FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0292			Date of visit: 14/08/2018
Time spent on site:	2 hrs	Main Insp	ector: PMM
Site No: FS0253 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Spelve (B) Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REP	2 REG 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 13.2	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-39
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~ .	N If yes, see additional i	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Accompanied vet from APHA following report from third party of suspected welfare issue on site.

AMX treatment had been scheduled on site and was completed on 14/08. A follow up SLICE treatment has also begun. ~15 poor doing fish observed in cage 7 with eye damage. Site staff were actively removing these fish from the population, SSF vet, in attendance also discussed this with site staff at time of inspection.

Caligus numbers were very low week 26 and began to increase from week 28. There was a sharp increase week 31 where numbers more than doubled and a significant increase week 32, prior to treatment, where numbers more than tripled. The numbers increased much quicker than on other sites on Mull.

A thermolicer treatment was conducted wk11, all weeks, except wk 19, have been below the CoGP suggested criteria for treatment for L.salmonis.

Daily plankton samples are conducted during "high risk" periods. Outwith this weekly plankton samples conducted. Site has had some issues with gill imflammation, however, mortality rates have been low.

Site installed sea lice shields (skirts) following the thermolicer treatment in wk11, with treated fish being returned to cages with skirts. All stocked cages on site now have lice skirts fitted.

Fish were also observed on camera system and appeared to be shoaling well.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issı	ued by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0292		Site No:	FS0253				
Date of Visit:		14/08/201	18		Inspector(s):	: PMM		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	ative?			Y Y	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	ocked	8	No facilities	s inspected	8
	SAL	LUM	WRA					
Age group	2017 S1	MIXED	MIXED					
No Fish	210,000	~20,000	~2,000					
Mean Fish Wt	3.1kg	MIXED	MIXED					
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	October 20	)18	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Spring 201	19	
					1			
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last v	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
<b>Movement Records</b>	5							
1. Movement records	s available fo	or inspection	?					Y
2. Date of last inspec	ction:						18/04/2018	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement red				?				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification	ates for intro	ductions (out	with GB) avail	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		• •		,	•			Y
If yes, is there a syst	em in place	for maintena	nce of transpo	ortation records?	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed o	of?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of		correctly er						Y
4. Recent mortality (I	•			5%, WK 30 0.12	%, WK 31 0.1	18%, WK 32	0.16%	
5. Evidence of recen		•						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no s	tock per facility	y/reason:				
C. Any other pecks is	a mortality du	ring period	ah aakad?					N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	1 mortality do	ining period o	checkeu?					IN
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities b	peen reported t	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	подраштос,	III O T.GO	00.1.10	0 101 01 1 1 1				
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?
If yes, detail:  Alphamax, T.M.S.
If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
Biosecurity records available for inspection?
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?
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?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?
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.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?
If no, detail:
Results of Surveillance
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
3. Any significant results?
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).
Records checked between: 18/04/18 to 15/08/18

				-			
Case No:	2018-0292		Si	te No:	FS0253		
-	Seawater Sites Only)						
•	nced sea lice problems in	•					Υ
2. Is the CoGP Farm N	Management Area (or equiv	valent) fallowed syn	chronously on a	single ye	ear class basis?		Υ
azamethiphos and emcan these be deployed	access to a range of licence amectin benzoate) as well in a reasonable period of cumented farm manageme	I as access to suitable time?	ole biological and	d/or mech	nanical control mea	sures, and	Y
•			OD 4 0)				V
	ecords available for inspec						Y
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required sta	ndard specified in th	ne SSI and the C	oGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP An	nex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below? (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criter	ria for treatment	in the Co	GP during the peri	od that	N
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice ( <i>L. salmor</i> ?	nis) numbers per fisl	h been at a level	l of 3 or a	bove during the pe	riod that	Υ
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Heal	Ith Inspectorate? If r	no, FHI see com	ment.			Υ
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infe	station at a level which is o	considered to cause	significant welfa	are proble	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81	, 5.3.50)	N
	reatments been administer reatment or where <i>C. elon</i>						Υ
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where appl	licable)?					N/A
•	reatments or the actions ta	•	nt impact upon th	ne lice lev	els recorded?		Y
•	nere conducted, carried out	_					Y
	ng strategy for the site, who	•	•	_	held without treatm	nent for	Y
	cific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infe		aypoints describ	oing set a	ctions to deal with	recognised	Υ
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in	relation to sea lice l	evel and sea lice	e count da	ata? If no please de	etail	Υ
Containment Inchest	ion						
Containment Inspect  1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage o	due to predators in t	he current or nre	evious pro	oduction cycles?		
•	ice to mitigate against the	•	•	•	-		
z. Are measures in pla	to miligate against the	predation expension	ed on site: (Det	all below)			
lf athan alata!! bala							
If other, detail below							
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been experie	enced on or in the vi	icinity of the site	since the	last FHI inspection	n?	N
•	•		icinity of the site	Sirice trie	riast i i ii iiispectioi		
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Ministers	•					
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forth	with (where they exis	st)? (CoGP - 4.	4.37, 5.4.	.17)		
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and lo	cal fisheries trusts for	orthwith (where t	they exist	)? (CoGP – 4.4.37,	, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give deta	il				
0.14 =:11 = 1		- d ide J	- inter-			44'-b	
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Co0	oyed was this action agree	ed with local wild fish	interests and w	vas permi	ssion given by Sco	outisn	
	ken to prevent and minimis	se the risk of further	escapes? (Not c	covered in	code but could		
	er satisfactory measures			.5.5.50	. Jour Juli Juli		
	ed as satisfactory with rega	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	If no please do	tail reaso	nn(s)		
To. 13 the site mapetie	a as satisfactory with rega	and to containinent?	ii iio, picase de	tan reaso	(5)		

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Site No: FS0253 Inspector: PMM  Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification  Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp  Inspector: PMM  Date of Notification  Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp  Inspector: PMM  Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp  Inspector: PMM  Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp  Inspector: PMM  Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp  Inspector: PMM  In	Case No:	2018-0292	]		Date of visit:	14/08/2018			
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification	Site No:	FS0253	Inspector: PMM						
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp    Database Insp   Phone   Insp   Writing   Insp   2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	Reculte Summary	Freq							
	results Guillilary	1104.	Database	Insp				Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
						·	Ŭ		2 1105
		_							ļ
		+							-
									<del> </del>
Report Summary	Report Summary				_				
Case Type Date Insp 2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	Case Type REG, REP, SLI	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
REG, REP, SLI 06/02/2019 PMM DJT	REG, REP, SLI	06/02/2019	PMM	DJT	_				
					_				
					_				
					-				
					-				
					-				
		+	-						
		+		1					
		+	<del>                                     </del>						





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 NoFB0125Date of Visit15/08/2018Site NoFS0253Site NameLoch Spelve (B)InspectorPaul McKayCase No20180292

## **Inspection of Site**

The FHI accompanied a veterinary officer from the Animal and Plant Health Agency following a report of a suspected welfare issue by a third party.

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

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). There was a sharp increase in *Caligus elongatus* numbers during week 31 where numbers more than doubled and a significant increase in *Caligus elongatus* numbers during week 32, prior to conducting a therapeutic treatment, where numbers more than tripled. The treatment was successful in reducing all sea lice numbers on site.

A separate report will be issued by the Animal and Plant Health Agency.

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



Signed:

Date: 06/02/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0341			Date of visit: 14/08/2018
Time spent on site:	2 hrs	Main Ins	spector: PMM
Site No: FS0209 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Scallastle Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REP	2 REG 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 13.1	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-35
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~ .	N If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail ı	reason below:	

Accompanied APHA Vet following a report from a third party of a suspected welfare issue on site During weekly monitoring of sea lice Caligus numbers began to increase week 29 but were still low, they increased again during wk 30 sea lice count at which point a treatment was planned. An AMX treatment was conducted during wk 32. Fish showed a good feeding response and very few lice visible on fish coming up for feed. No dead or moribund fish observed at time of inspection. Fish behaviour was also monitored using the onsite camera system, where they appeared to be shoaling well. No salmon observed with sea lice grazing damage.

Cleaner fish are being removed from cages, at site, during harvest and split to the remaining stocked cages. Site stocked with both lumpsuckers and wrasse of mixed size.

FHI 059, Version 11			Iss	ued by: FH	I		Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0341		Site No:	FS	0209			
Date of Visit:		14/08/20	18		Inspector(s	s): PMM		]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		y site represen	tative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		16	Facilities st	tocked	9	No facilitie	es inspected	16
Species	SAL	LUM	WRA					
Age group	2017 S1	Mixed	Mixed					
No Fish	127,000	~1,000	~3,000					
Mean Fish Wt	6kg	Mixed	Mixed					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Sept/Oct 2	2018	Next Inp	ut Date (Site)	2019 S1		
				_	NI a	,		N.
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease prob	olems?			N Any escap	es (since last	visit)?	N
•								
Movement Records								
1. Movement record		or inspectior	า?					Y
2. Date of last inspec			10				15/05/2018	
3. Are records comp		•		•				Y
4. Are movement red				9?				Y
5. Are records comp				:1-1-0				Y N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for intro	ductions (or	itwith GB) ava	ilable?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemer	nts carried o	ut by (or on	behalf) of the b	ousiness (n	ot using a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst		• '	•	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Y
Mortality Records	·		·					
Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed	of?			Incinerated	l - on site		
If other detail:			. 10					
3. Mortality records of	complete an	d correctly e		0.0=0(.11.6		2 2 4 2 4 2 4 2 4 2		Υ
WK 32 - S-0.27%, N-0.22%, WK 30 - S-0.1% N-0.28%, WK29 S-0.18%, N- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):  0.14% - Attributed to production.								
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/	atypical mor		<u>'</u>				N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		ty/reason:				
C. Amazontha a a a a a a a	n ma a ut = 11t		ah a aka -10					
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality d	uring period	спескеа?					N
7. Have increased (u	Inexplained)	mortalities	heen reported	to yet or El	412			N/A
If yes, detail action:	aricapianieu)	mortanties	been reported	TO VEL OF IT				TW//\
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been r	eported to F	HI? If no, add	MRT case	and enter on mo	rtality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?
If yes, detail:  Alphamax, T.M.S.
If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
Biosecurity records available for inspection?
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?
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?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?
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.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?
If no, detail:
Results of Surveillance
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
3. Any significant results?
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).
Records checked between: 15/05/18 to 15/08/18

Case No:	2018-0341		S	Site No:	FS0209		
Sea Lice Inspection (S	**		s?				N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	•			a single ve	ear class basis?		Y
3. Does the site have ac azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	ccess to a range of lic mectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suital	sea lice medic	ations (inc	luding deltamethrin,	ures, and	Y
4. Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e	umented farm manag		atement relevar	nt to the sit	te and CoGP Farm		Υ
5. Are sea lice count red	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	oGP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the	ne SSI and the	CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested crite	ria for treatmen	t in the Co	GP during the period	that	N
8. Have average adult for records are inspected?	emale sea lice (L. sali	monis) numbers per fis	h been at a leve	el of 3 or a	bove during the perio	od that	N
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If r	no, FHI see con	nment.			N/A
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welf	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)	N
10. Have therapeutic tre suggested criteria for tre							Υ
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?					N/A
12. Have therapeutic tre			nt impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?		Υ
13. Are treatments, whe		_					Υ
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?		·	•	~		nt for	Y
15. Is there a site specific scenarios during the es			aypoints descri	ibing set a	ctions to deal with red	cognised	Υ
16. Does the stock on s reasons.	ite appear satisfactory	y in relation to sea lice I	level and sea lid	ce count da	ata? If no please deta	ail	Υ
Containment Inspection	on						
Has the site experien		ge due to predators in t	the current or pr	revious pro	oduction cycles?		
2. Are measures in plac	e to mitigate against t	the predation experienc	ced on site? (De	etail below)			
If other, detail below:							
<ol><li>Have escape incider</li></ol>	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the v	ricinity of the site	e since the	last FHI inspection?		N
If Yes proceed with que	·	•				,	
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	sters?					
5. Have these been rep	orted to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exi	ist)? (CoGP - 4	1.4.37, 5.4.	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts f	orthwith (where	they exist	)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	ail				
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoGl		greed with local wild fisl	h interests and	was permi	ssion given by Scotti	sh	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGi 9. What action was take	•	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	code but could		
be considered under							
10. Is the site inspected	•	•	? If no, please d	letail reaso	on(s)		

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0341	Date of visit: 14/08/2018						
Site No:	FS0209	Inspector: PMM						
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
, and the second second		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp		Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
Case Type REG, REP, SLI	06/02/2019	PMM	DJT					
- , , -								





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 NoFB0125Date of Visit15/08/2018Site NoFS0209Site NameScallastleInspectorPaul McKayCase No20180341

## **Inspection of Site**

The FHI accompanied a veterinary officer from the Animal and Plant Health Agency following a report of a suspected welfare issue by a third party.

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

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). Levels of *Caligus elongatus* had increased during week 30. At this point a therapeutic treatment was planned and conducted during week 32, reducing the *Caligus elongatus* numbers on site.

A separate report will be issued by the Animal and Plant Health Agency.

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



Signed: Date: 06/02/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 11	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0407			Date of visit: 28/08/2018
Time spent on site:	3.5 hrs	Main Inspect	or: PMM
Site No: FS0948	Site Name:	Score Holms	
Business No: FB0440	Business Name:	Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.5	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA: S-11
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•		rmation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N III yes, see additional iiilo	imation/cilinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit detail rea	ison below:	

All cages fitted with sea lice skirts (5m) and aeriation systems. Daily water quality checks conducted with samples taken to main office in Lerwick for processing. Two Inputs of fish on site 2017 S0 - from Taing of Railsborough and 2018 S1 from Kames - Loch Avich and Tralaig.

All cages fitted with predator nets, this is third cycle that Score Holms has had predator nets. MML has not been required in the area since installation of predator nets.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared to be in good condition and healthy. Sea lice numbers have been very low so far this cycle.

During a transfer of fish from Taing of Railsborough using the Martin Saele. Both wells contained stock, a separate pipe was attached to each well and allows the fish to be unloaded from either well. Following discharge in to one cage the discharge pipe was removed and placed on the deck of the wellboat. The wellboat then proceeded to the next cage, the discharge pipe from the opposite well was placed in the cage and the wellboat began to discharge, however, due to human error the wellboat crew began to pump fish from the wrong well which resulted in loss of fish. Following this incident the wellboat has amended its procedures and now both discharge pipes are placed in a cage for discharging to eliminate the risk of a reoccurance.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0407		Site No:	FS0948	3			
Date of Visit:		28/08/2018	3		Inspector(s):	PMM		]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	9	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	SAL	SAL	LUM					
Age group	2017 S0	2018 S1	2017					
No Fish	228,000	175,000	~30,000					
Mean Fish Wt	2.66kg	1.5kg	mixed					
Next Fallow Date (S	site)	Sept 2019		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	2020 S1 ir	nput	
					7			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	N Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	Υ
If yes, detail:	MSe180118	3SAL1						
Movement Records								
1. Movement record	ls available fo	or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe-							09/11/2016	
3. Are records comp								N
4. Are movement re				?				Y
5. Are records comp		•		chlo?				N/A
6. Are health certific		ductions (outv	VIII GD) avalla	able?				INA
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a systematical syste		• `	,	•	,			Y
	10111 111   1.0.0	ioi mai	00 01 1131110	Tiduori 1555.				
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	of?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	complete and	d correctly ent	_					Y
4. Recent mortality (	(last 4 wks):			23 for site, 06/08 ttributed to faile		ite, 13/08 -	553 for site, 2	0/08 - 494
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical morta	•					N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		y/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	- 1 - 3 1V	ta Pita a la a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · ·				NI/A
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reportea to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	rents' heen re	enorted to FH	12 If no ladd N	ART case and	enter on morts	ality events	sheet	N/A
O. Have mortality ov	GIIIO DECITIO	sponed to 1 11	/! II IIO, aud iv	IN I Case and	enter on more	ality Everito	Silect.	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S., SLICE	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	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	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	$\vee$
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	ı
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).	

Records checked between: Nov 2016 to Aug 2018

11 059, Version 11							155	sueu by.	ГП			
Case no:	2018-04	107	Site No:		FS0948					28/0	08/2018	28/0
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	00:00	14:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:	PMM		VMD No	р.	13
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
dd Fish/Pools - click												
	1	2	3									
	•	_										
	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Sex			J									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Origin Facility No	Taing of Railsborough	Taing of Railsborough	Taing of Railsborough									
Facility No	4	5	10									
	Case no:  Priority samples:  Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:  Summary samples  dd 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  dd Fish/Pools - click  Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 2.2kg Sex Water Type SW	Case no:  Priority samples:  VI  Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:  Summary samples  HIST  dd Fish/Pools - click  Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 2 Pool Group Species SAL SAL Average weight 2.2kg 2.2kg Sex  Water Type SW SW	Case no:  Priority samples:  VI BA  Time sampling 14:00:00 14:3 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2  Summary samples HIST BA  Add Fish/Pools - click  Pool/Fish No BA  Fish nos 1 2 3 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL SAL Average weight 2.2kg 2.2kg 1.5kg Sex Water Type SW SW SW  VI BA  BA  HIST BA  White No:  Pool Group Species SAL	Case no:  Priority samples:  VI BA  Time sampling 14:00:00 14:30:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2  Summary samples HIST BA  Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 2 3 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL SAL Average weight 2.2kg 2.2kg 1.5kg Sex Water Type SW SW SW	Case no:         2018-0407         Site No:         FS0948           Priority samples:         VI         BA         PA           Time sampling starts/ends:         14:00:00         14:30:00         3           Environmental conditions:         1 Indoors         2         3           Summary samples         HIST         BA         MG           dd Fish/Pools - click         BA         MG           Pool/Fish No         1         2         3           Pool Group         2         3         3           Species         SAL         SAL         SAL           Average weight         2.2kg         2.2kg         1.5kg           Sex         Water Type         SW         SW	Case no:    2018-0407   Site No:   FS0948	Case no:    2018-0407   Site No:   FS0948	Case no:    2018-0407   Site No:   FS0948   Date of Samplir	Case no:         2018-0407         Site No:         FS0948         Date of visit/ Sampling:           Priority samples:         VI         BA         PA         MG         HI           Time sampling starts/ends:         14:00:00         14:30:00         Inspector:         PMM           Environmental conditions:         1 Indoors         2         3         4         5           Summary samples         HIST         BA         MG         VI         PA           dd Fish/Pools - click         Pool/Fish No         Pool Fish nos         1         2         3         9           Pool Group         Species         SAL         SAL         SAL         SAL           Average weight         2.2kg         2.2kg         1.5kg         SW         SW           Water Type         SW         SW         SW         SW         SW	Case no:         2018-0407         Site No:         FS0948         Date of visit/ Sampling:         28// Sampling:           Priority samples:         VI         BA         PA         MG         HI           Time sampling starts/ends:         14:00:00         14:30:00         Inspector:         PMM         VMD Not starts/ends:           Environmental conditions:         1 Indoors         2         3         4         5           Summary samples         HIST         BA         MG         VI         PA           dd Fish/Pools - click           Pool/Fish No         1         2         3         Pool Group         Pool Group <td< td=""><td>  Case no:   2018-0407   Site No:   FS0948   Date of visit/   Sampling:   Priority samples:   VI</td></td<>	Case no:   2018-0407   Site No:   FS0948   Date of visit/   Sampling:   Priority samples:   VI

000,		100000 37.1111										
08/2018	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:								
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l						
												•

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0407		Site No:	FS0948		Insp:	PMM
Date of Visit	28/08/2018		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 compartment including third country			9	18	26	0
	Number of supp		0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	10
Movements on	Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contact:	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		4
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing owr	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
		from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				0
		from Category III farm	8	-			0
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				1
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	]			0
	No		2	1			0
					<b>Total</b> Rank		29 HIGH

Case No:	2018-0407	Sit	te No: FS0948	]			
Sea Lice Inspection (	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the previous	4 vears?		Υ			
	Aanagement Area (or equivalent) fallo		single year class basis?	Y			
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licenced in-feed a amectin benzoate) as well as access the access t	nd bath sea lice medicat	tions (including deltamethrin				
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or	cumented farm management agreeme equivalent)?	nt or statement relevant	to the site and CoGP Farm	Υ			
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection? (Legal	SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		Υ			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard specif	ied in the SSI and the C	oGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Anr	nex 6) Y			
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the suggest? (CoGP Annex 6)	ed criteria for treatment	in the CoGP during the perio	od that N			
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that records are inspected?							
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish Health Inspector	ate? If no, FHI see comr	ment.	Y			
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is considered to	o cause significant welfa	re problems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	, 5.3.50) N			
•	reatments been administered or other reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is con						
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable)?			Y			
•	reatments or the actions taken had a s	ignificant impact upon th	ne lice levels recorded?	Υ			
·				Υ			
<ul><li>13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?</li><li>14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?</li></ul>							
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. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in relation to s	ea lice level and sea lice	count data? If no please de	tail Y			
Containment Inspecti	ion						
	nced equipment damage due to preda	tors in the current or pre	vious production cycles?	Υ			
•	ce to mitigate against the predation ex	•		Y			
	ts (below), Tensioned Nets, Top Ne		,				
If other, detail below:	· , ,						
ii otilor, dotaii bolow.							
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been experienced on or	in the vicinity of the site	since the last FHI inspection	)? Y			
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10						
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Ministers?			Υ			
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where t	they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4	4.37, 5.4.17)	N/A			
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisheries	trusts forthwith (where t	hey exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37,	5.4.17) Y			
7. Were methods (if an	ny) used to recover escapees? If yes g	ive detail		N			
8. If gill note were deal	oved was this action agreed with lead	wild fish interests and w	rae normiceion divon hy Cost	tich			
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed with local GP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	wiid lish lineresis and W	as permission given by Scot	N/A			
	ken to prevent and minimise the risk of	further escapes? (Not co	overed in code but could	14/71			
	r satisfactory measures of the Act)		poat procedures, see addition	nal information			
	d as satisfactory with regards to contain			Υ			

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0407	Site No: FS0948	
Date of Visit: 28/08/2018	Inspector: PMM	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located If N, no further questions require comp	_	Y
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
<ul><li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in</li><li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant</li><li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fair</li></ul>	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statemer	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
farm?  9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxis individual farm?  12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual farm.  Arrangements for The Management		r farm? Y r farm? Y the area or the Y ad fish from any
<ul><li>14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availated of statement?</li><li>15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual farms.</li><li>16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulated on farms in the area or individual.</li></ul>	ability and the use of medicines on farms covered irements for the sensitivity testing of available trains?  mstances under which biological controls and cl	reatments for sea  Y  Ideaner fish are to be
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or regements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	le harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be resto	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow cked?	and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	es covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept of the state of the	on any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreer parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	d operated in accordance with the agreement or st	ratement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? Feb-18	

Case No:	2018-0407			Date of visit:	28/08/2018				
Site No:	FS0948	]		Inspector:	PMM	]			
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
Nesults Summary	1 104.	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
								2 1100	
		-			-				
								1	
D 0	_								
Report Summary	_		nd						
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	18/01/2019	РММ	JET						
				4					
	1								





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0440Date of Visit28/08/2018Site NoFS0948Site NameScore HolmsInspectorPaul McKayCase No20180407

## 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 found to be inadequately 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.

R25

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

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

The following point was raised with the site representative during the inspection:

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

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

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: 18/01/2019

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0447			Date of visit: 10/09/2018
Time spent on site:	30 mins	Main Inspec	etor:
Site No: SS0543	Site Name:	c.o Creagan Farm	
Business No: SB0354	Business Name:	Creagan Oysters	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): N/A	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	N If yes, see additional inf	ormation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		ormation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional inf	ormation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostio samples taken.		N.	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Accompanied by \_\_\_\_\_. Site observed to be fallow. Evidence of old trestles on site. A collection of oyster bags was located close to the site location. Evidence would suggest the site has not been used for some time. Site operator unable to accompany inspector during visit. Email communications made to ascertain appropriate information. Confirmed no activity since last inspection. Surveillance frequency not completed as site has been fallow for some time. Agreed by email with site operator to make the site inactive.

FHI 059, Version 11	Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0447	Site No:	SS0543				
Date of Visit:	10/09/2018		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary cho 2. Changes made to details?		tive?			N N/A	}
Site Details		_		_		
Total No facilities 0	Facilities stoo	ked	0	No facilitie	s inspected	All
Species Site fallow						
Age group						
No Fish						
Mean Fish Wt						
Next Fallow Date (Site)		Next Input Dat	te (Site)	Site to be	made inactive	•
_						
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problem	is?	N/A	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:						
Movement Records						
Movement records available for in	snection?					N
Date of last inspection:	opeonorr.				14/07/2014	
Are records complete and correctly	ly entered?				14/01/2014	N/A
Are movement records available f	•					N/A
5. Are records complete and correct						N/A
6. Are health certificates for introduc	-	ble?				N/A
Transport Records						
1. Are any movements carried out by	y (or on behalf) of the bus	siness (not usir	ng a STB)?			
If yes, is there a system in place for	maintenance of transport	tation records?	•			
Mortality Records						
1. Mortality records available for insp	pection?					N/A
2. How are mortalities disposed of?						
If other detail:						
3. Mortality records complete and co	prrectly entered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):						
5. Evidence of recent increased/atyp	oical mortalities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per fac		reason:				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during	g period checked?					N/A
If yes, detail:						
7. Have increased (unexplained) mo	rtalities been reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:						
8 Have 'mortality events' been report	rted to FHI? If no, add MI	RT case and el	nter on morta	lity events s	heet	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?  If yes, detail:  If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspection?		
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality remov		
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been in	•	nary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been in	nciuded :	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that is detected been included and how and when that v		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals bein health status, certification if required)?	ng stocked on the farm site been o	covered (equal or higher Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures im transmission of disease been covered (movement o	•	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measure aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately If no, detail:	y implemented on site?	N/A
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance been carried of	out by, or on behalf of, the busines	ss? N/A

Last inspection date 14/07/14 to 10/09/18

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:	2018-0447			Date of visit:	10/09/2018			
Site No:	SS0543			Inspector:		1		
	333310	mapeotor.						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summary	_			1				
	Dete	la a a	and .					
Case Type	Date 08/44/2040	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI	08/11/2018 20/02/2019							
Case completion	20/02/2019							
			ļ					
	-	-	-					





Creagan Oysters Achalic Farm Lerags, Oban Argyll

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0354
SITE NO SS0543
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 10/09/2018
SITE NAME Creagan Farm 20180447

## Case completion report

Issues were raised in relation to the above case, with a requirement for records unavailable for inspection to be submitted by 8 December 2018. The required records have now been provided to Marine Scotland.

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:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 20/02/19

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017			
Case No: 2018-0449	]		Date of visit: 11/09/2018			
Time spent on site:	3 hours	Main In	spector:			
Site No: FS0869	Site Name:	Marine Farming Unit				
Business No: FB0439	Business Name:	FAI Aquaculture Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 13.9	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-32			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Clinical signs of disease obser	ved?		al information/clinical score sheet.			
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additiona	al information/clinical score sheet.			
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

**Additional Case Information:** 

FHI 059, Version 11	I		İssı	ued by: FHI		Date of is	ssue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0449	ə	Site No:	FS086	ð9		
Date of Visit:		11/09/2018	8		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	tails summar		site representa	ative?		Y N	3
Site Details							
Total No facilities		96 SAL	Facilities sto		16 WBASSE	No facilities inspecte	ed All areas
Species	SAL 18 s1	SAL 2018 Q1 /	WRASSE Brood -	WRASSE 2017	WRASSE 2017		
Age group No Fish	18 s1 480	2018 Q1 / 1,084	Brood -	794	322		
	480 250g	1,084 110g	Various up	794 20g	322 10-15g		
Mean Fish Wt	250g		2.51	· ·	10-10g	The CAL from E	
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	None planne fallow in 201	ned Lagoon to 019	Next Input D	Date (Site)	Possible SAL from B maybe next couple o	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease pro	oblems?			N Any escapes	s (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:							
<ol> <li>Movement record</li> <li>Date of last inspe</li> <li>Are records comp</li> <li>Are movement re</li> <li>Are records comp</li> <li>Are health certific</li> </ol>	ection: plete and cor ecords availa plete and cor cates for intro	orrectly entered able for dead fis orrectly entered	d? fish and waste? d?			4/4/16	Y Y Y Y N/A
Transport Records  1. Are any movement of yes, is there a system.	ents carried o	• •	•	•	_		Y
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records		er inspection?					Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)	A	
If other detail:	Incinerated	d off site Dougl			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
3. Mortality records	complete ar	and correctly ent	ntered?				Y
4. Recent mortality (	•			ire mortality p	oer tank per rem	oval	
5. Evidence of recer		• •					Y
If yes, facility nos/no		•		•	rea for the falles of	in July to H	· · · ·
some salmon lost po and trials units. Mort			•	•	450 fish following	ing transfer in July to th	e quarantine
6. Any other peaks i				and Sucas.			N
If yes, detail:	Tinoru,	Juling po	HOURCA.				
7. Have increased (	unexplained	d) mortalities b	een reported t	o vet or FHI?			Y
If yes, detail action:		Yes reporte	ed to company	vet who inves	estigated		
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been					ality events sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Recent treatments     If yes, detail:     If other, detail:     Medicines records				N
	s available for inspection? Dete and correctly entered?			V
4. Are fish in a withd	•			N/A
5. If yes, what treatn	•			INA
If other, detail:	iciti(3):			
6. Are medicines sto	ored appropriately?			Y
Biosecurity Record				V
	ds available for inspection? and frequency of mortality removal,	recording and safe	disposal been considered?	Y
			s or veterinary professional of any	<u>'</u>
	ined) mortality at the site been incli	•	3 of veterinary professional or arry	Y
more accar (arroxipran	, <b>,</b>			
	at will be taken in the event that the luded and how and when that will		ion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
			site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific				
	•		ach epidemiological unit to minimise	Υ
	ase been covered (movement of s			
	available regarding the measures	in place to maintain	the physical containment of	N/A
aquaculture animals				V
If no, detail:	rity procedures been adequately in	npiemented on site?		Ť
ii iio, detaii.				
Results of Surveilla	ance			
1 Has any animal h	ealth surveillance been carried out	by or on behalf of	the husiness?	Y
·	available for inspection?	by, or orr berian or,	and buomicoo.	Y
3. Any significant res	•			Y
o. / y o.gou			Historical sampling and investigation (	not by MSS)
			revealed Epithelial lesion in broodstock	•
			observed on head and opercula appea	rance like a
			a pox type virus. Some sequencing an	
			testing - negative for Salmon Pox Virus	
			believed to be a herpes type virus - fur	
			identify being undertaken. No reported mortality, clinical signs ceased in July a	
			appears that they may be related to sp	
If yes, detail (if not d	etailed under recent disease probl	ems).	stress.	
F	Records checked between:	April 16 and	present	

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0449		Site No:	FS0869		Insp:	
Date of Visit	11/09/2018		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 notuding third country	0	9	18	26	0
•	Number of sup	·	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	l 0	3	6	10	3
movement on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through borehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category V	1	4	8		0
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
the fales of the ancetive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				0
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	Ī			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				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		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0	1			0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				0
					Total Rank		15 LOW

Case No:	2018-0449		S	ite No:	FS0869	]	
•	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years	?				N/A
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	Management Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed sync	chronously on a	a single ye	ear class basis?		
azamethiphos and emo can these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as I in a reasonable perioc cumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath s well as access to suitable d of time? ement agreement or state	le biological an	nd/or mech	hanical control meas		
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the	e SSI and the (	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anr	nex 6)	
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteri	ia for treatment	t in the Co	oGP during the perio	d that	
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	· ·	monis) numbers per fish	n been at a leve	el of 3 or a	above during the per	iod that	
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no	o, FHI see com	nment.			
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which	is considered to cause s	significant welf	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)	
		istered or other actions to elongatus is considered to					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	applicable)?					
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the action	ns taken had a significant	t impact upon t	the lice le	vels recorded?		
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	l out in cooperation between	een participati	ng farms?	<b>&gt;</b>		
14. Is there a harvestir sea lice?	ng strategy for the site,	where fewer populations	s or part popula	ations are	held without treatme	ent for	
	cific written lice manage scalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with wa infestation?	aypoints descri	bing set a	ections to deal with re	ecognised	
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactor	y in relation to sea lice le	evel and sea lic	e count d	lata? If no please de	tail	
Containment Inspect	ion						
•		ge due to predators in th	ne 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	·)		Υ
Large part of site ho	used indoors. Outsite	e taks with appropriate	covers and l	ids			
If other, detail below	:						
							N
		perienced on or in the vio	cinity of the site	e since the	e last FHI inspection	?	IN
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip	•					
4. Have these been re	ported to Scottish Minis	sters?					
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist	st)? (CoGP – 4	.4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been re	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 ar	ny) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	I				
8 If all nots were deal	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish	interests and	was nerm	ission given by Scot	tish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild lish	interests and	us penn	Joseph Given by Scot		
	•	imise the risk of further e	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 d	etail reaso	on(s)		Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0449			Date of visit:	11/09/2018			
Site No:	FS0869			Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
					-			
	-							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI, CNÍ	03/10/2018							





FAI Aquaculture Ltd Ardtoe Marine Research Facility Ardtoe, Acharacle Argyll PH36 4LD

### FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0439 SITE NO FS0869 INSPECTOR **DATE OF VISIT** 11/09/2018 **SITE NAME** Marine Farming Unit

**CASE No** 20180449

### Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

### Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to 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 <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 3 October 2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0450		Date of visit: 11/09/2018
Time spent on site: 2 hours	Main	Inspector:
	Name: Site B	
Business No: SB0380 Busin	ness Name: Measan Na Mara (Fru	it of the Sea) Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	3 4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): Not taken There	mometer No:	FHI 045 completed
Observations: Region	on: HI Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish pro Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	N If yes, see additio	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out into	ended visit detail reason below:	

**Additional Case Information:** 

FHI 059, Version 11			Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0450		Site No:	SS0444				
Date of Visit:		11/09/2018			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to Site Details	ails summary		te representa	tive?			Y N	l
One Details								
Total No facilities		40 trestles (158 bags)	Facilities sto	cked	40 Trestles (158 bags)	No facilities	s inspected	Several bags from one of the two banks of trestles stocked
Species	Pacific oyster	Pacific oyster						
Age group	input March							
No Fish	113,000	1,000						
Mean Fish Wt	10-15g	~500g +						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	_	in October 2 00k from Tra	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last v	visit)?	N/A
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?						Y Y N/A Y		
Transport Records								
Are any movemer If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records					_			
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)			
	Approved La		10					NI/A
<ol> <li>Mortality records of</li> <li>Recent mortality (</li> </ol>	•		None reporte	2d				N/A
5. Evidence of recen	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			, u				N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		reason:				
0. A			1 10					NI/A
<ol><li>6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:</li></ol>	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N/A
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities bee	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	itv events s	neet.	N/A
			,			,		

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	<u>'</u>
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?	N
If no, detail: No sign indicating biosecurity measures are in operation and no footbath present for disinfer	tion
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).	

Records checked between: 21/04/15 and 11/09/18

Date of issue: 12/09/2017 FHI 059, Version 11 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2018-0450 Site No: SS0444 Date of Visit 11/09/2018 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 0 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 5 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 5 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 1 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 0 3 6 Areas 0 3 Number of destinations **Secure** Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 0 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2018-0450			Date of visit:	11/09/2018				
Site No:	SS0444	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
	+	-			-	<b>-</b>			
	+								
	+								
Report Summary				1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
ECI	03/10/2018		2 11100						
Case completion	20/02/2019								
•									
	1								
	1								





Measan Na Mara (Fruit of the Sea) Ltd An Tearmann, East Lewiston Drumnadrochit Inverness IV63 6UJ

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0380 SITE NO SS0444 INSPECTOR 
 DATE OF VISIT
 11/09/2018

 SITE NAME
 Site B

 CASE NO
 20180450

Date: 20/02/19

#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 3 November 2018. 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:

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 11	l:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0451			Date of visit: 13/09/2018
Time spent on site:	4 hours	Main Insp	ector:
Site No: FS0241 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Kingairloch Marine Harvest (Scotland)	Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 VMD 3 CNI	4 SLI 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 13.3	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-36
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin	•		information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed?	rea :		information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:	

#### Additional Case Information:

Paper work by , Site inspection and sampling by

Wrasse movements on site not in movement book but recorded separately electronically - copy emailed and received.

Mortality ensiled on site then uplifted by Billie Bowie. Larger scale mortalities taken off by Billie Bowie. Disposal at Dundas chemicals Dumfries

Wrasse being fed medicated feed florocol.

Fish to be treated soon for AGD prophylactic Tuesday next week is planned

Lesions were observed in wrasse in Linnhe, Gorsten, Leven and Kingairloch - not large numbers but prophylactic treatment on sites with Florocol

Mortality in previous stocks - Jan to July 2017 - loss of 20k fish over 6 month period mainly attributed to sea lice treatment losses.

Mortality of 2.45% in month Feb of 2017 - mortality reporting criteria not reached.

Requirement to record florocol against salmon (for treatment in wrasse) discussed with site manager

For question 26 of AFSA 2013 sheet - Farm management Statement agreed 30/7/2018 version 16

FHI 059, Version 11			Issue	ed by: FHI		Da	ate of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0451	]	Site No:	FS0241				
Date of Visit:		13/09/2018	8		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Author	orisation De	tails	_					
1. Business/site det			site representa	ntive?		Y		1
2. Changes made to			· ·			Y		
Site Details								
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilities in	nspected	all
	Atlantic	Wrasse	Wrasse					
Species	salmon							
Age group	Q1 2018 -	farmed - 2	wild - mixed					
No Fish	196,000	4,900	4,900					
Mean Fish Wt	994g	~50g	90g					
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	Sept 2019		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	July 2020		
					1			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	olems?		N	Any escapes	(since last visit	it)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	s							
Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		or inspection.				19	9/05/2015	
3. Are records comp		rectly entered	?				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp	plete and cor	rectly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certific	•	•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any moveme		ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys					_			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for	inspection?					ı	Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Ensiled - on s	cita		
If other detail:	es disposed	OI:			Liisilea - oii s	Site		
3. Mortality records	complete an	d correctly en	tered?					Y
,				weeks. (74 at	tributed to sea	als, 462 undiagr	nosed) Mo	rtalities
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		spread acros	•		, ,	,	
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/	atypical morta	alities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	r facility/no st	ock per facility/	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks								N
If yes, detail:					transport los	ses. Remaining	g undiagno	
7. Have increased (		mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		L						11/2
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been r	eported to FH	I? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events shed	et.	N/A

		prophylactic . Low level of lesions reported on			
		this site			
		other sites in the area			
If yes, detail:					
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records	available for ins	spection?			Y
Are records complete		•			N
4. Are fish in a withdo	•				Y
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)?		Florocol		
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately	P			Y
Biosecurity Record  1. Biosecurity record		spection?			Y
_			rding and safe	disposal been considered?	Y
	•	•		s or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplain	ned) mortality at	the site been included?	<b>?</b>		Y
		the event that the presend when that will be no	•	ion of the presence of a listed disea	se Y
				site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific				one book corolou (equal of higher	
	•	•		ach epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
				ent, live or dead fish etc.)?	
aquaculture animals		ng the measures in plac	ce to maintain	the physical containment of	<u>'</u>
•		een adequately implem	ented on site?		Y
If no, detail:					
Results of Surveilla	ince				
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance	been carried out by, or	r on behalf of, t	the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results		ection?			Y
3. Any significant res		ent disease problems).			Y
				Ing in wrasse on medicated feed.	
R	Records checked	between:	19/05/15 until	September 2018	

Case no:   2018-0451   Site No:   FS0241   Date of visit/   Sampling:   Sampling:   Date of visit/   Date of visit/   Date of visit/   Date of visit/   Sampling:   Date of visit/	F	HI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI										
Priority samples:		Case no:	2018-04	151	Site No:		FS0241					13/0	09/2018	
Starts/ends: Environmental conditions:  1 Windy 2 Dry 3 Cloudy 4 Sunny 5  Summary samples  HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples  Add Fish/Pools - click  Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1-3 4-6 7-9 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 1 kg 1 kg 1 kg Sex Water Type SW SW SW SW		Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA							
Summary samples			11:0	00:00	13:0	0:00		Inspector	r: <b> </b>			VMD No	).	27
Pool/Fish No		Environmental conditions:	1	Windy	2	Dry	3	Cloudy	4	Sunny	5			
Pool/Fish No		Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG	\	/I		PA		Total Sa	imples
Fish nos	A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Fish nos	п	Pool/Fish No	Π											
Pool Group  Species  Average weight  Sex  Water Type  SW  SW  SW  Water Type  Water Type  SW  SW  SW  SW  SW  SW  SW  SW  SW  S			1-3	4-6	7-9									
Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 1 kg 1 kg Sex Water Type SW		Pool Group												
Sex Water Type SW SW SW Ch Leven Ch Lev			SAL	SAL	SAL									
Water Type  SW SW  ch Leven  ch Leve		Average weight	1 kg	1 kg	1 kg									
ch Leven														
Stock Origin Coch Coch Leven Coch		Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Origin Stock Origin Facility No  4 5 6														
Stock Origin Stock Origin Facility No  4 5 6														
Stock Origin Stock Origin Facility No  4 5 6														
Stock Origin   Stock Origin   Stock Origin   Stock Origin   Facility No	.,		E .	드	E C									
Stock Origin 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2		eve	eve	eve									
Stock Origin S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	De		h L	h L	h L									
Facility No 4 5 6	_		00	00	00									
	Sto	Facility No	_											

	Additional Sample Information:												
0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l							

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI Date of issue				: 12/09/2017		
Case Number:	2018-0451		Site No:	FS0241		Insp:	
Date of Visit	13/09/2018		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	$\overline{}$
Sp. 53.55	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	-
Movements off			0			10	10
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	5 0		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		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III 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	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
		n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				ш
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
		from Category III farm	8				$\Box$
	Processing fish	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				П
	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				$\vdash$
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		T 0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	]			0
	No		2	j			
					Total Rank		16 MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0451		\$	Site No:	FS0241	]				
•	Seawater Sites Only)	s in the previous 4 years	s?				N			
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single v	ear class hasis?		N			
	•		•				V			
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?  4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm										
Management Area (or equivalent)?										
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)										
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)										
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	•	low the suggested criter	ria for treatmen	nt in the Co	GP during the perio	od that	Υ			
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	•	monis) numbers per fish	h been at a lev	el of 3 or a	above during the per	riod that	N			
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	no, FHI see cor	mment.			N/A			
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant wel	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	, 5.3.50)	N			
•		istered or other actions t elongatus is considered					N/A			
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where a	applicable)?					N/A			
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the action	is taken had a significan	nt impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?		Υ			
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	l out in cooperation betw	veen participati	ing farms?	•		Υ			
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?  You have a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?										
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?										
16. Does the stock on steasons.	site appear satisfactor	y in relation to sea lice le	evel and sea li	ce count d	ata? If no please de	tail	Υ			
Containment Inspecti	ion									
•		ge due to predators in th	he current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?		N			
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (De	etail below	)		Υ			
Seal blinds ADDs ter	nsion nets									
If other, detail below:										
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vi	icinity of the sit	e since the	e last FHI inspection	1?	N			
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip ported to Scottish Minis	•								
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4	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	ny) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	il							
8. If aill nets were denl	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and	was perm	ission given by Scot	ttish				
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		g. 200 mili 1000 mila 1131		us poiiii						
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 inspecte	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment?	If no, please o	letail reaso	on(s)		Υ			

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0451	Site No: FS0241	
Date of Visit: 13/09/20	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection locate	d within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require com	pletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Far	m Management Agreements and Statements	
<ul><li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for</li><li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance</li><li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish</li></ul>	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or stateme	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Man	agement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minifarm?	mum health standards for the stocks to be introd	uced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	cination requirements for stocks held in the area of ecies of fish which may be stocked into the area of eximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrafish farm in the area or the individual	angements for the storage and disposal of any de I farm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemer	nt of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ailability and the use of medicines on farms cover	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any reclice on farms in the area or individual	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available t	reatments for sea
	cumstances under which biological controls and c	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra	angements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circ area or farm?	cumstances when live fish may be introduced or r	removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra or individual farms?	angements for the movement of live fish on and o	off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indivi	idual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates to date when a farm or area may be restocled.	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow ked?	w and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto si	ites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether br covered by the agreement or statement?	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ?	t on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	ent include arrangements for persons to becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or s	statement? Y
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S?	

Site No: FS0241

Case No: 2018-0451

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0451			Date of visit:	13/09/2018						
Site No:	FS0241	1		Increator		1					
Oile NO.	1 30241			Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notification						
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp			
	-										
					-						
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	03/10/2018										
Case completion	20/02/2019										





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 FS0241 INSPECTOR

**DATE OF VISIT** 13/09/2018 Kingairloch SITE NAME CASE NO 20180451

Date: 20/02/19

#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 3 November 2018. 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:

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