FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2020-0073			Date of visit: 17/02/2020			
Time spent on site:) min.	Main Inspect	or:			
Site No: FS1099 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Gletness Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd				
Case Types: 1 REG	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 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 reas	son below:				

Site fallow and has been since wk 1, 2017. It may be used as a nursery site this autumn, after which there are no future plans to use again so to be made inactive. No pens currently in the water at site location but area is still marked by a buoy at each corner of the grid area.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ıed by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0073		Site No:	FS1099				
Date of Visit:		17/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho								
1. Business/site deta	ails summary o	checked by si	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	•						N	1
Site Details								
Total No facilities			Facilities sto	cked		No facilitie	es inspected	
Species	fallow							
Age group								
No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)			Next Input Da	ate (Site)			
				N//A	1			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease proble	ems?		N/A	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record	s available for	rinspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							13/09/2016	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?						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		by (or on bel	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			
Mortality Records		71 11.2	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
Mortality records a	available for in	espection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:	s disposed c.	:			WHOLE HOLL	TVVIVIA (CIT	stialiu)	
Mortality records (complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (N/A					
5. Evidence of recer	•							N/A
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i								Y
1-4-9-	•	•		uring final quart	ter of 2016. Sit	te was fallo	w by week 1,	2017.
If yes, detail:		down to gill h						
7. Have increased (u			•					Y
If yes, detail action:				reported to cor				• NI
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents been rep	orted to FHI	? If no, add iv	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 v If yes, detail: If other, detail: 2. Medicines records availab 3. Are records complete and 4. Are fish in a withdrawal pe 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail:	le for inspection? correctly entered?	
6. Are medicines stored appr	ropriately?	
3. Has the manner and perior increased (unexplained) mo 4. Has the action that will be is detected been included an	nency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposated in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterality at the site been included? I taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the did how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers quaculture animals being stocked on the farm site bee	ne presence of a listed disease ters?
transmission of disease beer 7. Is documentation available aquaculture animals held on	piosecurity measures implemented between each epiden covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live e regarding the measures in place to maintain the physisite? edures been adequately implemented on site?	or dead fish etc.)?
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health sur	veillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the busi	ness?

13/09/2016 - 17/02/2020

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

Site No: FS1099

Case No: 2020-0073

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

Case No:	2020-0073			Date of visit:	17/02/2020			
				Date of Field.	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
Site No:	FS1099			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
·		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	1							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	25/02/2020		Z IIISP					
1120	20/02/2020							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440 SITE NO FS1099 INSPECTOR
 DATE OF VISIT
 17/02/2020

 SITE NAME
 Gletness

 CASE NO
 20200073

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:

Date: 04/03/2020

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0075			Date of visit: 17/02/2020
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS0333 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	East Voe Laxfirth 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 detail	il reason below:	

Site currently fallow and has been since November 2016. Site last inspected 31/05/2017 so no mortality records to check. Unlikely to be used again and is to be made inactive. 3 pens currently in the water but no nets.

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ued by: FHI		Date of i	issue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0075	Site No:	FS0333	,		
Date of Visit:	17/02/202	20		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary checked by	site representa	ative?		Y	_
Site Details Total No facilities		Facilities sto	ocked		No facilities inspecte	ed
Species Age group No Fish	fallow					
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S	ite)		Next Input Da	ate (Site)		
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease problems?		N/A	Any escapes	s (since last visit)?	N/A
 Date of last inspects Are records comp Are movement records comp Are records comp 	s available for inspection	d? fish and waste? d?			31/05/20	Y 017 Y N/A N/A N/A
_	nts carried out by (or on b tem in place for maintena	•	•	_		
2. How are mortalitie	available for inspection?					N/A
If other detail: 3. Mortality records of the second	complete and correctly er last 4 wks):		ince last inspec	etion		N/A
	nt increased/atypical mort mortality per facility/no s		/reason:			N/A
	n mortality during period	checked?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	unexplained) mortalities been reported to FF	·		enter on morts	plity events sheet	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 v If yes, detail: If other, detail: 2. Medicines records availab 3. Are records complete and 4. Are fish in a withdrawal pe 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail:	le for inspection? correctly entered?	
6. Are medicines stored appr	ropriately?	
3. Has the manner and perior increased (unexplained) mo 4. Has the action that will be is detected been included an	nency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposated in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterality at the site been included? I taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the did how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers quaculture animals being stocked on the farm site bee	ne presence of a listed disease ters?
transmission of disease beer 7. Is documentation available aquaculture animals held on	piosecurity measures implemented between each epiden covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live e regarding the measures in place to maintain the physisite? edures been adequately implemented on site?	or dead fish etc.)?
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health sur	veillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the busi	ness?

31/05/2017 - 17/02/2020

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

Site No: FS0333

Case No: 2020-0075

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

Case No:	2020-0075			Date of visit:	17/02/2020			
0430 110.	2020 0010			Date of Visit.	1170272020			
Site No:	FS0333			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
ŕ	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	25/02/2020		Z IIISP					
1120	20/02/2020							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440 SITE NO FS0333 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 17/02/2020
SITE NAME East Voe Laxfirth 20200075

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: 25/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2020-0077			Date of visit: 17/02/2020			
Time spent on site:) min.	Main Insp	ector:			
Site No: FS0999 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Collafirth 3 Grieg Seafood Shetland Lt	d			
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-4			
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 reas	son below:				

Site fallow and has been since the last inspection on 26/07/2017. No mortality records to check. Site not being planned to hold fish again but is planned on being used as a location to hold equipment. To be made inactive. Still 2 pens on site but no nets.

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0077	Site No:	FS0999				
Date of Visit:	17/02/202	0		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authornament 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary checked by	site represent	ative?			Y Y	
Site Details Total No facilities Species Age group	fallow	Facilities sto	ocked		No facilities	inspected	
No Fish Mean Fish Wt		-					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)		Next Input Da	ate (Site)			
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease problems?		N/A	Any escapes	(since last vi	isit)?	N/A
 Date of last inspet Are records compt Are movement re Are records compt 	s available for inspection?	? sh and waste? ?			[26/07/2017	Y N/A N/A
•	s nts carried out by (or on be tem in place for maintenar	•	•	_			
2. How are mortalities	available for inspection?						N/A
If other detail: 3. Mortality records	complete and correctly en	tered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality	•		nce last inspec	tion			
	nt increased/atypical morta mortality per facility/no st		/reason:				N/A
ii yee, idemiy iiee/iie	Therealty per racinty/ric of	ook per raemity	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality during period c	hecked?					N/A
•	unexplained) mortalities be	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
	ents' been reported to FH	I? If no. add M	MRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events sh	neet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
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)?		
of ther, 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	2
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal,Has the manner and period in which the APB will not	·	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	an or arry
······ , ······ , ···········		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the	presence or suspicion of the presence of a list	sted disease
is detected been included and how and when that will		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being s	tocked on the farm site been covered (equal	or higher
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures imple	emented between each epidemiological unit to	minimice
transmission of disease been covered (movement of st		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures i		
aquaculture animals held on site?	, , ,	
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately im	plemented on site?	
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out	by or on behalf of the business?	

26/07/2017 - 17/02/2020

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

Site No: FS0999

Case No: 2020-0077

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2020-0077	Date of visit: 17/02/2020							
Site No:	FS0999	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	-								
	+								
	 								
	 								
Report Summary	T			1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
REG	25/02/2020		2 11155						





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440
SITE NO FS0999
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 17/02/2020 SITE NAME Collafirth 3 CASE NO 20200077

Date: 25/02/2020

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

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	Date of issue: 08/10/2018	
Case No: 2020-0078			Date of visit: 17/02/2020
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1144 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Hamnavoe 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-4
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 detail reas	son below:	

Site fallow, last movement off site was 06/09/2016. No fish have been on site since. Site to be made inactive but my be reactivated in future. No pens currently in the water but barge is still on site.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ıed by: FHI	Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018		
Case No:	2020-0078		Site No:	FS1144				
Date of Visit:		17/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by si	te representa	ative?			Y	1
2. Changes made to	•						Υ	1
Site Details								
Total No facilities			Facilities sto	cked		No facilitie	es inspected	
Species	fallow							
Age group								
No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)			Next Input Da	ate (Site)			
(,				-			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease proble	ems?		N/A	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						<u> </u>		
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		mspection:					19/07/2016	
3. Are records comp		actly entered?					19/07/2010	T 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		by (or on bel	nalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STR)2			
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			
	lem in place ic	of maintenant	e or transpor	lation records				
Mortality Records	il-l-la fau is							
Mortality records a		•			Otto (data)			'
2. How are mortalitie		?			Other (detail)			
	N/A	carrectly onto	d2					
3. Mortality records	complete and			- v.tr 20 26 2	046 ranged fr	0 60/ to	0.040/ porty	als for
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			e wk 29 - 36 20 e before being r		om 0.6% to	0.24% per w	еек тог
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/at	typical mortali	ties?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
	. 11/							
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality dur	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:	mayalainad) ı	artalitica bar	- reported to	Tuet or EUI2				N/A
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) i	nortalities bee	en reported to) Vet or Fri!				INA
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	rente' been re	ported to EUI'	2 If no. add N	APT case and c	enter en morts	lity ovente (aboot	N/A
o. Have mortality ev	ents been let	ponied to Finis	, ii no, add iv	in i case and e	mier on moria	ility events s	sileet.	13//

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail:		
 Medicines records available for inspection Are records complete and correctly ente Are fish in a withdrawal period? 		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail:		
 Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records Biosecurity records available for inspecting 	on?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of morta	lity removal, recording and safe disposal be APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterin	
	vent that the presence or suspicion of the p	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animelealth status, certification if required)?	mals being stocked on the farm site been c	overed (equal or higher
transmission of disease been covered (mo	asures implemented between each epidem vement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or	dead fish etc.)?
aquaculture animals held on site?	e measures in place to maintain the physica	al containment of
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been a If no, detail:	dequately implemented on site?	
Results of Surveillance		

19/07/2016 - 17/02/2020

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:

Site No: FS1144

Case No: 2020-0078

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

Case No:	2020-0078	Date of visit: 17/02/2020						
Site No:	FS1144	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	25/02/2020							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440
SITE NO FS1144
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 17/02/2020 SITE NAME Hamnavoe CASE NO 20200078

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: 4/03/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0080			Date of visit: 17/02/2020
Time spent on site:) min.	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1115 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Geo of Valladale 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-8a
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	If yes, see additional infor	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Site fallow since the end of April 2016. Currently no plans to use site again. Site to be made inactive. carried out visual inspection of site and could not see any equipment in the water on 18/02/2020.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0080		Site No:	FS1115				
Date of Visit:		17/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author 1. Business/site detai 2. Changes made to	ils summary o		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities Species	f-lla		Facilities sto	cked		No facilities	s inspected	
Age group	fallow							
No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (Sit	e)			Next Input Da	ite (Site)			
Recent (last 4 wks) di	isease proble	ms?		N/A	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records	available for	inspection?						N
2. Date of last inspec		mapedion.					03/03/2016	
3. Are records comple		ctly entered?					00.00	N/A
4. Are movement rec	ords available	e for dead fis	h and waste?	>				N/A
5. Are records comple		•						N/A
6. Are health certificate	tes for introdu	uctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement				•	_			
If yes, is there a syste	em in place fo	r maintenand	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a					Ott (-1-4-i)			Y
2. How are mortalities If other detail:	s disposed of N/A	?			Other (detail))		
3. Mortality records co		correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (la	·		mortalities fr	rom wk 9 - 14, 2 v was 0.1% or l		on wk 6 at 0	.2% (2017 fis	sh). All other
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): wks mortality was 0.1% or below. 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no		••		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	mortality dur	ing period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:		-4-liking ha						N/A
Have increased (ur If yes, detail action:	nexpiained) ii	iortaiities bee	en reported to) Vet or Fmi?				N/A
8. Have 'mortality eve	nts' been rer	orted to FHI	? If no. add N	IRT case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	heet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
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 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality remova 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will n increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been inc	notify Scottish Ministers or vete	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the is detected been included and how and when that with 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being health status, certification if required)?	ill be notified to Scottish Ministe	ers?
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures imptransmission of disease been covered (movement of 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures aquaculture animals held on site?	staff, visitors, equipment, live of s in place to maintain the physical	or dead fish etc.)?

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

If no, detail:

Results of Surveillance

3. Any significant results?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

03/03/2016 - 17/02/2020

Site No: FS1115

Case No: 2020-0080

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

Case No:	2020-0080			Date of visit:	17/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1115			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					
REG	25/02/2020							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440
SITE NO FS1115
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 17/02/2020
SITE NAME Geo of Valladale
CASE NO 20200080

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0081			Date of visit: 20/02/2020
Time spent on site: 4.	5 hrs	Main Ir	espector:
Site No: FS1278 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	East of Papa Little Grieg Seafood Shetland	I Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 7.1	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-8b
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addition	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Site currently in the process of harvesting. Hope to have this complete by late March. Sea lice levels have been above reporting level the last few weeks and physical treatment has been carried out during breaks in the bad weather of late. Fish behaving as per expected and look to be in good condition. Fish removed for VMD sampling inspected and looked healthy internally with no signs of disease and no physical damage externally.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0081		Site No:	FS1278				
Date of Visit:		20/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	itive?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL							
Age group	18 S0							
No Fish	189,055							
Mean Fish Wt	4.38 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	March 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Sep. 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) (disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		пореспол.					28/11/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?					20/11/2010	Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?						Y
6. Are health certification		•		ıble?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t bv (or on bel	nalf) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:	<u> </u>				•		,	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
			Wk 4 - 833 (0.27%), wk 5 -	2783 (0.91%)), wk 6 - 867	′2 (2.85%), w	k 7 - 995
Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		(0.39%)					
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					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	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		Y
If other, detail:	S., Salmosan	
2. Medicines records available for insp		Y
3. Are records complete and correctly	entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for insp	ection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of m	ortality removal, recording and safe disposal be	en considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which	the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterina	ary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	e site been included?	Y

	11 059, Version 12							155	ueu by. r				
	Case no:	2020-00	081	Site No:		FS1278			Date of v		20/	02/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		y. HI		1	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:1	5:00	12:5	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	15
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos												
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	4.3800	4.3800	4.3800									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Jubilee Loch Shin (FS0890)	Jubilee Loch Shin (FS0890)	Jubilee Loch Shin (FS0890)									

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l					

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018	
Case Number:	2020-0081		Site No:	FS1278		Insp:		
Date of Visit	20/02/2020		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	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or			9	18	26		
Special Control of the Control of th	compartment including third country Number of suppliers			5		14	0	
Mayamanta off							10	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10 10	10	
Exposure via water	rtuniber er des	Site contacts		_				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through						
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				oxdot	
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2	
,	•	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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8			
	iaims upstream	TOT WILLIEF T LIGHT EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>			
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	cessing	0					
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1	
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-	
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status							
	Processing fish from Category III farm							
	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	i			0	
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	1			-	
Biosecurity		Number of sites	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]			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-	
CoGP/Regulator	•			•				
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				\vdash	
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0	
	No		2					
					Total		21	
					Rank		MEDIUM	

Case No:	2020-0081		S	ite No:	FS1278		
•	Seawater Sites Only)	s in the previous 4 years	:7				N
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single v	ear class hasis?		Y
		enced in-feed and bath					\ \
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period	well as access to suitab	ole biological an	id/or mecl	hanical control measu	ures, and	Y
Management Area (or	equivalent)?						
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the 0	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
records are inspected?	(CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criter					N
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 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,	5.3.50)	N
		istered or other actions telongatus is considered					Υ
11. Has any other action	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 le	vels recorded?		Υ
•		•					Υ
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 leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	se detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	ion						
•		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
ADD, Tensioned Net	ts, Top Nets						
If other, detail below:							
·							
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site	since the	e last FHI inspection?	•	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip	•					
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	.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il				
B. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild fish	n interests and v	was perm	ission given by Scotti	sh	
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and mini	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could		
be considered unde	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment?	If no, please de	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: 2020-0081	Site No: FS1278	
Date of Visit: 20/02/202	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 	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of 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 cies 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	ed by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	uirements for the sensitivity testing of available tr arms?	
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 arrar	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	imstances when live fish may be introduced or re	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of Issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	le harvest practices on farms in the area or ind	lividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be fall cked?	low and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be ket?	ept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement of	r statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 2.0 25/09/2019	

Site No: FS1278

Case No: 2020-0081

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

Case No:	2020-0081			Date of visit:	20/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1278	l		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	+							
	1							
D	_							
Report Summary	5.4		nd					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	24/02/2020							
	+							
		-						
	+							





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 FS1278 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 20/02/2020
SITE NAME East of Papa Little 20200081

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.

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: 2020-0083			Date of visit:	24/02/2020				
Time spent on site:	nrs	Mair	n Inspector:					
Site No: FS0544 Business No: FB0317	Site Name: Business Name:	Glen Orrin Fish Farm Glen Orrin Fish Farm						
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6	1				
Water Temp (°C): 2.1	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 com	pleted				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additi	ional information/clinical ional information/clinical ional information/clinical	score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Ova on site sourced from sites own broodstock which were stripped in January 2020.

No fish moved onto site. Fish moving off are transported by site staff to local put and take fisheries.

No treatments undertaken since 2014 and as such, no medicines currently held on site.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 12	2		ls	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0083	<u> </u>	Site No:	FS054	4			
Date of Visit:		24/02/2020	0		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site detail 2. Changes made to	tails summary		site represer	ntative?			Y Y	}
Site Details Total No facilities		19 ponds	Facilities s	stocked	7	No facilitie	es inspected	19
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	NO facilitie	S inspecieu	10
Age group	19	18	17	16	Ova			
No Fish	2,500	1,500	1,500	60	No count yet			
Mean Fish Wt	60g	250g	450g	1kg	<1g			
Next Fallow Date (S		No plan	1	Next Input D	_	No plan		
Next allow bally	ine)	Ινο για		NOX! IIIput	vale (Oile)	NO pian		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease pro	blems?			N Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
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	ection: plete and cor ecords availal plete and cor cates for intro	rrectly entered able for dead fis rrectly entered	l? ish and waste l?				16/04/2018	Y Y Y Y N/A
1. Are any movement fyes, is there a sys	stem in place		•					Y
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. How are mortalitie	available for	•			Domestic was	ste - <25kg		Y
If other detail:								
Mortality records	•	•		- 41				Y
4. Recent mortality	•			alities across the	e site over the la	ast 4 weeks		N
5. Evidence of recei		• •		rt /research				N
If yes, facility nos/no) mortality pe	er facility/no su	ock per raciii	ty/reason.				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality d	luring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (If yes, detail action:) mortalities be	een reported	to vet or FHI?				N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev		reported to FH	I? If no, add	MRT case and	enter on morta	lity events	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?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

16/04/2018 - 24/02/2020

Description of the second of t		0000 A 155 1 0 1- 1-5 5														
Percussive blow.	02/2020	2/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
Total Tests assigned 0		Percussive blow.														
	0	1	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	1									

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI				Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0083		Si	ite No:	FS0544		Insp:	
Date of Visit	24/02/2020		N	lo of mo	ovements/s	upp./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	0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	+	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off	$\overline{}$	0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des		+	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site conta	acts	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 l n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category \ n or within 1 tidal excursion	V	1	4	8		
Management practices			N	lone	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent wa	iters	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				
		from MS of equivalent status		2				
	equivalent statu			4				
		r 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				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms		3				ш
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	T	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	$\overline{}$	5				-
Biosecurity		Number of s	ites	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		Т	0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1				ш
CoGP/Regulator								
Practices in accordance	Yes			0				
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes			0				0
	No			2				
						Total Rank		17 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0083		Site No:	FS0544	
Sea Lice Inspection (
·	nced sea lice problems in the previo	•			
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	anagement Area (or equivalent) fa	llowed synchronously o	n a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed 4. Is there a signed doo	access to a range of licenced in-feed amectin benzoate) as well as acces in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agree	s to suitable biological	and/or mec	hanical control measu	res, and
Management Area (or e					
	cords available for inspection? (Leg				
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard spe	cified in the SSI and the	e CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	onis) record levels below the sugget (CoGP Annex 6)	ested criteria for treatme	ent in the Co	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult frecords are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numb	ers per fish been at a le	evel of 3 or a	above during the perio	d that
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish Health Inspec	torate? If no, FHI see c	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered	d to cause significant w	elfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
	eatments been administered or other eatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is o				
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where applicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions taken had a	a significant impact upo	n the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried out in coope	ration between participa	ating farms?	?	
14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where fewer	populations or part pop	ulations are	e held without treatmen	t for
	ific written lice management proced scalation of a sea lice infestation?	ure with waypoints des	cribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea li	ce count data? If no ple	ase detail r	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
•	on nced equipment damage due to pre	dators in the current or	previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
·	ce to mitigate against the predation			•	Y
Lids on tanks	0 0 1			,	
If other, detail below:					
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been experienced on	or in the vicinity of the s	ite since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question	10			
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been rep	orted to local DSFB forthwith (when	re they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisheri	es trusts forthwith (whe	re they exis	et)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If yes	give detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo	oyed was this action agreed with loo	cal wild fish interests an	d was perm	nission given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG					
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the risk	of further escapes? (No	ot covered i	n code but could	
be considered under	r satisfactory measures of the Ad	et)			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to cor	tainment? If no, please	detail reas	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0544

Case No: 2020-0083

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2020-0083			Date of visit:	24/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0544	1		Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
	 							
	 							
	 							
	•							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD	28/02/2020							
	ļ							
	_							





Glen Orrin Fish Farm Glen Orrin Lodge Urray, Muir of Ord Ross-shire IV6 7UL

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0317 SITE NO FS0544 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 24/02/2020
SITE NAME Glen Orrin Fish Farm
CASE No 20200083

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. 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.

R04

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.

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: 04/03/2020

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: 2020-0084			Date of visit: 26/02/2020
Time spent on site: 5	nrs	Main In	espector:
Site No: FS0150 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Lochy Mowi Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 MIX	2 VMD 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed N
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addition	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Waste is taken to Dundas Chemicals by Billy Bowie when capacity exceeds incinerator limits.

A few fish with fungus observed across site (1 or 2 per cage) but were sitting deep in the water and exhibiting normal behaviour.

Motalities across site mainly attributed to Saprolegnia and RTFS.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018				
Case No:	2020-0084		Site No:	FS0150]							
Date of Visit:		26/02/2020			Inspector(s):]				
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	itive?			Y N	}				
Site Details								_				
Total No facilities Species	CAL	36 cages	Facilities sto	cked	24	No facilitie	s inspected	36				
Age group	SAL 2019 Q1/Q2											
No Fish	· ·											
Mean Fish Wt	86g											
Next Fallow Date (Site) W/b 27/04/2020 Next Input Date (Site) July 2020												
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? N Any escapes (since last visit)? N If yes, detail:												
Movement Records												
1. Movement records available for inspection? 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 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a system.	nts carried out		•	•	_							
Mortality Records												
 Mortality records a How are mortalities If other detail: 		•			Incinerated -	on site		Y				
3. Mortality records of	·	correctly ente	Wk5: 89 (0.0	02%), Wk6: 94	(0.02%), Wk7	7: 173 (0.049	%), Wk8: 142	Y (0.03%)				
4. Recent mortality (•	6	across site.					N				
Evidence of recent If yes, facility nos/no		• •		reason:				N				
6 Any other needs:	a mortelity du	ring poried -l-	ookod?					N				
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	Thortality du	ning period ch	ecked?					IN				
7. Have increased (ull fight yes, detail action:			·					N/A				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A				

ii yes, detaii.	I Officially	
	Cress has	
	also been	
	used as a	
If other, detail:	treatment.	
	s available for inspection?	Y
•	olete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withd		Y
5. If yes, what treatn	nent(s)?	
	Fish in	
	withdrawal	
If other, detail:	from Cress.	
6. Are medicines sto	ored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Record	· Ic	
_	ds available for inspection?	
	and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexpiai	ned) mortality at the site been included?	
4 11 41		
	at will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease luded and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
	atus of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certific	sation il required)?	
6 Have the husband	dry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	
	ase been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals		
•	rity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	nty procedures seen adequately implemented on site.	
Results of Surveilla	ance	
1. Has any animal h	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
•	available for inspection?	
3. Any significant res		
If yes, detail (if not d	etailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between: 29/10/2019 - 26/02/2020

HI 059, VEISION 12					_									155	ueu	υy.								
Case no:	2020)-00	84		Site	No:			FS0	150										26/0	02/20	20		26/
Priority samples:		VI		_		ВА			١	РА				МG		ipiiii	g.	н		7				
Time sampling starts/ends:						4:3	0:00				Insp	ecto	or:						VME) No) .	[40
Environmental conditions:		1	Indo	ors		2				3				4				5		_				
Summary samples	HIST	Г			ВА				MG	- 1			VI				PA	ı			Tota	l Sa	mple	es
dd Fish/Pools - click																						_		
	E1 0		E10	10	E10	27	E20	26	E27	15	E46	54	E55	63	E64	72	E72	01	E92	QΩ	EQ1	00	E100	11
	1-9		10.	-10	F 19-	21	120	-30	F31.	-45	140	-54	F 55-	-03	104	-12	F / 3-	01	102-	-90	F 9 1-	99	1100	J- 10
·	SAL		SAL		SAI		SAL		SAL		SAI		SAL		SAL		SAI		SAI		SAI		SAI	
	_																			_				
Sex			_		_		_		_		_				_		_			_	_	_	_	
Water Type	FW		FW		FW		FW		FW				FW											
Stock Origin		Finfish FS0264	14	Finfish FS0265		Finfish FS0266	16	Finfish FS0267	17	Finfish FS0268	18	Finfish FS0269	19	Finfish FS0270	20	Finfish FS0271	21	Finfish FS0272	22	Finfish FS0273			24	Finfish FS0274
	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-9 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 86g Sex N/A Water Type FW	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-9 Pool Group Species Average weight Sex N/A Water Type Stock Origin	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling 13:00:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indo Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex N/A Water Type Stock Origin Stock Origin	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 13:00:00 14:3 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-9 F10-18 F19-27 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight Sex N/A Water Type FW FW FW Stock Origin Site No: BA Site No: BA BA Site No: BA BA Site No:	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 13:00:00 14:30:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-9 F10-18 F19-27 F28 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL SAL Average weight 86g 86g 86g 86g 86g 86g Sex N/A N/A N/A N/A Water Type FW FW FW FW Stock Origin Starts/ends: VI BA BA 13:00:00 14:30:00 14:30:00 14:30:00 15:00:00 16:00:00 16:00:00 16:00:00 17:00:00 18:00:00	Priority samples:	Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling starts/ends: 13:00:00 14:30:00 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG Summary samples HIST BA MG Add Fish/Pools - click BA MG MG Pool/Fish No F1-9 F10-18 F19-27 F28-36 F37-45 Pool Group Species SAL SAL	Priority samples: VI	Priority samples:	Priority samples: VI	Priority samples: VI	Date	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of Samplin Priority samples: VI BA PA MG Time sampling 13:00:00 14:30:00 Inspector: Samplin Starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI Summary samples HIST BA MG VI Summary samples F1-9 F10-18 F19-27 F28-36 F37-45 F46-54 F55-63 F64-72 P00I Group Species SAL	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of visit/ Sampling: Sampli	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 13:00:00 14:30:00 Inspector: Sampling: Starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1-9 F10-18 F19-27 F28-36 F37-45 F46-54 F55-63 F64-72 F73-81 Pool Group Species SAL	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 13:00:00 14:30:00 Inspector: VMI Starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA MG VI PA MG	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Sampling: VMD No starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA MG VI PA MG MG VI PA MG	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of visit/ 26/02/20 Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2020-0084 Site No: FS0150 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no:

02/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
	Anaesthetic overdose.													
0]	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l								
F109-1	16													
SAL														
86g														
86g N/A														
FW														
Loch Ailort FS827														
25														

Site No: FS0150
Case No: 2020-0084
Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2020-0084			Date of visit:	26/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0150	l		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MIX	04/03/2020							
MIX VMD	04/03/2020							





Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0119
 DATE OF VISIT
 26/02/2020

 SITE NO
 FS0150
 SITE NAME
 Loch Lochy

 INSPECTOR
 CASE NO
 20200084

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

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015. Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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 information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated.

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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.

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

Signed: Date: 04/03/2020

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

R20

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10)/2018				
Case No: 2020-0085				Date of visit: 25/02/2020					
Time spent on site:	3hrs	M	lain Inspector:		l				
Site No: FS0649 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Arkaig Mowi Scotland Ltd			∃				
Case Types: 1 MIX	2 VMD 3	45	•	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:]	FHI 045 completed	N				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	F	CoGP MA					
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 If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.									
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit deta	ail reason below:							

Waste incinerated on site unless the incinerator cannot cope with the capacity. Surplus waste is taken away by Billy Bowie and taken to Dundas Chemicals.

Saprolegnia has been confirmed on site. However it is not causing significant mortalities at this time and is currently being treated with Formalin and Cress prior to transfer off site w/b 16/03/2020.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0085		Site No:	FS0649]			
Date of Visit:		25/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		24 cages	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	24
Species	SAL							
Age group	Q2 2020							
No Fish	495, 277							
Mean Fish Wt	93g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	18/03/2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	August 20	20	
Pagent (last 4 vdcs)	diagona proble	-m-2		V	Any assense	(since last	vioit\2	N
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o			site but not c	ausing significa	Any escapes ant mortalities			IN
Movement Records								
		r inapportion?						V
 Movement record Date of last insper 		inspection?					06/02/2019	'
3. Are records comp		actly entered?					00/02/2019	V
4. Are movement re		•						· ·
5. Are records comp								Ÿ
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		by (or on bel	nalf) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:	<u> </u>							
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
			Wk4: 369 (0	.7%), Wk5: 78	7 (0.16%), WI	k6: 1,114 (0	.22%), Wk7:	1,685
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		(0.34%) acro	oss site.				
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:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					l N
If yes, detail:	Thortainty du	ing period en	concu:					1,
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								N/A

If yes, detail:		Formalin					
	Cress has						
	also been						
	used as a						
If other, detail:	treatment.						
2. Medicines record		•		Y			
3. Are records comp		•		Y			
4. Are fish in a withd	•			Y			
5. If yes, what treatn	nent(s)?		Formalin				
	Fish in						
	withdrawal						
If other, detail:	for Cress.						
6. Are medicines sto	ored appropria	tely?		Y			
Biosecurity Record	le						
Biosecurity record		r inspection?					
•		•	ding and safe disposal been considered?				
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 increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?							
moreasea (unexpiai	nou) mortality	at the site been included:					
1 Has the action the	at will be taken	in the event that the prese	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease				
			tified to Scottish Ministers?				
			ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher				
health status, certific	•		d on the faith site been covered (equal of higher				
ricaitii status, tertiiit	ador ii requii	cu):					
6. Have the husband	dry and bioses	ourity measures implement	ed between each epidemiological unit to minimise				
	•	•	isitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?				
			ce to maintain the physical containment of				
aquaculture animals			ce to maintain the physical containment of				
•		s been adequately impleme	ented on site?				
If no, detail:	nty procedure	3 Deen adequately impleme	CHICA OH SIC:				
ii iio, actali.							
Results of Surveill	ance						
1. Has any animal h	ealth surveilla	nce been carried out by or	r on behalf of, the business?				
 Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? If yes, are results available for inspection? 							
3. Any significant results?							
•		recent disease problems)					
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).							

Records checked between: 06/02/2019 - 25/02/2020

ni 059, version 12							153	ueu by. Fi				
Case no:	2020-00	085	Site No:		FS0649					25/0	02/2020	25/0
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	15:0	0:00	15:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	13
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	P	Α		Total Sa	amples
dd Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	F1-12	F13-24	F25-40									
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Average weight	93g	93g	93g									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	FW	FW	FW									
Stock Origin	Finfish Hatchery FS0264	Finfish Hatchery FS0265	Finfish Hatchery FS0266									
	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-12 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 93g Sex N/A Water Type FW	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 15:00:00 15:3 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-12 F13-24 F25-40 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 93g 93g 93g Sex N/A N/A N/A N/A Water Type FW FW FW Vigure 1900 Site No: BA BA Water Type FW FW FW Vigure 1900 Site No: BA BA Water Type FW FW Vigure 1900 Site No: BA BA Water Type FW FW Site No: BA BA BA BA BA BA BA BA BA BA	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 15:00:00 15:30:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1-12 F13-24 F25-40 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 93g 93g 93g Sex N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Water Type FW FW FW Note that the No: Priority samples: VI BA Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA BA Pool Fish No F1-12 F13-24 F25-40 Pool Group Species SAL	Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2020-0085 Site No: FS0649	Case no: 2020-0085 Site No: FS0649	Case no: 2020-0085 Site No: FS0649 Date of visampling	Case no: 2020-0085 Site No: FS0649 Date of visit/ Sampling: Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2020-0085 Site No: FS0649 Date of visit/ 25/15 Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2020-0085 Site No: FS0649 Date of visit/ Sampling: 25/02/2020

02/2020	02/2020 Additional Sample Information:											
	Anaest	netic ove	erdose.									
0	ı	Total To	ests ass	signed	0	l						

Site No: FS0649

Case No: 2020-0085

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2020-0085			Date of visit:	25/02/2020					
Site No:	FS0649			Inspector:		ı				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
·		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
Report Summary										
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
MIX	04/03/2020	шэр	2 insp							
MIX VMD	04/03/2020									
VIVID	04/03/2020									





Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 25/02/2020

 Site No
 FS0649
 Site Name
 Loch Arkaig

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200085

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

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015. Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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 information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated.

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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.

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

Signed:

R20

Date: 04/03/2020

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

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel - 0131 244 3498 Fax - 0131 244 0944 Email - ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0087			Date of visit: 25/02/2020
Time spent on site:	nrs	Main	Inspector:
Site No: FS0226 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Inchmore Mowi Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 14	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed N
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Dead fish and waste incinerated on site unless volumes are too high for the capacity of the incinerator. In these instances, waste is collected by Billy Bowie and taken to Dundas Chemicals.

Very few moribunds and 4 mortalities observed across the site.

The site is currently vaccinating against SAV. Mortalities have therefore been attributed to vaccination losses.

tanks d 1
tchery
iciic. j
/k17
Y
V
Y
Y
Y
N
Y
Y
Nk6:
cross the r Q3's
Q33
N
N
N/A
IN/A
N/A

1. Recent treatment	s (last 4 wks)	?		Y				
If yes, detail:		Formalin, T.M.S.						
	Cress is							
	being used							
	as a							
If other, detail:	replacemen t for							
2. Medicines record		inspection?						
3. Are records comp		•		Ÿ				
4. Are fish in a without		•		Y				
5. If yes, what treatn	•		Formalin, T.M.S.					
Fish in								
	withdrawal							
If other, detail:	from Cress.							
6. Are medicines sto	red appropria	tely?		Y				
Biosecurity Record	le							
Biosecurity record		r inspection?		Y				
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? Y								
		•	ottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any					
	•	at the site been included?	ottori ministere er veterinary professionar er arry	Y				
` '	,							
4. Has the action that	at will be taker	n in the event that the prese	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y				
is detected been inc	luded and ho	w and when that will be not	ified to Scottish Ministers?					
5. Has the health sta	atus of aquacu	ılture animals being stocke	d on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y				
health status, certific	cation if requir	ed)?						
	•	•	ed between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y				
		•	sitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?					
	_		e to maintain the physical containment of	Y				
aquaculture animals								
If no, detail:	rity procedure	s been adequately impleme	ented on site?	Ť				
ii iio, detaii.								
Results of Surveill	ance							
1. Has any animal h	ealth surveilla	nce been carried out by, or	on behalf of the business?	Y				
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? If yes, are results available for inspection?								
3. Any significant results?								
3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).								
,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
			0.4/0.0/0.40					

Records checked between: 04/02/2019 - 25/02/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0087		Site No:	FS0226		Insp:	
Date of Visit	25/02/2020		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	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
.	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5
Movements off			I 0			10	10
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	10
Exposure via water	Transport of doo	Site contacts	0				
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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
·	•	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		
	iaimo apotroan	Tot walling a data execution			<u> </u>		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure	ı	
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	cessing	0				0
the fules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				ш
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status						П
	Processing fish from Category III farm						
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1			
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			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				ш
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				ш
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		32
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2020-0087	;	Site No:	FS0226		
•	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the prev	rious 4 years?				
2. Is the CoGP Farm I	Management Area (or equivalent) 1	fallowed synchronously on	a single ye	ear class basis?		
azamethiphos and em	access to a range of licenced in-fer namectin benzoate) as well as according d in a reasonable period of time? ocumented farm management agre	ess 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? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)				
6. Do records adequa	tely reflect the required standard sp	pecified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)	
records are inspected						
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 bee	en reported to the Fish Health Inspe	ectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.			
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is consider	ed to cause significant we	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)	
	treatments been administered or ot treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is					
11. Has any other acti	ion been taken (where applicable)?					
12. Have therapeutic t	treatments or the actions taken had	l a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?		
13. Are treatments, wh	here conducted, carried out in coop	eration between participat	ing farms?	•		
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where fewer					
	cific written lice management proce escalation of a sea lice infestation?	edure with waypoints descr	ibing set a	ctions to deal with reco	ognised	
16. Do the sea lice lev	vels observed on stocks reflect sea	lice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.		
Containment Inspect	tion					
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment damage due to pr	redators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N	
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against the predatio	n experienced on site? (De	etail below)	Υ	
Contract with rentok	rill, sites indoors					
If other, detail below	<i>I</i> :.					
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been experienced or	n or in the vicinity of the sit	te since the	e last FHI inspection?	N	
•	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to question	•		o lact i ili iliopocacii.		
	eported to Scottish Ministers?					
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (wh	ere they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local fishe	eries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)	
7. Were methods (if a	ny) used to recover escapees? If ye	es give detail				
9. If all note were den	Noved was this action agreed with I	ocal wild fich interacts and	Was norm	ission divon by Soettish		
Ministers? (Legal, Co	oloyed was this action agreed with lo GP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	ocal who half interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottist		
9. What action was ta	ken to prevent and minimise the ris	k of further escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could		
be considered unde	er satisfactory measures of the A	Act)				
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with regards to co	ontainment? If no, please o	detail reasc	on(s)	Υ	

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0087			Date of visit:	25/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0226	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D								
Report Summary		-						
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	04/03/2020							





Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0119
SITE NO FS0226
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 25/02/2020 SITE NAME Inchmore CASE NO 20200087

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.

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.

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.

Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the

Date: 04/03/2020

FHI 059, Version 12	Issu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2020-0088			Date of visit: 27/02/2020					
Time spent on site:	10mins	Main Inspect	or:					
Site No: SS0551 Business No: SB0363	Site Name: Business Name:	Blaich, Loch Eil Silver Sea Mussels						
Case Types: 1 REG	23	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ 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 reason below:								
	Site has been fallow for seve	ral years and is to be de-registe	red.					

Inspected the site to confirm that it was fallow and all equipment has been removed from the water. Site to be de-registered.

FHI 059, Version 12	n 12 Issue					Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No: 202	0-0088	Site No:	SS0551				
Date of Visit:	27/02/2020			Inspector(s)]
Registration/Authorisa 1. Business/site details s 2. Changes made to deta	ummary checked by si	te representa	tive?			Y Y	}
Site Details Total No facilities Species N/A	U	Facilities sto	cked	U	No facilitie	es inspected	U
Age group No Fish							
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site)	N/A		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	N/A		
Recent (last 4 wks) diseatlf yes, detail:	ase problems?		N/A	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N/A
Movement Records 1. Movement records ava 2. Date of last inspection 3. Are records complete 4. Are movement records 5. Are records complete 6. Are health certificates	: and correctly entered? s available for dead fish and correctly entered?	h and waste?				03/07/2018	N/A N/A N/A N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movements of the second seco			•	_			
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records avail 2. How are mortalities dis	•						N/A
If other detail: 3. Mortality records comp 4. Recent mortality (last		ered? N/A					N/A
5. Evidence of recent income If yes, facility nos/no mor	• •		reason:				N/A
6. Any other peaks in mo	ortality during period ch	ecked?					N/A
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unex If yes, detail action:	plained) mortalities bee	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
8 Have 'mortality events	been reported to FHI	If no ladd M	RT case and e	enter on mort	ality events	sheet	N/A

5111.050 Marrian 40	leaved by FIII	D-1
FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspection? Are records complete and correctly entered? Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, r 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notifincreased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included. 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the pis detected been included and how and when that will be	fy Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional ded? presence or suspicion of the presence of a lis	al of any
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stated that the health status of aquaculture animals being stated that the health status, certification if required)?		or higher
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures impler transmission of disease been covered (movement of sta 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately improcedures.	aff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? n place to maintain the physical containment of	?
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		

03/07/2018 - 27/02/2020

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:	2020-0088			Date of visit:	27/02/2020			
Site No:	SS0551	1		Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
	+							
	 							
	 							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	28/02/2020		2 11150					





Silver Sea Mussels 11 MacColl Terrace Ballachulish Argyll PH49 4JH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoSB0363Date of Visit27/02/2020Site NoSS0551Site NameBlaich, Loch EilInspectorNicole LittleCase No20200088

The above site was inspected as fallow, all equipment has been removed from the foreshore. The lease for the site has been surrendered and so the aquaculture production business (APB) and site have been deregistered.

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

Signed: Date: 04/03/2020

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	Dat	te of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0094			Date of vis	it: 24/02/2020
Time spent on site:	2.5h	Ma	in Inspector:	
Site No: FS0831 Business No: FB0108	Site Name: Business Name:	Mill Burn (Old Mill) Kintail Hatchery		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 9.4	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 co	mpleted
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	F CoGP N	ЛА
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	n If yes, see add	itional information/clinic	al score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?		itional information/clinic	
Gross pathology observed?		n If yes, see add	itional information/clinic	al score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		n		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit deta	ail reason below:		

Higher than normal deformities noted in this intake.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0094		Site No:	FS0831]			
Date of Visit:		24/02/2020)		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornal Business/site details 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		26 tanks plus hatchery	Facilities sto	ocked	22	No facilities	s inspected	27
Species Age group	SAL alevins							
No Fish	2,005,000							
Mean Fish Wt	N/A							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	June/July 20	20	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	January 20	21	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	olems?		N	Any escapes	(since last v	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	diooco p.	10.110			741) 555345	(Cirico)	ion, i	
 Movement record Date of last inspe Are records comp Are movement re Are records comp Are records comp Are health certific Transport Records	ection: plete and correcords availab plete and correctes for introduced	rectly entered? ble for dead fis rectly entered?	? sh and waste? ?				12/02/2018	Y N/A N/A Y
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a sys		• •		•				N
Mortality Records								
 Mortality records How are mortalitied If other detail: 		•			Incinerated -	on site		Y
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•			41) up to hatchi	ing			
5. Evidence of recer		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	uring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	eported to FHI	? If no, add N	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

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

Results of Surveillance

3. Any significant results?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

12/2/2018 to 24/2/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0094		Site No:	FS0831		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	5
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country			9	18	26	П
·	Number of sup		0		10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off	I 0	3	6	10	10
IVIOVEITIETIUS OII	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	,	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		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	4					
		n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				ш
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				$\overline{}$
	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				ш
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 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		T 0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			-
CoGP/Regulator				1			
Practices in accordance	Yes		T 0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		I 0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		24 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0094	;	Site No:	FS0831	
•	(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-fo namectin benzoate) as well as aco d in a reasonable period of time? ocumented farm management agr	cess to suitable biological a	nd/or mech	hanical control measure	es, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count r	ecords available for inspection? (l	Legal 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. salr records are inspected	monis) record levels below the sugar ? (CoGP Annex 6)	ggested criteria for treatmer	nt in the Co	oGP during the period the	nat
	t female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) nul 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 cor	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is conside	red to cause significant wel	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)
	treatments been administered or or treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> in				
11. Has any other acti	ion been taken (where applicable)	?			
12. Have therapeutic t	treatments or the actions taken ha	d a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wi	here conducted, carried out in coo	peration between participat	ing farms?	,	
14. Is there a harvesti sea lice?	ng 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	ections to deal with reco	gnised
16. Do the sea lice lev	vels observed on stocks reflect se	a lice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	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
Site indoors					
If other, detail below	<i>r</i> .				
0. 11				- I4 FIII '4'0	N
	ents or events been experienced	•	te since the	e last FHI Inspection?	N .
	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to questice ported to Scottish Ministers?	on 10			
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (w	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 all nets were den	loyed was this action agreed with	local wild fish interests and	was nerm	ission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, Co		ma non intereste and	us poiiii		
9. What action was ta	ken to prevent and minimise the r	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)	У

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0094			Date of visit:	24/02/2020			
Site No:	FS0831	1		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
Report Summary								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI,CNI	11/03/2020		2 insp					
LOI,OIVI	11/03/2020							





Kintail Hatchery Ruarach Inverinate, Kyle of Lochalsh Ross-shire IV40 8HG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0108 SITE NO FS0831 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 24/02/2020
SITE NAME Mill Burn (Old Mill)
CASE NO 20200094

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 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.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business were available for 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: 11/03/2020
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	Dat	te of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0095			Date of visi	it: 25/02/2020
Time spent on site:	2.5h	Mai	in Inspector:	
Site No: FS1336 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross The Scottish Salmor	n Company	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 8.5	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 co	mpleted
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	F CoGP N	ЛА
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin	g fish present?	n If yes, see addit	tional information/clinic	al score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		tional information/clinic	
Gross pathology observed?		n If yes, see addit	tional information/clinic	al score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		n		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit deta	ail reason below:		

First cycle of fish going through the site.

Surveillance frequency number of movements offsite could not be assessed properly due to being the first cycle of fish and no movements have occurred yet. Estimate of movements off resulted in site being assessed as medium.

Sites thermometer used for biosecurity reasons.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0095	S	ite No:	FS1336				
Date of Visit:		25/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		representa	tive?			Y Y	}
Site Details Total No facilities Species	SAL	14 F	acilities sto	cked	8	No facilitie	s inspected	14
Age group No Fish	first feeding 1,714, 631							
Mean Fish Wt	0.5g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	ongoing cycle		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	July 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Record	s							
Movement record		r inspection?						у
2. Date of last inspe							first inspecti	
3. Are records comp	olete and corre	ectly entered?						У
4. Are movement re	cords availabl	e for dead fish	and waste?					N/A
5. Are records comp	olete and corre	ectly entered?						N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	uctions (outwith	ı GB) availa	ble?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any moveme		by (or on beha	lf) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N/A
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_			N/A
Mortality Records	·							
Mortality records	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly entere	ed?					Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):	2	0118 (1.169	%) background	l mortalities			
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	typical mortalitie	es?					N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period chec	ked?					N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unevnlained)	mortalities been	reported to	vet or EUI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	инехріантей) і	nortailles been	reported to	vet of 1 III:				13/7
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI? I	f no. add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A
, ,			,					

6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	у
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	У
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?	У
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?	у
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	У
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	У
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 aquaculture animals held on site?	У
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	У
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between:

23/1/2020 to 25/2/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0095		Site No:	FS1336		Insp:	
Date of Visit	25/02/2020		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	
oposico	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Mayamanta off							
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	6
Exposure via water	rtaniber of des	Site contacts	_				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III						\vdash
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		\mathbf{L}
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iaims apstream	TOT WILLIEF T HAZI EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>		
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	cessing	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						
	Processing fish from Category III farm						
	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	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		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				Н
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		2	-			┝─┤
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		17
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0095	Site No: FS1336	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site experie	nced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	
azamethiphos and emacan these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as in a reasonable perioc cumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, ard of time? ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	nd
		pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
		standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	
		<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) od that records are inspected?	or
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating farms?	
sea lice?	•	where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognise infestation?	:d
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	
Containment Inspect	ion		
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ
If other, detail below:			
Site indoors	unta au avianta haan avii	and an aring the vicinity of the site since the leat [1] increation?	N
•		perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	',
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep		•	
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if ar	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If all nets were deal	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		g. 222 1000	
· -		imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0095			Date of visit:	25/02/2020					
Site No:	FS1336	1		Inspector:		l				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
	-									
Report Summary	1									
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI,CNI	09/03/2020	шэр	2 IIISP							
201,0111	00/00/2020									





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0169
SITE NO FS1336
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 25/02/2020 SITE NAME Applecross CASE NO 20200095

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.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded. R04

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB Tel - 0131 244 3498 Fax - 0131 244 0944 Email - <u>ms.fishhealth@gov.scot</u> Website - <u>www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science</u> Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business were available for 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.



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: 2020-0096			Date of visit: 25/02/2020
Time spent on site:		Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0301 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Appleburn Hatchery The Scottish Salmon Company	/
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 2.2	Thermometer No:	T173	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 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:

Fish had been recently treated with formalin and Cress.

On inspection of the site no clinical signs of disease noted.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0096		Site No:	FS0301				
Date of Visit:		25/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		60	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	60
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group	2020s1	2020s0						
No Fish	245,000	953,000						
Mean Fish Wt	57g	0.9g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	ongoing cyc	le	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	saprolegnia				jy	(======================================	, :	
Movement Records	<u> </u>							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inopeodori.					21/02/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				0	У
4. Are movement re		•						Ý
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records			·					
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the hu	isiness (not ils	ing a STR)?			N
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_			N/A
Mortality Records								
Mortality records :	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Biogas - Ene	rgen. Cumb	ernauld	
If other detail:						. 90.11, 0 4.11.2		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	•		%) background	l mortalities			•
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	tvpical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
			· · ·					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					Y
If yes, detail:		•	/ 11	sfer first feedin	g fry)			
7. Have increased (t	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	l? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?			У
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	Formalin	Cress	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?			Y
Piecesurity Peeerde			
Biosecurity Records			
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		is dispessed been considered?	y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality re		•	У
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB	•	ers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site be	en included?		У
			,
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> t		•	У
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals			V
health status, certification if required)?	being stocked on the fair	if site been covered (equal of higher	y
meanin status, certification in required):			
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measure	es implemented between	each enidemiological unit to minimise	V
transmission of disease been covered (movement	•		,
7. Is documentation available regarding the mea		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	V
aquaculture animals held on site?	asures in place to maintal	in the physical containment of	,
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequ	ately implemented on site	2	V
If no, detail:	atery implemented on site	7 :	,
ii iio, dotaii.			
Results of Surveillance			
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carr	ied out by, or on behalf o	f. the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	• ,		Y
3. Any significant results?			Y
o. 7 my digrimount roomlo.		samples in July 2019 tested positive for	or
		Flavobacterium psychrophilum and Ic	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent diseas	e problems).	necator.	1
	,		
Departs shocked between	21/02/2019	25/2/2020	

Records checked between: 21/02/2018 - 25/2/2020

Pi Ti st Ei	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling tarts/ends:	2020-00 VI)96	Site No: BA		FS0301			Date of Samplin		25/0	02/2020	
Ti st Ei	ime sampling	VI		ВА					Campin	9.			
st Eı		12.0				PA		MG		HI			
			0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	4
Sı	invironmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
	I Fish/Pools - click												
	ool/Fish No												
	ish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	ool Group												
	pecies	SAL	SAL	SAL		SAL						SAL	SAL
	verage weight	55g											
	Sex												
W	Vater Type	FW	FW	FW	FW		FW	FW				FW	FW
Stock Details		Appleburn incubation unit											

	_										•		
	Additional Sample Information:												
Λ	1	Total T	ests ass	ianod	Λ	1							
0		TOTAL T	CS15 a55	igned	0								
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		
SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL		
	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g		
oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	Jog	oog		
E) A /	E) A /	E) A /	E147	E14/		E) A /	E\A/	E14/	- 14/	- LA /	E) A (
FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW		
L C	Ľ	L	L	L	L	u	Ľ	L	u	n	L		
Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit		
q	ps	pg	pg	pg	ps	pg	ps	pg	pg	pg	pg		
เมื	เร	เว	เร	าว	ซ	เร	เก	าว	เว	ซ	ซ		
.⊑	<u>⊇</u> .	.⊑	⊒.	.⊑	.⊑	Ë	₽.	.⊑	<u>.</u>	.⊑	ᆢ		
E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E		
nq	nq	nq	pq	nq	pq	nq	pq	nq	nq	nq	ηq		
<u>0</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>•</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>e</u>		
Appl unit	Appl Unit	Appl unit	pp	pp	Appl Unit	pp	pp	Appl unit	Appl Unit	Appl unit	pp		
C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2		

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0096		Site No:	FS0301		lnsp:	
Date of Visit	25/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s	upp./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
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n		1 0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des		0		6	10	6
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 upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	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 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				
	equivalent stat		4				
	_	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				\Box
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	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	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			ш
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2	1			
					Total Rank		22 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0096		Site No:	FS0301	
Sea Lice Inspection (•	in the previous 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm N	Management Area (or ed	uivalent) fallowed synch	ronously on a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and em can these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as v I in a reasonable period		biological and/or mec	hanical control measures, an	d
Management Area (or		ment agreement or state	ment relevant to the s	ic und coor i unii	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for insp	ection? (Legal SSI, CoG	P Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required s	standard specified in the	SSI and the CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. saln records are inspected?		ow the suggested criteria	for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that	
_	•	nonis) numbers per fish b d that records are inspec		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If no,	FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which i	s considered to cause sig	gnificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
				levels have exceeded the ions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	oplicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the actions	taken had a significant i	mpact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	nere conducted, carried	out in cooperation betwee	en participating farms?	?	
sea lice?				held without treatment for	
	cific written lice manager scalation of a sea lice in		points describing set a	actions to deal with recognise	d
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data	a? If no please detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damag	e due to predators in the	current or previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against th	ne predation experienced	on site? (Detail below	')	Υ
Covered tanks s	ome tanks indoors				
If other, detail below	:				
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicir	nity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip		my or are one or or	o laot i ili moposion.	
	ported to Scottish Minist	•			
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB for	thwith (where they exist)	? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	J.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and	local fisheries trusts fort	hwith (where they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover esca	pees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Coo		reed with local wild fish ir	nterests and was perm	lission given by Scottish	
9. What action was tak	ken to prevent and minir	nise the risk of further es	capes? (Not covered in	n code but could	
be considered unde	er satisfactory measure	es of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with re	gards to containment? If	no, please detail reas	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0096			Date of visit:	25/02/2020					
Site No:	FS0301	1		Inspector:		l				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
	-									
Report Summary										
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI,CNI,VMD	11/03/2020		2 insp							
LOI, OIVI, VIVID	11/03/2020									





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0169
SITE NO FS0301
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 25/02/2020
SITE NAME Appleburn Hatchery
CASE NO 20200096

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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business 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.

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: 11/03/2020
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: 08/10/2	2018
Case No: 2020-0098			Date of visit: 26/02/2020	
Time spent on site:	h	Main	Inspector:	
Site No: FS0234 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Torridon Mowi Scotland Ltd		∃
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 7.5	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed	コ
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-17	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	n If yes, see addition	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Additional Case Information:

No records of lumpfish offsite maintained as numbers are not known, the numbers are counted and recorded at Mallaig harvest station along with records of wild fish that have been transferred.

Lumpfish mortalities increased December 2018 (5168 no diagnosis), January 2019 (4031 No diagnosis), February 2019 (5332 atypical furunculosis) and March 2019 (5143 atypical furunculosis), April 2019 (5168,(no diagnosis), florfenicol had been administered.

Lumpfish morts 544 last four weeks

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2020-0098]	Site No:	FS0234					
Date of Visit:		26/02/2020			Inspector(s):]	
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			y n		
Site Details								_	
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	s inspected	10	
Species	SAL	LUM							
Age group	2019Q4	adult							
No Fish	903,121	53,504							
Mean Fish Wt	600g	30g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	June 2021		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	November	2021		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	n	
Movement Records									
Movement record Date of last inspec	s available fo	r inspection?					29/08/2018	Y	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?				23/00/2010	N	
4. Are movement red		•						N/A	
5. Are records comp								N/A	
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A	
Transport Records									
1. Are any movemen	nts carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N	
If yes, is there a syst				•	_				
Mortality Records									
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y	
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Incinerated -	on site			
If other detail:									
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y	
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		1059/site (0.	12%)					
5. Evidence of recen	it increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:					
6. Any other peaks in	•	-						Y	
see additional comments also wk 42 2018 11169 (1.41%) gill infection physical damage, wk 39 2018 7596 (0.95%) treatment losses physical damage									
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?									
If yes, detail action: Company biologist took samples									
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re				enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N	

yee, wetani		
If other, detail: TMS		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		Y
Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	ice TMS	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Discourity Beauty		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	wandaafa dianaaal baan aanaidanad?	<u>y</u>
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	•	у
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scotti	sn Ministers or Veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?		у
4	i-i	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence		
is detected been included and how and when that will be notifie		V
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked o	n the farm site been covered (equal or higher	ĭ
health status, certification if required)?		
C. University in the control of the	hat was a sale anidamialaniaal wiit ta minimia	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visito		
·		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to	o maintain the physical containment or	
aquaculture animals held on site?	ad an aita?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented If no, detail:	ed on site?	
ii iio, detaii.		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on	behalf of the business?	Υ
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		- ' '
il yes, detail (il flot detailed dildel recent disease problems).		

29/08/2018 to 26/2/2020 Records checked between:

٠.	11 059, Version 12			_	_			153	ueu by.				
	Case no:	2020-00	98	Site No:		FS0234			Date of		26/	02/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG	Samplin	ig: HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00	13:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	20
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL		SAL		SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL
	Average weight	600g		600g	•	600g	600g	600g	600g	600g	600g	600g	600g
	Sex	N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW
stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	O Glenfinnan	O Glenfinnan	Glenfinnan	∞ Glenfinnan	∞ Glenfinnan	∞ Glenfinnan	A Loch Garry	A Loch Garry	Loch Garry	A Loch Garry	N Loch Garry	N Loch Garry
(O		.0		10		•	•	•	-	•	7	_	_

Total Tests assigned 0	Additional Sample Information:														
Total Tests assigned 0															
	0 Total Tests assigned 0														
13															
SAL															
600g															
N/A															
SW SW															
Toch Garry															

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0098		Site No:	FS0234		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/02/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			C	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	C	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	r	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers			10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	1 0) 3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des		- 0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contact	ts 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	C)			
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	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	rs (1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		C				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2			
	equivalent stat		4	}			
	_	r 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				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	3			-
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed		- 			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	5			
Biosecurity		Number of site	es 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	C	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes						0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			ш
CoGP/Regulator			_	_			
Practices in accordance	Yes						0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				Ш
					Total Rank		25 MEDIUM

		_					
Case No:	2020-0098		Site No	o: FS0234			
•	Seawater Sites Only)	s in the previous 4 years	۶۶		N		
•	•	quivalent) fallowed syn		le vear class hasis?	Y		
				(including deltamethrin,	· •		
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period	well as access to suitab	le biological and/or n	mechanical control measures	s, and		
Management Area (or		· · ·					
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		Υ		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the CoGP	? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	S) Y		
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	•	low the suggested criter	ria for treatment in the	e CoGP during the period the	at N		
		<i>monis</i>) numbers per fisl od that records are insp		or above (prior to w/b 10/6/	19) or N		
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If r	o, FHI see comment		N/A		
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infe	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare pr	roblems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.	50) N		
				nis levels have exceeded th ications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.			
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where a	applicable)?			Y		
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the action	s taken had a significar	t impact upon the lice	e levels recorded?	Y		
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation bety	veen participating far	ms?	Y		
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?							
	ific written lice manage scalation of a sea lice i		aypoints describing s	et actions to deal with recog	nised y		
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no please deta	ail reasons.	Υ		
Containment Inspecti	ion						
•		ge due to predators in t	ne current or previous	s production cycles?	N		
		the predation experience	•	•	Y		
ADD	Top nets	Sinker tubes	MML	,			
If other, detail below:	·	Chiller tubes	IVIIVIE				
ir other, detail below.							
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site since	e the last FHI inspection?	N		
f Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip	o 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 and	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they	exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.	17)		
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give deta	il				
8 If all note were deal	oved was this action as	greed with local wild fick	interests and was n	ermission given by Scottish			
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild list	rinterests and was p	Cimission given by Scottisti			
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and mini	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not covere	ed in code but could			
be considered unde	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with re	egards to containment?	If no, please detail re	eason(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: 2020-0098	Site No: FS0234	
Date of Visit: 26/02/20	20 Inspector: DJT	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection locate	ed within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require com	pletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	m Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relev5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish f	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statement of review?	Y Y Y
	mum health standards for the stocks to be introduc	ced to the area or
 Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination Does the FMAg/S identify the speed 	cination requirements for stocks held in the area or ecies of fish which may be stocked into the area or eximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrafish farm in the area or the individual	angements for the storage and disposal of any dea I farm?	ad fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemen	nt of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers	s and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the ava of statement?	ailability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available tre	eatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circused on farms in the area or individual	cumstances under which biological controls and cle al farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra	angements for synchronous treatments on farms v	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	cumstances when live fish may be introduced or re	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of Issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or inc	dividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be fal	low and the earliest y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kee?	ept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement o	or statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 19/10/2019	

Case No: 2020-0098 Site No: FS0234 Date of visit: 26/02/2020

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
15/10/18	21/10/2018	≥750g	2.7kg	SAL	2017q4	Weekly	1.41	Explained	Gill issues, Physical damage
			_						
	+		+			_			

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	11169	Physical damage associated to treatment	

Case No:	2020-0098			Date of visit:	26/02/2020				
Site No:	FS0234	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.								
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
5									
Report Summary Case Type									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI,CINI,SLI,VIVID	10/03/2020								
Case completion	30/03/2020								





Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 26/02/2020

 Site No
 FS0234
 Site Name
 Torridon

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200098

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 8/4/2020 Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

This case will now be closed. This site may be subject to further audit and recommendations in the future.

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

Signed: Date: 30/03/2020
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





Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 26/02/2020

 Site No
 FS0234
 Site Name
 Torridon

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200098

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 movement records were inspected and found to be inadequately 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 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:

Records of movements of cleaner fish offsite were not maintained, it is understood that
records are kept at the Mallaig harvest station. Confirmation of the number of cleaner fish
transferred should be sought from the harvest station and a record maintained.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of the date this report was issued.

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, 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: 10/03/2020

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0099			Date of visit: 26/02/2020
Time spent on site:)m	Main Ins	pector:
Site No: SS0025 Business No: SB0016	Site Name: Business Name:	Ob Ghorm Mhor JG & B MacDonald & Sor	ns
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 7.4	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to 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 deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Three mussel lines stocked with mixed year class mussel. No harvests have taken place for many years.

Owner may sell the site.

No observed mortality therefore no records to maintain.

No movements on or off site since last inspection.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0099	,	Site No:	SS0025				
Date of Visit:		26/02/2020			Inspector(s)	:]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		e representa	ative?			у	}
Site Details Total No facilities Species Age group No Fish Mean Fish Wt	MED Mixed not known N/A	3	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	s inspected	3
Next Fallow Date (S		None planned		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Not knowr	1	
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
 Movement record Date of last inspect Are records comp Are movement records comp Are records comp Are records comp Are health certification 	ction: lete and corre cords availabl lete and corre	ectly entered? le for dead fish ectly entered?					29/08/2018	y n/a n/a N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movemer If yes, is there a syst	nts carried out		•	•	_			
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records a 2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	f?			Other (detai	l)		N/A
If other detail: 3. Mortality records of the second	complete and	_	ed?	eafloor I mortality there	efore no reco	rds maintair	ned	N/A
5. Evidence of recently yes, facility nos/no		* 1		/reason:				N/A
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:								N/A
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	. ,		·		enter on mort	ality events s	sheet.	N/A N/A

aquaculture ariimais	Tield off site:	
8. Have the biosecur	ity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no. detail:		

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

Results of Surveillance

aguaculture animals held on site?

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N/A
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: 29/08/2018 to 26/2/2020

Total Risk

OW

Case No:	2020-0099			Date of visit:	26/02/2020				
Site No:	SS0025	l	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary									
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI	10/03/2020		Z IIISP						
201	10/00/2020								





JG & B MacDonald & Sons Peat Port Badachro Gairloch IV21 2AB

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0016
 Date of Visit
 26/02/2020

 Site No
 SS0025
 Site Name
 Ob Ghorm Mhor

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200099

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 low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every fourth 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: 10/03/2020
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: 2020-0101			Date of visit: 27/02/2020
Time spent on site:	0m	Mair	n Inspector:
Site No: FS0760 Business No: FB0461	Site Name: Business Name:	Seafield Hatchery River Carron Restora	ition Project
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed?	•	N/A If yes, see additi	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry			
	Site fallow	and to be made inactive	

Additional Case Information:

Site to be made inactive, reported to be poor water quality for salmon production, high ph high co2. Paperwork completed to make the site inactive

No water supply to the tanks.

Site fallow since 19/9/18

FHI 059, Version 12	Issu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue: 0	08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-	0101 Site No:	FS0760		
Date of Visit:	27/02/2020	Inspector(s):	
Registration/Authorisation 1. Business/site details sur 2. Changes made to details	nmary checked by site representa	ative?	y n	
Site Details Total No facilities Species Age group	8 Facilities sto	ocked 0	No facilities inspected 8	
No Fish				
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site)	currently fallow	Next Input Date (Site)	N/A	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease If yes, detail:	e problems?	N/A Any escape	es (since last visit)?	/A
5. Are records complete an	nd correctly entered? available for dead fish and waste?		28/07/2015	Y Y Y Y N/A
-	ried out by (or on behalf) of the bupplace for maintenance of transpo		E	Y
3. Mortality records comple	osed of? stic waste te and correctly entered?	Other (deta	il)	Y
 Recent mortality (last 4 v Evidence of recent incre If yes, facility nos/no morta 		//reason:	L	N/A
	ality during period checked?		I	N
7. Have increased (unexplaint yes, detail action:	ained) mortalities been reported to een reported to FHI? If no, add M		tality events sheet.	N/A

4. Are fish in a withdrawai period?	N/A
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	1171
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	У
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	У
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?	У
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?	У
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	У
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	V
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	У
aquaculture animals held on site?	
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	У
If no, detail:	
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).	
29/07/2015 to 27/2/2020	
Records checked between: 28/07/2015 to 27/2/2020	

5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Containment Inspection The 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)	Case No:	2020-0101	Site No:	FS0760	
Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, zamethiphos and emamectin herozate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and an these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm lanagement Area (or equivalent)? Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that cords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 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 or above (from with 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) Are therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Has therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infes	•	••			
Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, zamethiphos and emanectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and an these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm lanagement face (or equivalentl?) Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that scords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 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 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, Fit1 see comment. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) Do Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for an lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect	•				
anamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and an these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm lanagement Area (or equivalent)? Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that ecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) Are sea lice (<i>C. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that ecords are inspected? As everage 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 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? Yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) On Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatments or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 1. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for eal lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? Are measures in p			•		
Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that scords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 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 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Has any entereatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for an lice? Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Is there are 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) Is 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)	azamethiphos and emar can these be deployed i 4. Is there a signed docu	amectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biologin a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agreement or statement re	cal and/or med	chanical control measure	s, and
Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that acords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 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 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) 0. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 1. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarics during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? 3. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 3. On the sea lice experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? 4. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 5. Are measures in place to mitig			6\		
Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that secords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 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 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) D. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 1. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. 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) **Tother, detail below: Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)			•		0)
Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 1. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 1. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and	the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex (6)
or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) 0. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when L. salmonis levels have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 1. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Containment Inspection			atment in the C	CoGP during the period th	nat
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 L. salmonis levels have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where C. elongatus 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 eal lice; levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios 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. 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? (Detail below) 17. Are measures in place to mittigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 18. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? 18. Have there appeared to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/	19) or
0. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the uggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 1. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. 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) 3. Are measures in clidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? 4. If No skip to question 10 5. Have these been reported to Iocal DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI se	e comment.		
1. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Containment Inspection	9. Is C. elongatus infest	station at a level which is considered to cause significar	nt welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	5.50)
2. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. 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) fother, detail below: Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
3. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. 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) fother, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	11. Has any other action	n been taken (where applicable)?			
4. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. 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) fother, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	12. Have therapeutic tre	eatments or the actions taken had a significant impact	upon the lice le	evels recorded?	
ea lice? 5. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? 6. 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) f other, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	13. Are treatments, whe	ere conducted, carried out in cooperation between part	cipating farms	s?	
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) Tother, detail below: Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Pyes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part	populations ar	re held without treatment	for
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) f other, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)			describing set	actions to deal with recog	gnised
. 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) f other, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	16. Do the sea lice level	els observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no	please detail	reasons.	
. 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) f other, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
. 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) f other, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	Containment Inspection	on			
Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) fother, detail below: Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	•		t or previous p	roduction cycles?	
f other, detail below: . Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	•			•	
. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)			•	,	
Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	If other, detail below:				
Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	3. Have escape inciden	nts or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of t	he site since th	he last FHI inspection?	N/A
. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
	4. Have these been repo	ported to Scottish Ministers?			
	5. Have these been repo	oorted to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoG	P - 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)	
					.17)
. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail	7. Were methods (if any	y) 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	8. If aill nets were deploy	oved was this action agreed with local wild fish interest	and was perr	mission given by Scottish	
linisters? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)				3. c	
. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	9. What action was take	en to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	(Not covered	in code but could	
pe considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	be considered under	satisfactory measures of the Act)			
0. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, ple	ase detail reas	son(s)	

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0101			Date of visit:	27/02/2020					
Site No:	FS0760	1	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	+									
	_									
	_									
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
REG	11/03/2020		2 IIISP							
1120	11/00/2020									
	1									
	1									





River Carron Restoration Project Dunosdale Lochcarron Ross-shire IV54 8YH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0461
 DATE OF VISIT
 27/02/2020

 SITE NO
 FS0760
 SITE NAME
 Seafield Hatchery

 INSPECTOR
 CASE NO
 20200101

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.

Should you require to restock the site in the future you must apply to the Fish Health Inspectorate to have the status amended prior to stocking

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

Signed: Date: 11/03/2020
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: 2020-0103			Date of visit: 27/02/2020
Time spent on site:	5h	Main Inspec	etor:
Site No: FS0945 Business No: FB0461	Site Name: Business Name:	Glen Mor River Carron Restoration Pro	pject
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 2	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	n If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Some issues with costia April 2019 due to high temperature.

FHI 059, Version 12	!		Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0103		Site No:	FS0945				
Date of Visit:		27/02/2020)		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornal Business/site det 2. Changes made to	tails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		8 tanks 1 hatchery trough	Facilities sto	cked	5	No facilitie	s inspected	8
Species Age group	SAL 2020s1							
No Fish	5,000							
Mean Fish Wt	20g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	March 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	April/May 2	2020	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		n	Any escapes	(since last)	/isit)?	n
If yes, detail:								
 Movement record Date of last inspe Are records comp Are movement re Are records comp Are health certific Transport Records	ection: plete and correcords availab plete and correcates for introduction:	rectly entered? ble for dead fis rectly entered?	? sh and waste? ?				26/11/2018	Y Y Y Y N/A
1. Are any moveme If yes, is there a sys	ents carried ou	• •		•				Y
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. How are mortaliti		•			Other (detail)			Y
If other detail:		aste as only s	mall amounts		Curer (Comm.)			
3. Mortality records	complete and		tered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•	at missl morts		ed, records are	e maintained			N/A
Evidence of receil f yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				IN/A
11 900, 1201119	/ Intertainty p	Tuointy/1.5	TOR PET TELLING	Touce				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality du	uring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	· neveloined		an reported to	a viet er EUI2				N/A
7. Have increased (If yes, detail action:	• •	mortalities be	en reported to) Vet or FHI?				N/A
8. Have 'mortality e		eported to FHI	? If no, add N	IRT case and ε	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N1/ 0
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	N/A
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
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 increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y 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?	У
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	У
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.)?	У
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	У
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	У
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?	N/A
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 26/11/2018 to 27/2/2020	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:						: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0103		Site No:	FS0945		Insp:	
Date of Visit	27/02/2020		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
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	I 0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits 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	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	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		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	s 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				
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
	_	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				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	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		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			1
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		18 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0103	;	Site No:	FS0945	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the previo	ous 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm N	Management Area (or equivalent) fa	llowed synchronously on	a single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and em can these be deployed	access to a range of licenced in-feed amectin benzoate) as well as acces I in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agree	ss to suitable biological a	nd/or mech	hanical control measur	es, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection? (Leg	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required standard spe	cified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (Lo	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected)	nonis) record levels below the sugger? (CoGP Annex 6)	ested criteria for treatmer	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	that
2 or above (from w/b 1	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numb 0/6/19) during the period that record	ls are inspected?		above (prior to w/b 10/6	6/19) or
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish Health Inspec	torate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is considered	d to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50)
	reatments been administered or other reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is contact the contact of				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the actions taken had a	a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in coope	ration between participat	ing farms?	•	
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where fewer				
	cific written lice management proced scalation of a sea lice infestation?	ure with waypoints descr	ribing set a	ctions to deal with reco	ognised
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks reflect sea li	ce count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion				
•	nced equipment damage due to pre	dators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the predation	experienced on site? (De	etail below)	Υ
Lidded tanks					
If other, detail below	:				
2. Have escape incide	unto ar avanta haan avnarianced on	or in the vicinity of the cit	to since the	a last EUI inspection?	n
	ents or events been experienced on	•	ie since une	e last Fri ilispection?	
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question ported to Scottish Ministers?	10			
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forthwith (wher	re they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
	ported to the SSPO and local fisheri				1.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escapees? If yes	s give detail			$\overline{}$
If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Coo	oyed was this action agreed with loo SP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	cal wild fish interests and	was permi	ission given by Scottis	n
, -	en to prevent and minimise the risk	of further escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the A				
	d as satisfactory with regards to cor	·	detail reaso	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0103			Date of visit:	27/02/2020				
Site No:	FS0945	1	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	+								
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
11/3/2020	11/02/2020		Z IIISP						
11/0/2020	11/02/2020								





River Carron Restoration Project Dunosdale Lochcarron Ross-shire IV54 8YH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0461
 DATE OF VISIT 27/02/2020

 SITE NO
 FS0945
 SITE NAME Glen Mor

 INSPECTOR
 CASE NO
 20200103

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.



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