

Case No: 2020-0136 Date of visit: 11/03/2020

Time spent on site: 6 hrs Main Inspector:

Site No: FS0767 Site Name: Tarbert South

Business No: FB0169 Business Name: The Scottish Salmon Company

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 SLI 4 VMD 5 6

Water Temp (°C): 7.4 Thermometer No: T205 FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA M-42

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken? N

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

Additional Case Information:

Seal in the pen since last inspection but no holes and not suspected losses, situation now resolved.

4,900 LUM stocked in January into two pens (5&6), however LUM experiences increased mortality and the batch of Lumpfish was diagnosed with atypical furunculosis, remaining lumpfish were culled as part of the move of these cages to Rubha Stillaig as well as sustained high mortality. Risk assessment for LUM movement available, resulting in decision to cull remaining fish.

2019 S1 moved from Sgian Dubh to Tarbert South in November 2019 and then on to Rubha Stillaig in February 2020. Risk assessment available. FMS outlines following includes consideration for this.

treating with SLICE at the moment

Fish very deep in the water. Fish from 4 cages removed for lice counts appeared to be in very good condition and very clean. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy. No containment issues observed on site. Net and top net still fastened to the handrail with zip ties every few meters. No seals observed in the vicinity of the site during the inspection.

Initial and Final notification (MSe041219SAL) received 11/5/2020. Documents reviewed as satisfactory regarding recommendations made with regards to containment and escapes. 14/5/2020

Case No: Site No:
 Date of Visit: Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

- 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?
- 2. Changes made to details?

Site Details

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="14"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="7"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="14"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="2019 S0"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="467,036"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="1083g"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="May 2021"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="September 2021"/>	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? Any escapes (since last visit)?
 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 movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection?
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of?
- If other detail:
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?
- If yes, detail:
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?
- If yes, detail action:
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S., Slice	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S., Slice	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	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 how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If no, detail:		

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	seal; Atypical furunc in LUM	

reports mention issues with seals spooking fish and causing damage; 23/1/2020 report for lumpfish (samples from Quarry Point but these are the same batch of fish as on Tarbert South) from FVG for histology some systemic pathology suspicious of systemic infection of possible bacterial colonies (unconfirmed) in several tissues, and significant degeneration of the skin and underlying tissue associated with diffuse bacterial infection. Bacteriology report (also FVG) for source site for Feb 2020 for atypical furunculosis.

Records checked between: 04/06/2019 -11/03/2020

Case no: Site No: Date of visit/
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No													
Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8					
Pool Group													
Stock Details	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL					
	Average weight	1kg	1kg	1kg	1kg	1kg	1kg	1kg					
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW				
	Stock Origin	Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph				
	Facility No	13	13	12	12	2	2	3	3				

Case Number:	2020-0136	Site No:	FS0767	Insp:		
Date of Visit	11/03/2020	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices		None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised 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 staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					21	MEDIUM

Case No: 2020-0136

Site No: FS0767

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? | N |
| 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? | Y |
| 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? | Y |
| 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? | Y |
| 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) | Y |
| 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) | Y |
| 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) | Y |
| 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? | N |
| If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. | N/A |
| 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) | N |
| 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) | N/A |
| 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? | N/A |
| 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? | N/A |
| 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? | Y |
| 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice? | Y |
| 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation? | Y |
| 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. | Y |

Containment Inspection

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? | N |
| 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) | Y |

If other, detail below:

ADD, tension nets, tops nets, seal blinds, MML,

- | | |
|--|--|
| 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? | Y |
| If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 | |
| 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? | N |
| 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) | N |
| 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) | N |
| 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail | N |
| 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) | N/A |
| 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) | ADD was adjusted, nets tied to the handrail with zip ties, and |
| 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s) | Y |

see additional information

Case No: 2020-0136

Site No: FS0767

Date of Visit: 11/03/2020

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

Live Fish Movements

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

Harvesting

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

Fallowing

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

Management and operation

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site No: FS0767
Case No: 2020-0136
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



Case No: **2020-0136** Date of visit: **11/03/2020**

Site No: **FS0767** Inspector: **[Redacted]**

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	16/04/2020	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
case completion	15/04/2020	[Redacted]	[Redacted]

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	11/03/2020
SITE No	FS0767	SITE NAME	Tarbert South
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20200136

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 16/5/2020. 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:

[REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 15/05/2020

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

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	11/03/2020
SITE No	FS0767	SITE NAME	Tarbert South
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20200136

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.

R25

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria in the previous cycle 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.

On this occasion recommendations were issued in relation to containment and escapes.

- **It is recommended that a documented review of the predator risk assessment and the equipment and farm design is undertaken to meet the requirements of Chapter 4, points 4.26 and 5.8 of the Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture. This should ensure that appropriate equipment is in place to protect the site stock from predator ingress and that appropriate mitigations are in place to deter predator attacks.**
- **It is recommended that a documented review of the procedures in place for the reporting, as required by The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, of an incident that has caused an escape or gave rise to a significant risk of an escape of fish should be undertaken. This should identify and implement improvements to ensure:**
 - **Staff are aware of the reporting requirements of The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009;**
 - **Adequate procedures are in place to ensure immediate reporting of the circumstances that have caused an escape of fish or gave rise to a significant risk of an escape of fish.**
- **It is recommended that a retrospective breach of containment notification should be submitted to Marine Scotland in relation to the incident where a seal was found within a pen. This should be regarded as an incident that would give rise to a significant risk of escape, as required by regulation 31D of the Aquatic Animal Health Regulations 2009, unless a suitable explanation can be provided as to how the predator would exit from the pen without the intervention of site staff and without causing equipment damage. Any failure to undertake this recommendation is likely to result in enforcement action under regulation 39 of the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.**

Please ensure that these points have been addressed by 16/05/2020. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below). The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above points not be taken within the time period stipulated.

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

Signed:

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the Fish Health Inspector.

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/04/2020

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