FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018						
Case No: 2020-0380			Date of visit: 16/09/2020						
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspecto	or:						
Site No: FS1121 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Bight of Bellister, Dury Voe Scottish Sea Farms Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 11.8	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-5						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Weather very calm during site inspection, very good visibility. Fish were shoaling well, deeper in the water. No current issues reported on site. New sea lice procedure, counting 100 fish per cage every week (where possible), also targetting cages for treatment where lice numbers have started to increase, very low level used to trigger treatment. All treatments have given 100% clearance so far. Extremely low trigger for teating, 0.01 adult females per cage.

Fish on site are smaller grade from Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe. Some lumpsuckers on site, but low level and no plans to add more.

No Issues noted on site and fish sampled for VMD appeared in good condition.

No lice skirts installed on site due tides experienced there. SLICE treatment due to begin next week, caligus numbers have increased, but not causing any welfares issue.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0380		Site No:	FS1121				
Date of Visit:		16/09/2020	ס		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Autho  1. Business/site deta  2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	7
Site Details								•
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	2019 S0	2,019						
No Fish	415,165	1,444						
Mean Fish Wt	1.4kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	August 2021		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Oct 2021		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		т пореспол.					07/11/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				07711.22	Y
4. Are movement red								Y
5. Are records comp		•						Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Other (detail	)		
	Incinerated of							
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (	last 4 wks):		23/08 - 195 f site.	for site, 30/08 -	291 for site,	06/09 - 511	for site, 13/09	9 - 198 for
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	n mortality du	ring period of	hooked?					N/A
If yes, detail:	1 mortality du	ring period ci	leckeu:					TV// V
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	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	ality events s	sheet.	Y

,,	T.M.O., Theadard	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records comple	ete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdra	awal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatme	ent(s)? T.M.S., Azasure	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stor	ed appropriately?	Y
Diagonarity Booseds	•	
Biosecurity Records		V
•	s available for inspection?	ľ
	nd frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	'
	nd period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any ed) mortality at the site been included?	
increased (unexplain	ed) mortality at the site been included?	
4 Has the action that	will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	ided and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
	us of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certifica	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	·
ricaliti status, oci unoc	audit ii requirea):	
6 Have the husbandr	y and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	se been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	evailable regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals h		
•	ty procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	,, p	
Results of Surveilla	nce	
1. Has any animal hea	alth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Υ
•	vailable for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant resu		N
•	tailed under recent disease problems).	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Nov 2018 to 16/09/2020 Records checked between:

- 1	11 009, Version 12							155	ueu by. F	ш			
	Case no:	2020-03	380	Site No:		FS1121			Date of vi		16/0	09/2020	16/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:3	0:00	14:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). 	16
	Environmental conditions:	1	Sunny	2	Calm	3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	F	PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
Г	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	1.4000	1.4000	1.4000	1.4000								
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
		٦	у	у	у								
		Ind	Dury	Dury	Dui								
		, ,	Skerry,	۷, ا	ζ,								
		Geri	eri	Skerry,	eri								
ails		ळॅ	κ̈́	Š	κ̈́								
Details	1	rta	rta	rta	rta								
$\overline{}$		Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe	Swarta (	Swarta Voe	Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe								
toc	Stock Origin Facility No		6 6	9	12								
S	I domity NO	4	U	3	12								

O Total Tests assigned O														
	09/2020	09/2020 Additional Sample Information:												
Total Tests assigned 0														
	0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l							

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0380		Site No:	FS1121		nsp:	
Date of Visit	16/09/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	_		40	00	
species	compartment in Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
F	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Earm is protect	Site contacts ed (secure water supply through	0	1-5	6-10		_
farms (holding species	disinfection or l		0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	4		2
uiseases		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	'		4		
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	n 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		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0	]			0
the fales of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			0
		from zone or compartment of		1			
	equivalent state	ı from Category III farm	4				-
	Processing fish	10				0	
			10				
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		* *	0				0
producto		esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	. 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		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				0
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				0
Diatform access to cares	Yes		1 ^	1			
Platform access to cages	No		0				0
	140		2	J			0
					Total		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0380		s	ite No:	FS1121	]	
Sea Lice Inspection (	• •	s in the previous 4 years	s?				Υ
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single y	ear class basis?		Υ
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of lic	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medica	ations (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	ures, and	Y
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or	_	ement agreement or sta	atement relevan	t to the si	ite and CoGP Farm		Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the C	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Ann	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ria for treatment	t in the Co	oGP during the period	d that	Υ
_		<i>monis</i> ) numbers per fish od that records are insp		el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	)/6/19) or	N
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see com	ment.			N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infes	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 belongatus is considered					Υ
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where	applicable)?					Υ
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon t	he lice le	vels recorded?		Υ
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried	d out in cooperation betw	veen participatir	ng farms?	•		Υ
		where fewer population		_		ent for	Υ
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with wiinfestation?	aypoints descril	bing set a	actions to deal with re	cognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	e detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	on						
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the	he current or pr	evious pro	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (De	tail below	<b>'</b> )		Υ
Top net, seal pro XL,	, sinker tube, ADD, I	MML					
If other, detail below:							
3 Havo oscano incido	nte or ovente boon ov	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site	sinco the	o last EUI inspection	)	N
If Yes proceed with que			cirilly of the site	Since un	e last i i il ilispectioni		
4. Have these been rep		•				[	
		orthwith (where they exis					
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il				
8. If gill nets were deplo	oyed was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and	was perm	ission given by Scott	ish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG				,			
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could		
be considered under	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with i	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: 2020-0380	Site No: FS1121	
Date of Visit: 16/09/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
<ol> <li>Is the current FMAg/S available for it</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fat</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the date of</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the date of</li> </ol>	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statement f review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	jement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimifarm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or Y
<ol> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the speci</li> </ol>	ation requirements for stocks held in the area of ies of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cover	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available to arms?	reatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and c farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or r	

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 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	llow and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	o sites covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be keep?	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 of	or statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 30/06/2020	

Site No: FS1121

Case No: 2020-0380

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

Case No:	2020-0380			Date of visit:	16/09/2020			
Site No:	FS1121	ı		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
	1							
Poport Cummen								
Report Summary Case Type	D 4		- nd -					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	22/12/2020							





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

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

**BUSINESS No** FB0125 SITE NO FS1121

INSPECTOR

**DATE OF VISIT** 16/09/2020

SITE NAME Bight of Bellister, Dury Voe

CASE NO 20200380

## 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.

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

Date: 22/12/20

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/</a>

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2020-0381			Date of visit: 17/09/2020						
Time spent on site:	5	Main Inspec	etor:						
Site No: FS0850 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Lippie Geo Scottish Sea Farms Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 11.7	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-11						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  N									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Sealice treatment aboard well boat (Ronja Superior, 22/06/2020) Azasure, whole site treated but only cage 6 had increased mortality attributed to this. Fish were held for 3.5 hours. 13,699 attributed purely to treatment in cage 6. Fish did not react well to treatment, maybe due to stressful sweep and CO2 levels was slightly higher in well reportedly caused by worsening weather conditions. Fish in well appeared blue and stressed on discharge. Mortality was increased in 3 days post treatment then returned to background level. Fish health manager took samples and tested for CMS and HSMI, both results came back as negative.

Cages 1 and 4 treated with Azasure in fully enclosed tarpaulins and cage 5 treated with Azasure on well boat. Lice treatments only undertaken on these cages as adult female lice numbers were not so high on others cages

New thermolicer to arrive at start of new year. It will operate all around Scotland.

Some caligus on site but very few Leps.

Slice treatments synchronised with other site in the area. Bath treatments not synchronised

Treatment intiated on individual cages once the lice count hits average of 0.01 adults females per fish.

Currently no AMA in place as regional manager recently left and there was no body to conduct meetings between the two companies. In the meantime Greig and SSF have written up FMS's and are willingly sharing those between each other. Once new regional manager starts a new AMA will be drawn up. Reportedly, sealice data currently shared with Grieg on a weekly basis.

10-15 metre lice skirts on at moment. Reportedly more effective at reducing lep numbers than caligus.

Remote inspection carried out by on 11/09/2020 via Microsoft Teams

Site inspection and sampling by

No issues noted on site, fish shoaling well and fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Site reported that plankton levels have been lower so far this year and gill health has been good so far. Smolts reportedly came in from Barcaldine ~200g.

SSF have implemented a very low trigger level for sea lice, 0.01, 100 fish counted per cage per week, trigger is 1 adult female for a cage. Treatments are targetted to specific cages that reach the treatment level.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0381		Site No:	FS0850	]			
Date of Visit:		17/09/2020	]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author	isation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site detail	ils summary	checked by s	ite representa	tive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (include	cleaner fisl	n for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	SAL							
Age group	2020 S1							
No Fish	284,000							
Mean Fish Wt	1.2kg							
Next Fallow Date (Sit	e)	Aug 2021		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Jan 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) d	isease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
4. Are movement rec 5. Are records comple 6. Are health certifica Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syste	ete and corre tes for introd ts carried out	ectly entered? uctions (outwood)	vith GB) availa	ible? siness (not usi				Y Y N/A Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	vailable for in	spection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	s disposed of	f <b>?</b>			Incinerated -	Shetland W	aste to Energ	ly
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records c	omplete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (la	ast 4 wks):		2,282 mainly	due to seal pr	edation (1,13°	1 attributed	to seal mortal	ity)
5. Evidence of recent	increased/at	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	mortality dur	ring period ch	necked?					Y
		al comments						
7. Have increased (un	nexplained) r	nortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:		The mortality	attributed to	the well boat to	reatment was	reported to	fish health an	d welfare
8. Have 'mortality eve	nts' been re	oorted to FHI	? If no, enter o	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Decords	FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Records	Treatments and Medicines Records		

Treatments and Medicine	es Records	
1. Recent treatments (see	comment)?	Y
	T.M.S.,	
If yes, detail:	Salmosan	
If other, detail: Azasu	ure	
2. Medicines records availa	able for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete an	nd correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal p	period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored ap	ppropriately?	Y
·		
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records avail	lable for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and free	quency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and per	riod in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) m	nortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will b	be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disea	ase
is detected been included a	and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of	aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification is	•	
6. Have the husbandry and	d biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	e Y
	een covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	ble regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held o	• • •	
8. Have the biosecurity pro	ocedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health si	surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available	ble for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed	I under recent disease problems).	
Record	ls checked between: 23/04/2020 - 11/09/2020	

٠.	ii 039, versiori 13			_				133	ueu by. i				
	Case no:	2020-03	381	Site No:		FS0850			Date of		17/0	09/2020	17/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	g: HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	<b>1</b> 7
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
	Pool Group												
Г	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	1.2000	1.2000	1.2000	1.2000								
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
is		i.e	Φ	ine	ine								
Details			din	aldi	aldi								
		Barcaldine	Barcldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine								
ock	Stock Origin												
St	Facility No	3	4	5	6								

09/2020 Additional Sample Information:												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0											

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0381		Site No:	FS0850		Insp:	
Date of Visit	17/09/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26	0
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	0
							40
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10 10	10
Exposure via water	Number of des	Site contacts					J
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through		<u> </u>			
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III					
		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category v n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters		1	2		1
processors			0	1	2		
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
		from zone or compartment of		1			0
	equivalent state	ı from Category III farm	8				0
		from Category V farm	10				0
Discount of Sala and Sala have		<u> </u>	10	]			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		• •	0				0
·		esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds		·	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites		from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				1
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0
i lationii access to cages	No		2				0
	1.10			J			0
					Total		22
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of iss	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0381		Site No:	FS0850	
2. Is the CoGP Farm M 3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema 4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or 5. Are sea lice count re	lanagement Area (or equivalent) fallo access to a range of licenced in-feed a amectin benzoate) as well as access cumented farm management agreeme	wed synchronously of and bath sea lice med to suitable biological ent or statement releved SSI, CoGP Annex 6	lications (inc and/or mech ant to the si	cluding deltamethrin, nanical control measures, and te and CoGP Farm	N Y Y Y
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	onis) record levels below the suggest (CoGP Annex 6)	ted criteria for treatme	ent in the Co	oGP during the period that	Υ
If yes, have these beer 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infer 10. Have therapeutic tr suggested criteria for the 11. Has any other action 12. Have therapeutic tr 13. Are treatments, who 14. Is there a harvestin 15. Is there a site specific specific transfer in the 15 is there as the specific specific transfer in the 15 is the 15 in the	female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) number a reported to the Fish Health Inspector station at a level which is considered to eatments been administered or other reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to been taken (where applicable)? The eatments or the actions taken had a serie conducted, carried out in cooperary strategy for the site, where fewer positic written lice management procedurels observed on stocks reflect sea lice	rate? If no, FHI see co o cause significant we actions taken when Lasidered to have welfa- significant impact upor tion between participal opulations or part pop- e with waypoints descrip-	omment. elfare proble salmonis l are implicati n the lice levating farms? ulations are cribing set a	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) levels have exceeded the lons? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) levels recorded? held without treatment for actions to deal with recognised	N/A N N/A N/A Y Y
2. Are measures in pla	nced equipment damage due to preda ce to mitigate against the predation ex cel nets, tensioned nets, sea blind	perienced on site? ([	Detail below	)	N Y urface, con
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep 5. Have these been rep	nts or events been experienced on or estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 ported to Scottish Ministers? ported to local DSFB forthwith (where ported to the SSPO and local fisheries	they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	N
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If yes g	ive detail			
Ministers? (Legal, CoG 9. What action was tak be considered unde	oyed was this action agreed with local P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) en to prevent and minimise the risk of r satisfactory measures of the Act) d as satisfactory with regards to contain	further escapes? (No	ot covered in	n code but could	Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0381	Site No: FS0850	
Date of Visit: 17/09/2020	0 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
<ol> <li>Has a current farm management agr</li> <li>Is the current FMAg/S available for in</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fance</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the date on</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the date on</li> </ol>	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or stater of review?	Y Y Y Y
<b>Arrangements for Fish Health Manag</b> 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	gement oum health standards for the stocks to be intr	oduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the are lies of fish which may be stocked into the are imum stocking density of any pen on any farr	ea or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any farm?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	of Sea Lice ments for the sharing of data on sea lice num	nbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of availabl arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls an farms?	d cleaner fish are to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on farm	ms within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circularea or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced o	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran or individual farms?	ngements for the movement of live fish on an	nd off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of i	issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harves	st practices on farms in the area or i	ndividual farms?	Y
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which	h the area or individual farm will be f	allow and the earliest	Y
date when a farm or area may be restocked?  22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or magreement or statement?	ore year classes may be stocked on	to sites covered by the	Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstoo covered by the agreement or statement?	ck or potential broodstock are to be	kept on any site	Υ
Point of Compliance for Farm Management A 24. Does the farm management agreement incluparties to the agreement?		come, or cease to be,	N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operate 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the F		or statement?	Y

Site No: FS0850

Case No: 2020-0381

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2020-0381			Date of visit	17/09/2020	1		
Site No:	FS0850			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	22/12/2020							





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

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 17/09/2020

 Site No
 FS0850
 Site Name
 Lippie Geo

 Inspectors
 Case No
 20200381

#### 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.

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

Date: 22/12/20

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/</a>

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2020-0382			Date of visit: 17/09/2020				
Time spent on site:	Hrs	Main Inspect	or:				
Site No: FS0749 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Holms Geo Scottish Sea Farms Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 11.8	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-11				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

#### **Additional Case Information:**

When fish were transferred from Teisti Geo to Holms Geo in August 11th 2020, a fire occurred on the well boat. The fire cut all power to the well boat and the wells could not be oxygenated. The fish could not be removed from the wells. This caused the death of 29,000 fish.

In the last cycle of fish 28,000 (19.08%) fish died in July 30th 2018. A crash in oxygen levels over night (reportedly due to a plankton die off) caused the death of 6,500 fish. The fish were immunocompromised due to CMS. Fish killed as a result of CMS numbered 21,500 fish.

No sea lice treatments yet this cycle.

Caligus numbers on the way up, so SLICE has been ordered for the site and they will be treating using SLICE on the week of the physical inspection.

Caligus numbers elevated, but Lep numbers still very low.

Treatment intiated on individual cages once the lice count hits average of 0.01 adults females per fish. Bath treatments not synchronised between sites.

Currently no AMA in place as regional manager recently left and there was no body to conduct meetings between the two companies. In the meantime Greig and SSF have written up FMS's and are willingly sharing those between each other. Once new regional manager starts a new AMA will be drawn up. Reportedly, sealice data currently shared with Grieg on a weekly basis.

Remote inspection carried out by on 11/09/2020 via Microsoft Teams

Site inspection and sampling by

No issues noted on site, sea lice skirts not installed on site at present, may put these on, but this is still to be decided. Sea lice extremely low, with an extremely low trigger for treatment. 100 fish counted per cage per week and trigger is 0.01 adult female, treatments are being targeted to specific cages that reach the treatment level.

Hoping to get another site manager in to share management of the sites, after the promotion of previous site manager. weather changeable during the inspection.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0382		Site No:	FS0749				
Date of Visit:		17/09/2020	]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	tive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		8	1 ′		5	No facilitie	s inspected	8
Species	SAL							
Age group	20 S1							
No Fish	151,765							
Mean Fish Wt	1.2kg							
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	Aug 2021		Next Input Da	te (Site)	Jan 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
1. Movement records 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records comp 6. Are health certificator  Transport Records 1. Are any movement figes, is there a system.	ction: lete and corre cords availabl lete and corre ates for introd	ectly entered? e for dead fis ectly entered? fuctions (outw	h and waste? vith GB) availa	ible? siness (not usi	_		23/04/2018	Y Y Y Y
Mortality Records								V
Mortality records a		•			Incinorated	Chatland \//	acta ta Energ	1
2. How are mortalitie If other detail:	es disposed o	!			Incinerated -	Snelland vv	aste to Energ	У
	amplete and	correctly ent	arad?					V
3. Mortality records of		correctly ente		tteibund to box	allina and tuan			'
<ul> <li>4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 739 mainly attribued to handling and transport</li> <li>5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?</li> </ul>							N	
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		roscon:				IN
ii yes, iacility nos/no	mortality per	racility/110 Sto	ck per racility/	reason.				
6. Any other peaks ir	n mortality du	ring period of	ecked?					V
If yes, detail:	See addition		ieckeu!					1
7. Have increased (u			en reported to	vet or EUI2				V
If yes, detail action:	inexplained) i		•	nvesdtigation a	fter low exuse	n orach in l	act stock of fir	sh CMS
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been ro						ast Stock of IIs	SII. CIVIO
o. Have intortainty ev	CHIS DECITIE	ooned to i fil	: if no, enter (	uctails off filorit	anty events si	CCI.		'

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
T.M.S., SLICE	
If yes, detail: Slice	
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)?	<u> </u>
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
o. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<u> </u>
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ÿ
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
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).	
100/04/0000 44/00/0000	
Records checked between: 23/04/2020 - 11/09/2020	

	al 059, version 15							133	ueu by. F	111			
	Case no:	2020-03	382	Site No:		FS0749			Date of vi Sampling		17/0	9/2020	17/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:3	0:00	15:0	0:00	l	Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	19
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5	$\blacksquare$		
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4		$\overline{}$				$\overline{}$		
	Pool Group		_										
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL		$\overline{}$				$\neg$		
	Average weight	1.2000			1.2000								
	Sex										$\neg$		
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
Stock Details	Stock Origin	Teisti Geo	Teisti Geo	7 Teisti Geo	Teisti Geo								
S	Facility No	1	2	9	10								

O Total Tests assigned O		······································													
	ງ9/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
Total Tests assigned   Total Tests assigned															
	0	Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue:	12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0382		Site No:	FS0749		Insp:	
Date of Visit	17/09/2020		No of m		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	
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
Movements off			I 0			10	10
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	10
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts	_				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
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		
	namio apotroan	Tot walling a data execution					
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
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	8					
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ī			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of 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	]			
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				1
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2	]			
					Total		22
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0382	Site No:	-S0749
_	problems in the previous 4 years? rea (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year	
	ge of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (inclu ate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mecha	
4. Is there a signed documented farm Management Area (or equivalent)?	management agreement or statement relevant to the site	and CoGP Farm
	e for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) equired standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Leg	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record le records are inspected? (CoGP Annex	evels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGx 6)	SP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice If yes, have these been reported to th 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a leve 10. Have therapeutic treatments been	e ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or able Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. el which is considered to cause significant welfare problem administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levere C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication	N/A Ns? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N N/A N/A N/A
<ul><li>13. Are treatments, where conducted,</li><li>14. Is there a harvesting strategy for t</li><li>15. Is there a site specific written lice</li></ul>	(where applicable)? e actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice leve , carried out in cooperation between participating farms? the site, where fewer populations or part populations are h management procedure with waypoints describing set act n stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail rea	eld without treatment for Y tions to deal with recognised Y
2. Are measures in place to mitigate a	nt damage due to predators in the current or previous prod against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) sioned nets, sea blinds on dead sock, 1m long section	Y
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If 4. Have these been reported to Scotti 5. Have these been reported to local I	ish Ministers?  DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.1  SPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	7)
	action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permise	sion given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP - 4.4.38, 5.4	<b>1</b> .18)	
be considered under satisfactory		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactor	ry with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason	Y Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0382	Site No: FS0749	
Date of Visit: 17/09/2020	0 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
<ul><li>2. Has a current farm management ag</li><li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i</li><li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva</li><li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa</li></ul>	int farm management area? irm site(s) to which it applies? if commencement of the agreement or state	red? Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage. 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	gement num health standards for the stocks to be into	roduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the are sies of fish which may be stocked into the are imum stocking density of any pen on any far	ea or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of angarm?	y dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arranger	of Sea Lice ments for the sharing of data on sea lice nun	nbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms co	vered by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	uirements for the sensitivity testing of availab arms?	le treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls ar farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on far	ms within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu area or farm?	ımstances when live fish may be introduced	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar or individual farms?	ngements for the movement of live fish on ar	nd off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of is	ssue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harves	st practices on farms in the area or i	ndividual farms?	Υ
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which	h the area or individual farm will be f	allow and the earliest	Υ
date when a farm or area may be restocked?  22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or magreement or statement?	ore year classes may be stocked on	to sites covered by the	Υ
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstocovered by the agreement or statement?	ck or potential broodstock are to be	kept on any site	Υ
Point of Compliance for Farm Management A 24. Does the farm management agreement incl parties to the agreement?		come, or cease to be,	N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operate 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the F		or statement?	Υ

Site No: FS0749

Case No: 2020-0382

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

		_				_		
Case No:	2020-0382			Date of visit:	17/09/2020			
Site No:	EC0740			la an a atam				
Site No.	FS0749			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
					_			
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	22/12/2020							





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

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 17/09/2020

 Site No
 FS0749
 Site Name
 Holms Geo

 Inspectors
 Case No
 20200382

#### 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.

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

Date: 22/12/20

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/</a>