/no stoc	k per facility/r	reason:				
	t "t li merical also						V
	mortality during period che		COOAObila b	Con an alice	t - b - stanial is	for the m	Y
	ncreased mortality during f			arvesting que	to bacteriai ii	ntection	Y
/. Have increased (unit	explained) mortalities beer Increased mor	•		et Mortali	the levels fell b	alaw roporti	
If yes, detail action:		•	e site became f	•	ty levels lell be	elow reportin	ng level
	nts' been reported to FHI?				ality events sh	eet	N
O. Have mortality cross	its been reperted to 1	II IIO, Gaa III.	AT OUSE WITH S	ATTOC OF THE	anty evernoe	CCL.	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4	wks)?			
If yes, detail: If other, detail:				
Medicines records availab	le for inspection?			
3. Are records complete and	•			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal pe	•			
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?				
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stored appr	ropriately?			
Biosecurity Records				
Biosecurity records availal	ble for inspection?			
•	iency of mortality removal, recor	ding and safe disposal be	en considered?	
3. Has the manner and perio	d in which the APB will notify Sc	ottish Ministers or veterin	ary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mo	rtality at the site been included?			
	taken in the event that the prese			
	nd how and when that will be not			
	quaculture animals being stocke	d on the farm site been o	overed (equal or higher	
health status, certification if r	equirea)?			
6. Have the husbandry and b	piosecurity measures implemente	ed between each epidemi	iological unit to minimise	
•	n covered (movement of staff, vi	•	_	
7. Is documentation available	e regarding the measures in place	ce to maintain the physica	Il containment of	
aquaculture animals held on	site?			
	edures been adequately impleme	ented on site?		
If no, detail:				
Results of Surveillance				
1. Has any animal health sur	veillance been carried out by, or	on behalf of, the busines	s?	

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

06/11/2017 - 17/02/2020

Site No: FS0501

Case No: 2020-0065

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0065			Date of visit:	17/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0501	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	25/02/2020							





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0440 SITE NO INSPECTOR

FS0501

DATE OF VISIT 17/02/2020

SITE NAME Taing of Railsbrough Catfirth

CASE NO 20200065

In accordance with The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, the site was inspected as fallow. Site is not planned to be used again in the long term but unsure if it is to be used at some point this year.

Once decision has been made, please submit a completed amendment form to change the status of the site to inactive. If the site is to be restocked in the future you must notify the Fish Health Inspectorate at least 30 days prior so the status can be amended.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/03/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter