FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0044			Date of visit: 08/04/2019
Time spent on site:	1 Hr	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: SS0456 Business No: SB0291	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Ryan, Shore Site and Bu The Loch Ryan Oyster Fishery	•
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional infor	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	y out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

A consignment of 210 native oysters (OED) for export to University College, Cork, Ireland inspected at the harbour in Stranraer. No clinical signs of disease observed and no reports of mortalities on site. No hitchhikers observed in the consignment. Health certificate INTRA.GB.2019.0009095 (MD19/040).

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0044		Site No:	SS0456				
Date of Visit:		08/04/2019			Inspector(s)	:		1
Registration/Author 1. Business/site detai 2. Changes made to	ls summary o		te representa	itive?			Y N]
Age group	OED Mix	5	Facilities sto	cked	5	No facilitie	es inspected	5
	Unsure Mix							
Next Fallow Date (Sit		N/A		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	N/A		
Recent (last 4 wks) di	isease proble	ms?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records 1. Movement records 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comple 4. Are movement records. Are records comple 5. Are records comple 6. Are health certifications	tion: ete and corre ords available ete and corre	ctly entered? e for dead fisl ctly entered?					13/11/2018	Y N/A N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a systematical experience of the syst				•	_			
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records at 2. How are mortalities	disposed of	•			Other (detai	1)		Y
3. Mortality records co	•							Y
 Recent mortality (la Evidence of recent If yes, facility nos/no 	increased/at	ypical mortali						N
6. Any other peaks in	mortality dur	ing period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (ur If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality eve			·		enter on mort	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for insp		
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 ins Has the manner and frequency of	pecτιon <i>?</i> nortality removal, recording and safe disposal bee	n considered?
•	n the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinar	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	•	y professional or any
	the event that the presence or suspicion of the pre	
	nd when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
b. Has the health status of aquaculture health status, certification if required)?	e animals being stocked on the farm site been cov	/ered (equal or nigner
rieditii status, cerunication ii required):		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity	y measures implemented between each epidemio	logical unit to minimise
	(movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or de	
7. Is documentation available regardin aquaculture animals held on site?	g the measures in place to maintain the physical o	containment of
8. Have the biosecurity procedures be	en adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	en adequately implemented on site.	
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance	been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business'	? N

13/11/2018 - 08/04/2019

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:	2019-0044			Date of visit:	08/04/2019			
Site No:	SS0456	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Inch	and In-					
MOV	11/04/2019	Insp	2 nd Insp					
WOV	11/04/2019							
	 							
	 							
			—					
	-							





The Loch Ryan Oyster Fishery Co Ltd The Thatched Cottage Penberth, St. Buryan Penzance. Cornwall TR19 6HJ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0291 SITE NO SS0456 INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 08/04/2019

SITE NAME Loch Ryan, Shore Site and Buildings

20190044 CASE NO

Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of Native oysters (Ostrea edulis) for scientific research in Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Date: 11/04/2019

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date	e of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0151			Date of visit	: 01/04/2019
Time spent on site:	.5 hrs	Mai	in Inspector:	
Site No: FS1325 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine First Fee Scottish Sea Farms		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6	ב
Water Temp (°C): 14	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 con	npleted
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F CoGP M	A
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addit	tional information/clinica tional information/clinica tional information/clinica	l score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:		

Fish transferred from Incubation Units to First Feeding Unit 28/03/2019. Fish feeding well already appearing healthy. No movement of dead fish records at time of inspection. No treatments carried out since input, no medicine records to inspect. No medicine currently stored on site.

Fish checked by histology and pcr prior to movement through from incubation units to first feeding unit. No significant findings in histology. PCR came back negative for Yersinia.

No records of movement of dead fish off site as there had not been any movements off site at time of inspection.

Site thermometer used due biosecurity procedures.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0151		Site No:	FS1325				
Date of Visit:		01/04/2019]		Inspector(s)]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ils summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details Total No facilities Species	SAL	16	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilitie	es inspected	16
Age group No Fish	alevins/fry 1,596,325							
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Si	0.18g te)	June 2019		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	July 2019		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:					Any escapes		visit)?	N
Movement Records 1. Movement records 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certifications	s available fo ction: lete and corre cords availablete and corre	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered?	h and waste?				first inspecti	on Y N/A N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movemer If yes, is there a syst	nts carried ou		•	•	_			N
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records a 2. How are mortalitie If other detail:		•			Ensiled - on	site		Y
Mortality records of 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	•	1210 (0.08%) for whole site	e since input 2	28/03/19		Y
5. Evidence of recent If yes, facility nos/no		••		/reason:				N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	•		·		enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		N
If yes, detail: If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection	n?	N/A
Are records complete and correctly enter		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		N/A
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection	on?	Y
Has the manner and frequency of mortali	-	
3. Has the manner and period in which the	•	ary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site	e been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the ev	ant that the processes or cuspicion of the p	reserves of a listed diseases
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>who</i>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture anin		
health status, certification if required)?		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Have the husbandry and biosecurity mea transmission of disease been covered (mov		
7. Is documentation available regarding the		
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been ad	equately implemented on site?	Y
lf no, detail:		
Posults of Survaillance		

19/12/2018 - 01/04/2019

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0151		Site No:	FS1325		nsp:	
Date of Visit	01/04/2019		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			26 14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	6
F	Number of desi		0			10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	IFarm is protect	Site contacts ed (secure water supply through	0	1-5	6-10		_
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	1		
uiscuscs)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	<u> </u>		7		-
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion		,			
	iarriis upstream	1 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 rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				ш
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent statu	4					
		ı from Category III farm	8				-
		r from Category ∨ farm	10				-
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	i			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	-			3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5	-			ш
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			
oco or ampaotoanoca rocao	Feeding unpas	· ·	5				⊢ ⊢
Biosecurity	,	Number of sites			≥4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0		2		2
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0		2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				Н
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				Ш
	IVos			1			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				\Box
					Total		16
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0151		Site No:	FS1325	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
	• •	in the previous 4 years?	?		
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed sync	hronously on a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	amectin benzoate) as			cluding deltamethrin, hanical control measures, a	nd
can these be deployed	•	l of time? ement agreement or stat	amont relevant to the e	ite and CaCD Form	
Management Area (or		ement agreement or stat	ement relevant to the s	and CogP Faim	
		pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		
	·	, -	•	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	•	ow the suggested criteria	a for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nonis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or a	above during the period that	
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause s	significant welfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•				levels have exceeded the cions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	pplicable)?			
•	•	s taken had a significant	impact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
•		out in cooperation between			
		•		e held without treatment for	
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es			ypoints describing set a	actions to deal with recognise	ed
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count da	ta? If no please detail r	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
•		ge due to predators in the	e current or previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	he predation experience	d on site? (Detail below	<i>'</i>)	Υ
Site inside					
If other, detail below:					
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been exp	erienced on or in the vic	inity of the site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10			
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Minis	ters?			
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and	l local fisheries trusts for	rthwith (where they exis	et)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail			
If gill nets were deployed Ministers? (Legal, CoG		reed with local wild fish	interests and was perm	nission given by Scottish	
, -		mise the risk of further e	scapes? (Not covered i	n code but could	
be considered under		_			
	•	egards to containment? I	f no. please detail reas	on(s)	Υ
	a ao candidotory with re	garas to contaminent: 1	, prodoc dotair rodo	(•)	

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0151			Date of visit:	01/04/2019			
Site No:	FS1325	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
			-					
Report Summary								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd In ■					
ECI/CNI	11/04/2019	шэр	Z III					
201/0111	11/0-1/2010							
	1							





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 FS1325

INSPECTOR Warren Murray

DATE OF VISIT 01/04/2019

SITE NAME Barcaldine First Feeding Unit

CASE No 20190151

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 11/04/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0152			Date of visit: 02/04/2019
Time spent on site:	Hrs	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: FS1267 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Gometra The Scottish Salmon Comp	pany
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5 REP	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.1	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-37
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Escape event 06/11/2018 (MSe061118SAL1) no fish thought to have escaped at time of event. Count carried out during grading on 25/03/2019, numbers came back the same as expected showing no loss. All nets changed to hdpe nets.

Strategic AGD treatment using H2O2 carried out 22/02/19. Pen 3 and 7 had increased mortality post treatment due to physical damage, net bagged during crowding for treatment. Bad scaling and rubbing as fish were burrowing down into the net during treatment led to lesions after treatment. Mortalities have gradually decreased since time of event and are below reporting threshold.

Fish sampled for VMD showed no signs of ill health externally and internally. No sea lice were visible.

Risk based inspection brought forward following report from company of the increased mortalities late February due to physical damage.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0152		Site No:	FS1267				
Date of Visit:		02/04/2019	1		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	16	No facilitie	s inspected	16
Species	SAL							
Age group	2018 S0							
No Fish	625,000							
Mean Fish Wt	1.4 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	June/July 20	20	Next Input Da	te (Site)	Sep./Oct. 2	2020	
Recent (last 4 wks) (disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					13/11/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?					10/11/2010	Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?						Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any movement		t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			
Mortality Records			·					
Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Whole fish - I	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
			1-08/03:2954	4(0.46%), 9-16	/03:2147(0.34	%), 17-23/0	3: 1265(0.2%	b), 24-31/03:
Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		1141(0.18%))				
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:		3						
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	Y

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)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
more according to the site seem 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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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 health status, certification if required)?	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	Y
Results of Surveillance	
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?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). AGD detected by PCR	
Records checked between: 13/11/2018 - 02/04/2019	

	11 059, VEISION 12							155	ueu by. r	111			
	Case no:	2019-01	152	Site No:		FS1267			Date of v		02/0	04/2019	02/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		a. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	16:0	0:00	16:2	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	D.	7
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	F	PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	1.4000	1.4000										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
		_	ے										
S		٦	3gr										
Details		<u> </u>	<u> </u>										
De		Russell Burn	Russell Burn										
Stock	Stock Origin	Ru	Ru										
Stc	Facility No	11	12										
St	Facility No	11	12										

04/2019 Additional Sample Information:														
	Fish sampled for VMD showed no signs of ill health externally and internally													
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0152		Site No:	FS1267		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/04/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	•	I 0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
		n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10				\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	unpasteurised feed	0	Ī			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			ш
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				Ш
					Total Rank		22 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0152	Site No: FS1267						
Sea Lice Inspection (S	••	s in the previous 4 years?	N					
•	•	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Y					
	•	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin,	Y					
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	mectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period	well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and d of time?						
Management Area (or e	equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y					
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y					
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ					
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ					
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 been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A					
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N					
•		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Υ					
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ					
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ					
•		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Y					
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y					
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised infestation?	ΙΥ					
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ					
Containment Inspection								
•	• •	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against t	he predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y					
ADD, Top Nets, Tens	ioned Nets, MML							
If other, detail below:								
			N					
•		perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N					
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	•	·						
5. Have these been rep	orted to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail						
8 If all nots were deplo	wed was this action as	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish						
Ministers? (Legal, CoGI	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)							
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could						
be considered under	•	·	V					
10. Is the site inspected	as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Y					

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0152	Site No: FS1267	
Date of Visit: 02/04/20	19 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	d within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require com	pletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farr	m Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish for	rant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statemer of review?	Y Y Y
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minin farm?9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vacci10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	mum health standards for the stocks to be introdu ination requirements for stocks held in the area o ccies of fish which may be stocked into the area o ximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	r farm? Y r 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 farm?	ad fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemen	t of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ements for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ilability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any req lice on farms in the area or individual	uirements for the sensitivity testing of available tr farms?	
Does the FMAg/S identify the circused on farms in the area or individua	umstances under which biological controls and cl al farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra	angements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	numstances when live fish may be introduced or reasonances when live fish may be introduced or reasonances.	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or inc	dividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be fal	low and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement?	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kee?	ept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement o	or statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 30/07/2018	

Case No:	2019-0152			Date of visit:	02/04/2019			
Cuse No.	2010-0102			Date of visit.	02/04/2010			
Site No:	FS1267			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/CNI/SLI//REP/VMD								





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0169Date of Visit02/04/2019Site NoFS1267Site NameGometraInspectorWarren MurrayCase No20190152

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 11/04/2019
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018								
Case No: 2019-0153			Date of visit: 02/04/2019								
Time spent on site:	5 Hrs	Main Inspect	or:								
Site No: FS0617 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Tuath The Scottish Salmon Compan	у								
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6								
Water Temp (°C): 8.1	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed								
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-37								
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:											

SAL from Lamlash. Fish brought in @ 1 kg smolts. Plan to harvest out June 2019 then move fish from Gometra to Tuath for harvest in 2020.

Lumpfish stocked at 15% (2600 - 3000/pen)

PGD on site. PD thought to be on site, samples taken recently still awaiting results. No increase in mortality though. Site negative for AGD.

Water visibility not good. Fish coming close enough to surface appearing healthy. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy both externally and internally. No lice spotted either.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2019-0153		Site No:	FS0617					
Date of Visit:		02/04/2019	9		Inspector(s)]	
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site detaction 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	ative?			Y N	}	
Site Details									
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	ocked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12	
Species	SAL	LUM							
Age group	2018 S0	2019							
No Fish	189,000	35,350							
Mean Fish Wt	3.9 kg	70g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	June/July 20	020	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Sep./Oct.	2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N	
•									
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?									
Transport Records 1. Are any movement of the second secon	nts carried oເ			•	_			N	
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	available for i	nenection?						Y	
2. How are mortalitie					Whole fish -	Dundas Ch	emicals		
If other detail: 3. Mortality records	complete ene	L correctly ont	arad?						
Recent mortality (•	correctly ent		3/19: 2438 (1.2	290/) whole o	ito		'	
5. Evidence of recei	•	atunical morta		3/19. 2436 (1.2	2070) WHOLE S	ile		N	
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		ı/reason:				IN	
ii yes, idenity iies/iie	7 mortality per	Taomity/110 St	ook per raemty	ncason.					
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality du	ıring period c	hecked?					N	
If yes, detail:		1 120							
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A	
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	ente' boon ro	norted to EU	2 If no ladd M	APT case and	enter on mort	ality events	sheet	N/A	
o. Have mortality ev	venta neen te	ported to Ph	i: ii iio, aud iv	in the case and t	enter on mort	anty events	oneet.	IN//	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspections. 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?		Y Y N
3. Has the manner and period in which the increased (unexplained) mortality at the sit. 4. Has the action that will be taken in the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the increase in the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the increase in the exist detected been included and how and which the increase in the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how and which the exist detected been included and how	lity removal, recording and safe disposal be APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterina	resence of a listed disease Y
transmission of disease been covered (mo	asures implemented between each epidemic vement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or of e measures in place to maintain the physical	dead fish etc.)?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been actification in the control of the contro	dequately implemented on site?	Y
Results of Surveillance		

11/10/2017 - 02/04/2019

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

FIT 059, Version 12		issued by. Frii										
Case no:	2019-01	153	Site No:		FS0617			Date of v		02/0	04/2019	02/0
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	6
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	imples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1											
Pool Group												
Species	SAL											
Average weight	3.9000											
Sex	N/A											
Water Type	SW											
<u>si</u>	ے											
Details	las											
	Lamlash											
ਤੁੱਠ Stock Origin Facility No												
ಸ್ರ Facility No	11											

04/2019 Additional Sample Information:												
Fish sampled for VMD showed no signs of ill health externally and internally												
Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI				Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0153			Site No:	FS0617		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/04/2019			No of mo	ovements/s	Score		
Live fish movements				0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements 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			0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	•		0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m			0	3	6	10	10
Movements on	Number of des			0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site con	0	1-5	6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,		0				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line farms upstream		1	2	4		2	
	Farm is on-line farms upstream		1	3	6		ш	
		or in a coastal zone with category n or within 1 tidal excursion	y V	1	4	8		ш
Management practices				None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent w	/aters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro			0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)		1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status		2				
	equivalent statu			4				
		from Category III farm		8				
	Processing fish	rfrom Category ∀ farm		10				\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms		3	1			3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed		0	i			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5				
Biosecurity		Number of	sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase		0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment		0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1				\vdash
CoGP/Regulator					J			
Practices in accordance	Yes			0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			0				0
	No			2				
						Total Rank		22 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0153	Site No: FS0617	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •		
•	•	s in the previous 4 years?	N
		quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Y
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	mectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period		Y
Management Area (or e	equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ
8. Have average adult for records are inspected?	emale sea lice (L. sali	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that	N
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N
•		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Υ
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ
•		out in cooperation between participating farms?	· V
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y
15. Is there a site specific scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	Υ
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspection	on		
 Has the site experien 	ced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in plac	e to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ
ADD, Tensioned Nets	s, Top Nets, MML		
If other, detail below:			
,			
3. Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	stions 4 – 9. If No skip	o to question 10	
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	sters?	
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
9 If gill note were deale	wod was this satism	ground with local wild fich interests and was normical and all the Coefficients	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGI	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under	•	·	
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

Case No: 2019-0153 Site No: FS0617 Date of Visit: 02/04/2019 Inspector: Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area? If N, no further questions require completion. Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or individual farms	FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	I	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area? If N, no further questions require completion. Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the oricumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Do	Case No: 2019-0153	Site No:	FS0617		
1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area? If N, no further questions require completion. Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the aximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify the or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?	Date of Visit: 02	2/04/2019 Ir	nspector:		
If N, no further questions require completion. Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the manimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify the or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?	Point of Compliance				
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	1. Is the farm under inspection	n located within a farm	management area?		Υ
2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify the rounstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	If N, no further questions requ	ire completion.			
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? Y Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	Points of Compliance for Bo	oth Farm Managemen	t Agreements and Stat	tements	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	 Is the current FMAg/S availa Does the FMAg/S identify th 	able for inspection? he relevant farm manage he fish farm site(s) to we he date of commencement he date of review?	gement area? vhich it applies?		Y Y Y Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	Arrangements for Fish Healt	th Management			
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area		ne minimum health star	ndards for the stocks to	be introduced to the area	or Y
Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	10. Does the FMAg/S identify11. Does the FMAg/S identify	the species of fish which	ch may be stocked into t	the area or farm?	Y Y Y
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments? 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area			he storage and disposal	of any dead fish from any	y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	Arrangements for The Mana	gement of Sea Lice			
of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	13. Does the FMAg/S identify	arrangements for the s	sharing of data on sea lic	ce numbers and treatmen	ts? Y
lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area		the availability and the	use of medicines on far	ms covered by the agree	
used on farms in the area or individual farms? 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area? Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	_		ne sensitivity testing of a	vailable treatments for se	
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	_		ler which biological conti	rols and cleaner fish are t	
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	17. Does the FMAg/S identify	the arrangements for s	synchronous treatments	on farms within the area?	Υ
area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area	Live Fish Movements				
	area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify				

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of	f issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting			
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest p	practices on farms in the area or i	individual farms?	Υ
Fallowing			
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the date when a farm or area may be restocked?	ne area or individual farm will be	fallow and the earliest	Υ
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more agreement or statement?	year classes may be stocked or	nto sites covered by the	Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock covered by the agreement or statement?	or potential broodstock are to be	kept on any site	Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agr	reements Only		
24. Does the farm management agreement include parties to the agreement?	e arrangements for persons to be	ecome, or cease to be,	N/A
Management and operation			
25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in	n accordance with the agreement	t or statement?	Y
26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMA	Ag/S? 30/07/2018		

Case No:	2019-0153			Date of visit:	02/04/2019			
Site No:	FS0617			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D10								
Report Summary	D-4-	l	and .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	11/04/2019							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0169Date of Visit02/04/2019Site NoFS0617Site NameLoch TuathInspectorWarren MurrayCase No20190153

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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: Date: 11/04/2019
Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2019-0166			Date of visit: 02/04/2019		
Time spent on site:	nr	Main Ir	nspector:		
Site No: SS0712 Business No: SB0455	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch nan Ceall Arisaig Farms			
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed N		
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:			

Site currently has hundreds of trestles, site manager was unsure of exactly how many, but all are stocked. Site receives 500,000 seeds every year from Guernsey, channel islands.

Site doesn't record mortalities and shells are discarded on beach. If a significant rise in mortalities were to occur, site manager would record this in the site diary, however, this has not happened since 2006.

Oysters are moved off of site, outwith MSS management area to Loch Fyne Oysters depuration facility at Cairndow.

Inspection completed by supervised.

15/07/2020 – case updated as noticed it had been allocated to incorrect site. Company operates two sites at location and the other site was fallow. Case report re-issued with correct information. See attachment for original dates.

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by	r: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0166	Site No: SS0712		
Date of case: 02/04/20	19	Inspector(s):	ב
Business/site contacts correct? (if no, up	date site summary sheet	t)	Y
Site Details	_		
Total No facilities: Trestles		No facilities stocked	All stocked
Species CGI CGI	CGI		
Age group 2016 20			_
No shellfish 500,000 500,000	,		_
Mean fish Wt 2-20g 15-60g Next fallow date (site) No fallow	40-80g	xt input date (site)	lup 10
		xt input date (site)	Jun-19
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	09/10/2017		
Any recent increased or atypical mortaliti	es? (last 4 weeks):		N
If yes, detail:			
e.g. site			
average, max per facility			
per facility			
Any increased mortalities? (since last ins	pection)		N
If yes, detail:			
How are mortalities disposed of?			Other (detail)
If other detail: Shells discarded on bead	h.		
Are there any diseases on your site?			N
If yes, detail:			
Have you experienced predation on site?	•		N
If yes, detail:			
Has the site experienced increased or all	normal fouling?		N
If yes, detail:	g.		
Have you observed any invasive species	on your site?		N
If yes, detail:	on your site:		IV.
Do you have an unito data PMD, and are	there any issues?		N
Do you have an up to date BMP, and are If yes, detail:	there any issues?		N
What quantity of spat fall have you had in	the last 12 months? (m	ussel sites only).	
N/A	Idot 12 months: (III	accor onco orny).	

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0166 Site No: SS0712 Date of Visit 02/04/2019 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 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 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 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 0 Areas 0 Number of destinations **Secure** Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area 0 Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No

Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc

0

Total Risk 0

Case No:	2019-0166	Date of visit: 02/04/2019						
Site No:	SS0712	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
PSI	09/04/2019							
PSI PSI (amended)	15/07/2020							
	I							





Arisaig Farms Glen House Arisaig Inverness-shire PH39 4NU

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0455
 Date of Case
 02/04/2019

 Site No
 SS0712
 Site Name
 Loch nan Ceall

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190166

This report replaces the fish health report 2019-0166 issued on 03/04/2019 by The previous report should be discarded.

Routine surveillance frequency assessment under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

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 four years. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

Signed: Date: 15/07/2020

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0167		Date of visit: 03/04/2019			
Time spent on site:	Main Inspect	tor:			
Site No: SS0490 Site Name: Business No: SB0316 Business Name:	Faingmor Bay me: Fearnmore Shellfish				
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3 4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): Thermometer	r No:	FHI 045 completed N			
Observations: Region:	HI Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended vi	sit detail reason below:				

Currently only taking in sample stock, so low numbers. Site manager is currently testing different growing systems.

Currently, five pearl lanterns are being used on site, and are spaced out along one, 200m longline.

Site manager has experienced very low mortalities on site, with most mortalities being attributed to starfish predation.

Inspection completed by unsupervised.

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FH	HI .	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0167	Site No: SS0490]	
Date of case: 43558		Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no, upda	te site summary sheet)	I	N
Site Details			
Total No facilities: 1 Longline		No facilities stocked:	1 Longline
Species PMA PMA	PMA		
Age group 2.5 yrs 1.5 yrs	1 yr		
No shellfish 500 50			
Mean fish Wt 70mm 40mm	20-25mm		
Next fallow date (site) No plan to fa	llow. Next in	put date (site)	Jun-19
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	31/10/2017		
Any recent increased or atypical mortalities	2 (last 1 weeks):		N
If yes, detail:	: (last 4 weeks).		IV.
e.g. site			
average, max			
per facility			
Any increased mortalities? (since last inspe	ction)		N
If yes, detail:			
How are mortalities disposed of?			Other (detail)
If other detail: Shells discarded on beach.			Other (detail)
offers distance off seast.			
Are there any diseases on your site?			N
If yes, detail:			
<u> </u>			
Have you experienced predation on site?			Υ
If yes, detail: starfish, picked out when sr	nall		
Has the site experienced increased or abno	ormal fouling?		N
If yes, detail:	arriar rouning:		
n yes, detail.			
Have you observed any invasive species or	n vour site?		N
If yes, detail:	,		
Do you have an up to date BMP, and are th	ere any issues?		N
If yes, detail:			
\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	l t 42 th - 2 /	al aite a amb de	
What quantity of spat fall have you had in th	ie iast 12 months? (musse	ei sites only):	
N/A			

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0167 Site No: SS0490 Date of Visit 03/04/2019 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 0 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 0 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area 0 Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2019-0167			Date of visit:	03/04/2019			
Site No:	SS0490	1	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
	. 104.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
								2 11100
	ļ							
	-							
	-							
	 							
	Ì							
	1							
Report Summary Case Type PSI								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
PSI	09/04/2019							
	ļ							





Fearnmore Shellfish 6 Craite Barn Applecross Wester Ross IV54 8LN

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0316 SITE NO SS0490 INSPECTOR DATE OF CASE 02/04/2019
SITE NAME Faingmor Bay
CASE NO 20190167

Routine surveillance frequency assessment under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

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 four years. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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: 03/04/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2	2018
Case No: 2019-0168			D	ate of visit: 02/04/2019	
Time spent on site:	nr	Ma	ain Inspector:		
Site No: SS0544 Business No: SB0331	Site Name: Business Name:	Eilean Liath Rangequest Oyste	rs		∃
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3	4 5		6	
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		F	HI 045 completed	1
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	s	CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:			

Site received 50,000 seeds onto site in 2016 and 200,000 seeds in 2018.

Mortalities are not recorded on site, however empty shells are discarded on the beach.

Any mortalities across site are generally attributed to handling and failed spat (which can be up to 20% of input).

Any mortalities over 1% that are unexplained are recorded in site diary and FHI are informed.

Evidence of predation on site by starfish. No predation by birds.

Fouling on lines by seasquirts, barnacles and mussels. In the warmer months of the year, seasquirts can become quite prevalent, smothering baskets and reducing water flow.

Movements on from Guernsey and Morcambe Bay. Movements off site go to Loch Fyne Oysters for depuration.

Inspection completed by unsupervised.

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0168	Site No: SS0544	
Date of case: 43557	Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no, upda	te site summary sheet)	N
Site Details		
Total No facilities: 2 Longlines	No faciliti	es stocked: 2
Species CGI CGI		
Age group 2018 2016		
No shellfish 200,000 50,000		
Mean fish Wt 0.2g 60g Next fallow date (site) No fallow	Next input date (site)	May-19
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	10/05/2016	
Any recent increased or atypical mortalities	? (last 4 weeks):	N
If yes, detail:	. (last 4 weeks).	
e.g. site		
average, max		
per facility		
Any increased mortalities? (since last inspe	ection)	N
If yes, detail:		
How are mortalities disposed of?		Other (detail)
If other detail: Shells disposed of on beach	n.	Other (detail)
Are there any diseases on your site?		N
If yes, detail:		
Have you experienced predation on site?		Y
If yes, detail: See additional comments.		
Has the site experienced increased or abno	ormal fouling?	Y
If yes, detail: See additional comments.	amaricaning.	
,,		
Have you observed any invasive species or	ı your site?	N
If yes, detail:		
Do you have an up to date BMP, and are th	ere any issues?	N
If yes, detail:		
What quantity of spat fall have you had in the	ne last 12 months? (mussel sites only)	
N/A		

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0168 Site No: SS0544 Date of Visit 02/04/2019 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 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 0 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 5 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 0 3 6 Areas 0 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 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:	2019-0168			Date of visit:	02/04/2019			
0.000 110.				Date of Visit.	32,0-112010			
Site No:	SS0544			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
PSI	09/04/2019							
								





Rangequest Oysters Pairc Dubh Ulva Ferry Isle of Mull PA73 6LY

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0331 SITE NO SS0544 INSPECTOR DATE OF CASE 02/04/2019
SITE NAME Eilean Liath
CASE NO 20190168

Routine surveillance frequency assessment under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

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 two years. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

Signed: Date: 03/04/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0172			Date of visit: 03/04/2019				
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main Inspecto	r:				
Site No: FS0305 Business No: FB0573	Site Name: Business Name:	Milnholm Hatchery Aqualife Services Ltd					
Case Types: 1 REG	3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: F	CoGP MA				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							
	Site fallow - never be	en stocked under current ownership					

Site inspected as fallow, no plans for stocking. If there is interest in research in this area/funding could become operational in future so left active for now.

Ability to use spring fed water on site and mix with burn water.

Surveillance frequency changed to low as not currently in use and no immediate plans to use. To be reassessed if stocked or during PSI

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI		Daf	te of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0172		Site No:	FS0305				
Date of Visit:		03/04/2019	9		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	ative?		Y		
Site Details		100	-			N. C. Wales in	to d	0.0
Total No facilities Species	fallow	83	Facilities sto	cked	U	No facilities ins	spected	83
Age group No Fish	Tanow							
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S	site)	current		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	none planned		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease proble	ems?		N/A	Any escapes	s (since last visit))?	N/A
Movement Record								
Movement record		r inspection?	,					Y
2. Date of last inspe		mapeodon.						
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					N/A
4. Are movement re		•		?				N/A
 Are records comp Are health certific 		•		able?				N/A N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any moveme If yes, is there a sys	nts carried out			•	_			N/A
Mortality Records		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	100 37 11 11 15					
Mortality records	available for ir	spection?						N/A
2. How are mortaliti		•						
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ent	tered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality	`							NI/A
5. Evidence of recei		• •						N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per racility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality dur	ring period c	hecked?					N/A
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (nortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev		corted to EH	12 If no. add N	APT case and s	enter on mort	ality events shee	,	N/A
O. Have Illulality e	venilə neenilei	Julieu iu i i	a: II IIO. auu IV	III Lase allu e	SHIEL OH HIOLV	anti evento onee	4.	1 1//

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0172		Site No:	FS0305		Insp:	
Date of Visit	03/04/2019		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	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	-
Mayamanta off							_
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 or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		-
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8		
	iainis apstream	TOT WITHIN T HALF EXCUSSION	<u>'</u>	-	٥		_
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				
the fales of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				-
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			$\overline{}$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				-
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	i			$\overline{}$
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	1			-
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			$\overline{}$
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				,			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				\vdash
ous of pructice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				
	No		2				
					Total		0
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0172			Date of visit:	03/04/2019			
Site No:	FS0305	1	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Penort Summan								
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	lnen	ond .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	23/04/2019							





Aqualife Services Ltd Milnholm Hatchery Craigend Road Auchenbowie Stirling FK7 9QN

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0573 SITE NO FS0305 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 03/04/2019
SITE NAME Milnholm Hatchery
CASE NO 20190172

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow. As the site has not yet been stocked under new ownership, no records were checked.

Signed:

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Date: 23/04/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0173			Date of visit: 03/04/2019
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main Ins	pector:
Site No: FS0833 Business No: FB0573	Site Name: Business Name:	Milnholm Smolt Unit Aqualife Services Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.8	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Site set up for trials in relation to development of automatic vaccination systems. Work being undertaken collecting data on length of salmon, work also to be undertaken on rtr. Possibility of adding other species in future dependent on interest. 20k smaller sal to arrive on site in May. Those currently on site from NBFRU. RTR from Frandy. RTR showing some low level mortality from ERM. All fish observed during inspection were in good condition. As trials develop may move fish onto FW farm sites for ID studies.

Some amendments to BMP suggested to include all FHI contact details for reporting of disease and include - manner and period of reporting. Add manner of mort removal. Risk assessment procedure for incoming stocks to state health status of incoming stocks should be from an equal or higher health status.

Fish moved on site end Jan 2019, new movement book inspected for these movements. Dead fish frozen - 3 freezers on site - in process of setting up a contractor for collection of waste, no movements of dead fish made to date, therefore no records. No treatments undertaken, therefore no medicine records.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0173		Site No:	FS0833				
Date of Visit:		03/04/2019]		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		27	Facilities sto	cked	2	No facilitie	s inspected	27
Species	SAL	RTR						
Age group	parr	MVG						
No Fish	2,000	10,000						
Mean Fish Wt	100g	15g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	none planne	d	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	May 2019		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease nrohl	ems?		Υ	Any escapes	(since last	visit\?	N
If yes, detail:			M in RTR - 0.3	3% highest we			violity.	11
Movement Records	s							
Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		порестант.					20/02/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	•					Y
4. Are movement re		•						N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	•					N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outw	rith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any movement		t by (or on bel	half) of the hu	isiness (not usi	ing a STR)2			Y
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)		
	Frozen				ouror (dotain	/		
3. Mortality records		correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	,	1 sal in marc	h, ~20/rtr/wk				
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	tvpical mortal		,				Y
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
as above RE:ERM a		•						
6. Any other peaks i	•							N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	heet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments If yes, detail:	s (last 4 wks)?		N
If other, detail:			
	s available for inspection?		N/A
•	lete and correctly entered?		N/A
4. Are fish in a withdo	•		N
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)?		
If other, detail:			N/A
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		IW/A
2. Has the manner a3. Has the manner a	Is available for inspection? In the frequency of mortality removal, record and period in which the APB will notify Sched) mortality at the site been included?	ottish Ministers or veterinary profession	
	nt will be taken in the event that the prese luded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no	·	sted disease N
5. Has the health sta health status, certific	itus of aquaculture animals being stocke ation if required)?	d on the farm site been covered (equal	or higher N
	lry and biosecurity measures implemente ase been covered (movement of staff, vi	•	
7. Is documentation aquaculture animals	available regarding the measures in plac held on site?	ee to maintain the physical containment	of Y
8. Have the biosecur	rity procedures been adequately impleme	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	Site currently on flow through and hatch current operations.	ery not operational so not fully impleme	nted but adequate for
Results of Surveilla	ance		
•	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or available for inspection?	on behalf of, the business?	N

3. Any significant results?

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

Records checked between:

Start 2019 when site stocked by current owners - 3/4/19

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0173		Site No:	FS0833		Insp:	
Date of Visit	03/04/2019		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	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	-
Mayamanta off							2
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	3
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts		_			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				igwdow
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		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8		
	iaims upstream	TOT WILLIAM FACULSION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			$\overline{}$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				\vdash
out of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		15
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0173	;	Site No:	FS0833	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the prev	ious 4 voars?			
•	•	•	o cinalo v	oor close basis?	
	lanagement Area (or equivalent) 1	•			
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licenced in-fer amectin benzoate) as well as acco in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agre	ess to suitable biological a	nd/or mecl	hanical control measu	res, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for inspection? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard sp	pecified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	onis) record levels below the sug (CoGP Annex 6)	gested criteria for treatme	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) num	bers per fish been at a lev	el of 3 or a	above during the period	d that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Health Inspe	ctorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is consider	ed to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
	eatments been administered or ot reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions taken had	l a significant impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in coop	eration between participat	ting farms?	?	
	g strategy for the site, where fewer		_		t for
	ific written lice management proce scalation of a sea lice infestation?	edure with waypoints descr	ribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea	lice count data? If no plea	ise detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment damage due to pr	redators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the predatio	n experienced on site? (D	etail below	')	Υ
topnets					
If other, detail below:					
2 Havo oscano incido	nts or events been experienced or	o or in the vicinity of the si	to since the	o last EUI inspection?	N
			te since the	e last Frii ilispection?	
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question orted to Scottish Ministers?	1110			
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (wh	ere they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)	
	ported to the SSPO and local fishe				4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If ye	es give detail			
0. 6 mill	aved wee this action and a ""	and wild field interests		lasian alver by Occi	h
 If gill nets were deplements. Ministers? (Legal, CoG 	byed was this action agreed with lope P = 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	ocal wild fish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottis	n T
, -	en to prevent and minimise the ris	k of further escapes? (No	t covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the A				
	d as satisfactory with regards to co	· ·	detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

Case No: Date of visit: 03/04/2019	Date of visit: 03/04/2019			
Site No: Inspector:	Inspector:			
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification				
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp	2 nd Insp			
Penort Summany				
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				
ECI, CNI 23/04/2019 case completion 16/05/2019 case completion 16/05/2019 case completion 23/04/2019 case case case case case case case case				
case completion 16/05/2019				





Aqualife Services Ltd Milnholm Hatchery Craigend Road Auchenbowie Stirling FK7 9QN

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0573 SITE NO FS0833 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 03/04/2019
SITE NAME Milnholm Smolt Unit
CASE NO 20190173

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the site became operational under new ownership.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the site became operational under new ownership.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and the following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

- Include manner and time period for reporting increased unexplained mortalities to FHI or vet
- Include manner and time period for reporting suspicion or presence of listed disease to FHI
- Suggest include all FHI contact details, phone numbers and email as well as postal address (see below for details).
- Include manner of mort removal and details of waste uplift.
- Detail risk assessment procedure for health status of incoming stocks from an equal or higher health status.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of the date this report was issued (23rd May 2019) for the attention of myself.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

Signed:

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Date: 23/04/2019

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





Aqualife Services Ltd Milnholm Hatchery Craigend Road Auchenbowie Stirling FK7 9QN

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0573 SITE NO FS0833 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 03/04/2019
SITE NAME Milnholm Smolt Unit

CASE No 20190173

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 23/05/2019. 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.

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/05/2019

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

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2019-0174			Date of visit: 04/04/2019		
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main Inspec	etor:		
Site No: FS0979 Business No: FB0357	Site Name: Business Name:	Tropical Aquarium University of Stirling			
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 27	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: F	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:			

Additional Case Information:

No movements on or off site since 2016. All stock on site bred from own stocks. Mortalities very low across the site in all species.

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity protocols. All tanks are routinely kept at 27degrees C and operate on recirc. FHI phone number updated on BMP/VHP.

FHI 059, Version 12			Iss	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0174		Site No:	FS0979	<u> </u>			
Date of Visit:		04/04/201	19		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represen	tative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		150	Facilities st		45		s inspected	150
Species	TIL	catfish	zebrafish	catfish	TIL	TIL		
Age group	juv	juv	LVG	adult	fry	adult		
No Fish	1,389	106	727	169	1,300	2,091		
Mean Fish Wt	25g	25g	>1g	2-3kg	<0.5g	100g-2kg		
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	N/A		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records		or inspection	2					Y
2. Date of last inspec		/ Inspection					02/06/14 AS	
3. Are records comp		rectly entered	d?				02/00/11/	Y
4. Are movement red		•		?				Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	rectly entered	1?					Y
6. Are health certification	ates for intro	ductions (out	twith GB) avai	lable?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		ut by (or on b	ehalf) of the b	ousiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst			•					
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	of?			Other (detail))		
If other detail:				ste for disposal				
3. Mortality records of		l correctly en						Y
4. Recent mortality (`			k tilapia, 1/site/w	eek catfish, 0	zebrafish		
5. Evidence of recen								N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no st	tock per facilit	y/reason:				
O Amy other peaks i		in a mariad	الم مادم ما					N
Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	aring period c	checked?					N
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities b	een reported	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	л тохрісті тос.)		Controported	to vector i i iii				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	eported to FI	II? If no, add	MRT case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	heet.	N/A

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

02/06/14 - 04/04/19

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI				Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0174		Site N	No:	FS0979		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/04/2019		No o	f m	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements				0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS		0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone including third country	or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup			0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	\pm	0	3	6	10	3
	Number of des			0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site conta	cts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,		0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category II n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category ∨ n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	•	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	រ plant discharging into adjacent wat	ers	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing		0				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)		1				
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status							
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us		4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm		8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm		10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms		3				ш
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed		0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5				ш
Biosecurity		Number of si	tes	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		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		\top	0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1				ш
CoGP/Regulator								
Practices in accordance	Yes			0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			0				0
	No			2				
						Total		8
						Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0174		Site No:	FS0979	
Sea Lice Inspection (• •				
•	nced sea lice problems in	•		l bi.0	
		valent) fallowed synchronously			
azamethiphos and emacan these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as well in a reasonable period of	ed in-feed and bath sea lice me as access to suitable biologica time? ent agreement or statement rele	l and/or med	chanical control measu	res, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspec	tion? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required star	ndard specified in the SSI and t	he CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	*	the suggested criteria for treatn	nent in the C	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is) numbers per fish been at a	level of 3 or	above during the perio	d that
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish Heal	th Inspectorate? If no, FHI see	comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is o	onsidered to cause significant v	welfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
		ed or other actions taken when gatus is considered to have we			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where appl	icable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions ta	ken had a significant impact up	on the lice le	evels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out	in cooperation between particip	oating farms	?	
14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, who	ere fewer populations or part po	pulations are	e held without treatmen	t for
	ific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infe	nt procedure with waypoints de station?	scribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks ref	ect sea lice count data? If no pl	lease detail r	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage o	lue to predators in the current o	r previous pr	roduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced on site?	(Detail below	v)	Υ
Site inside					
If other, detail below:					
3 Have escape incide	nts or events been experie	enced on or in the vicinity of the	site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to			io idot i i i inopositori.	
	ported to Scottish Ministers				
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forth	vith (where they exist)? (CoGP	- 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	
		cal fisheries trusts forthwith (wh			4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escape	es? If yes give detail			
8. If all nets were deal	oved was this action agree	ed with local wild fish interests a	nd was perm	nission given by Scottis	sh
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		a mario da mila non interesto a	perili		
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimis	e the risk of further escapes? (N	Not covered i	in code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures	of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with rega	rds to containment? If no, pleas	e detail reas	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

Case No:	2019-0174			Date of visit:	04/04/2019			
Site No:	FS0979	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	 							
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	23/04/2019		2 11150					
	1							





University of Stirling Institute of Aquaculture University of Stirling Stirling FK9 4LA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0357 Site No FS0979 Inspector DATE OF VISIT 04/04/2019
SITE NAME Tropical Aquarium
CASE NO 20190174

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Date: 23/04/2019

Senior Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2019-0175			Date of visit: 04/04/2019		
Time spent on site:	5hr	Main Inspect	tor:		
Site No: FS1289 Business No: FB0357	Site Name: Business Name:	Temperate Facilities University of Stirling			
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 13.54	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: B	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:			

Additional Case Information:

Site thermometer used due to site biosecurity protocols.

Vets visit regularly to check on health of stocks. Report for May 2017 attributed higher level of mortality and deformities leading to culls in Jan/Feb 2017 to inferior egg quality or an issue at incubation. Affected eggs/fish culled and no problems in remaining stock.

Freezers for mortalities kept in a separate outbuilding.

Currently conducting feed trials with SAL.

There are two separate recirc systems that both serve 12 tanks. System A currently in use system B fitted with skimmer so can use artifical seawater (skimmer could also be fitted to system A if needed and job request came in therefore site details amended to 24 fw and sw tanks.

Fish inspected all in good condition. Phone number updated on VHP/BMP.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0175]	Site No:	FS1289	<u> </u>			
Date of Visit:		04/04/2019)		Inspector(s)):]
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		24	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	es inspected	24
Species	SAL							
Age group	fry							
No Fish	1,800							
Mean Fish Wt	1.6g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Dec 2019		
Depart (last 4 wks)	diagona probl	larma?		N	lary assent	- (since last	vinit\2	N
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probi	ems?		1	Any escape	s (since last	VISIT) ?	N
Movement Record								
Movement record		r increation?						V
Date of last insper		r inspection:					16/03/2016	'
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	2				10/03/2010	Y
4. Are movement re		•		,				Ý
5. Are records comp								Ÿ
6. Are health certific		•		able?				Y
Transport Records								
1. Are any moveme		it by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			Y
Mortality Records	·							
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detai	il)		
	Frozen					7		
3. Mortality records		correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•		3/site/week					
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	atypical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no				/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i								Y
If yes, detail:				rior egg quality	in 2017 stock	king		
7. Have increased (unexplained)		•	o vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:		see addition		To Table 1		!!t	1 1	NI/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been re	ported to FHI	i? It no, add iv	IKI case and e	enter on mort	lality events s	sneet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail:		N
If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspect		Y
Are records complete and correctly ent	ered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspec		Y
	tality removal, recording and safe disposal been	
 Has the manner and period in which the increased (unexplained) mortality at the second control in the increased (unexplained). 	e APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary site been included?	/ professional of any
	event that the presence or suspicion of the pres	sence of a listed disease Y
	nimals being stocked on the farm site been cove	ered (equal or higher
•	easures implemented between each epidemiolo	
•	he measures in place to maintain the physical c	
aquaculture animals held on site?	ie measures in place to maintain the physical c	ontainment of .
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been	adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance been assured to the survei	en carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2 If yes are results available for inspection		Y

As detailed mortality section 7 and additional info

3. Any significant results?

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

Records checked between:

16/03/2016 - 04/04/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0175		Site No:	FS1289		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/04/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		_	40	- 00	
species	compartment in Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	
Movements off	Frequency of n		0			10	3
F	Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	Site contacts ed (secure water supply through	<u> </u>	1-5	6-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or		0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)	•	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		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					\vdash
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		L I
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters			Chiocodic		
processors	, , p. c c c c	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	-			<u> </u>
		n from MS of equivalent status	1				-
		n from zone or compartment of					-
	equivalent stat		4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	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		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				ш
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes			1			0
with regulator or industry	No			-			\vdash
code of practice			3	J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	1			\Box
					Total		18
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0175		Site No:	FS1289	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchro	onously on a single y	ear class basis?	
	amectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath sea well as access to suitable b of time?			and
•	cumented farm manage	ement agreement or statem	nent relevant to the si	ite and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP	Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the S	SI and the CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		ow the suggested criteria for	or treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	· ·	nonis) numbers per fish be	een at a level of 3 or a	above during the period tha	at
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If no, F	FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause sigr	nificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	0)
•		stered or other actions take longatus is considered to h			1)
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	pplicable)?			
•	•	s taken had a significant im	npact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
		out in cooperation between			
		where fewer populations or			
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ment procedure with wayponfestation?	oints describing set a	ections to deal with recogni	sed
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data?	? If no please detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment damaç	ge due to predators in the c	current or previous pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	ne predation experienced o	on site? (Detail below)	
Site inside					
If other, detail below:					
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicinit	ty of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep		•			
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist)?	(CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	·.17)	
		l local fisheries trusts forth)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail			
O If will make warm about	aved wee this ti	wood with least wild field in	orooto ond	ission siver by Cartist	
If gill nets were deployed Ministers? (Legal, CoG		reed with local wild fish int	erests and was perm	ission given by Scottish	
, -	•	mise the risk of further esca	apes? (Not covered in	n code but could	
be considered under	-	_	,		
	•	egards to containment? If n	o, please detail 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: 2019-0175	Site No: FS1289	
Date of Visit: 04/04/20	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection locate	ed within a farm management area?	N
If N, no further questions require con	npletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Far	rm Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available fo4. Does the FMAg/S identify the rele5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies?	
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date	e of commencement of the agreement or statement or statement of review?	nt?
Arrangements for Fish Health Man	nagement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minifarm?	imum health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	cination requirements for stocks held in the area o ecies of fish which may be stocked into the area o aximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arr fish farm in the area or the individua	rangements for the storage and disposal of any de al farm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemen	nt of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrang	ements for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ailability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any relice on farms in the area or individual	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available tr I farms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circused on farms in the area or individu	cumstances under which biological controls and c ial farms?	within the area?
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arr	rangements 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 re	emoved from the
	rangements for the movement of live fish on and o	off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
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 restood	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
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether browered 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	ee, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or s	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S?	

Case No:	2019-0175	Date of visit: 04/04/2019						
Site No:	FS1289	1	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	1							
Report Summary	1							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	23/04/2019		2 insp					
LOI, OIVI	20/04/2010							





University of Stirling Institute of Aquaculture University of Stirling Stirling FK9 4LA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0357 SITE NO FS1289 INSPECTOR **DATE OF VISIT** 04/04/2019 **SITE NAME** Temperate Facilities **CASE NO** 20190175

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

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

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Senior Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 23/04/19

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0183			Date of visit: 12/04/2019			
Time spent on site:	3 hours	Main Inspecto	or:			
Site No: FS1269 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Lochailort Recirculation Hatch Mowi Scotland Ltd	ery			
Case Types: 1 REP	2 REG 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? 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 car	ry out intended visit deta	ail reason below:				

Additional Case Information:

Site inspected whilst accompanying APHA during a welfare inspection, following the report of a mortality event by Mowi on 23/03/19 resulting from a water supply failure in one of the hatchery units.

New batch of eggs brought on site 28/04/2019 to replace those lost during mortality event on 23/03/2019.

Fish on site appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0183]	Site No:	FS1269				
Date of Visit:		12/04/201	9		Inspector(s	s):]
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	ative?			Y Y	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		56	Facilities sto	ocked	20	No facilitie	es inspected	20
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL					
Age group	2020 Q1	2019 Q3	2019 Q4					
No Fish	3,100,000	2,278,864	1,520,443					
Mean Fish Wt	Ova	14g	1g					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	June 2019)	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escap	es (since last	visit)?	N
1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?								
If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?	nce of transpo	rtation records		d on cito		Y
2. How are mortalitied of their detail:	es aisposea d	or?			Incinerated	a - on site		
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly en	w/b 11/03/19 1,521,479 (4	9: Q4 - 3159 (0 49.81%,) Q3 - 1	11,216 (0.47	7%), w/b 25/03	3: Q3 - 17,500	(0.47%) Q4
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			I - 11,637 (0.76				
5. Evidence of recer		* 1						Y
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	r facility/no st	ock per facility	//reason:				
23/03/2019 - Water							natchery unit (1,521,479),
49.81% of 2019 Q4				representing 28	3.5% of all s	tock on site.		
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality di	iring period c	necked?					N
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action:		Reported to	FHI			ut aliba a a sa a t	l and	Y
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	eported to FH	i? If no, add N	/IKI case and e	enter on mo	rtality events s	sneet.	Y

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspec	ation?	
Medicines records available for inspects. Are records complete and correctly er		
Are fish in a withdrawal period?	itered?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspect	action?	
	rtality removal, recording and safe disposal be	een considered?
• •	the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or vetering	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	•	, pressure and
	e event that the presence or suspicion of the p	
	when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers	
•	animals being stocked on the farm site been c	overed (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity n	measures implemented between each epidem	iological unit to minimise
transmission of disease been covered (r	movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or	dead fish etc.)?
	the measures in place to maintain the physical	al containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been	adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:		

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

Results of Surveillance

3. Any significant results?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

05/02/2019 - 12/04/2019

Case No:	2019-0183	Date of visit: 12/04/2019						
Site No:	FS1269	l	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D 10								
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REP,REG	15/04/2019							





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 **DATE OF VISIT** 12/04/2019

SITE NO FS1269 SITE NAME Lochailort Recirculation

Hatchery

INSPECTOR CASE NO 20190183

The above site was inspected in conjunction with veterinary officers from the Animal and Plant Health Agency following the report of a mortality event by Mowi Scotland Ltd.

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.

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

Signed: Date: 15/04/2019

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 12	ls	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0184			Date of visit: 15/04/2019			
Time spent on site:	2hrs	Main Ins	pector:			
Site No: SS0922 Business No: SB0542	Site Name: Business Name:	Balfron Hatchery Great British Prawns Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 26-32	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed N			
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: B	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail r	eason below:				

Additional Case Information:

Site temperature ranges from 26-32 degrees across the different life stages.

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity concerns.

Mortality levels appear high percentage wise but only 330 prawns were introduced onto the site. Dead prawns and waste are transferred to the on-site biogas facility.

No movement off site since input, but once fully stocked, prawns will be moved onto the production unit for on growing prior to harvest (initially via sealed buckets, with intention to use pipes and pumps to transfer stock in the future between the two sites. Movements to production site will be recorded in the movements book and in the site diary.

Current stock imported from Hawaii, with stock arriving on Friday 19/04/19 originating from Texas. Site hoping to grow current adults to broodstock size so they can produce their own eggs and have more control over the production cycle.

Although the hatchery and production unit sites share the same base, the two sites have site specific staff and equipment that is not moved between them.

Site using iodine to disinfect the transfer bags upon arrival on site from supplier so that these can then be placed into the tanks for acclimatisation. No medicinal treatments used on site.

Inspection and paperwork completed by under supervision.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0184		Site No:	SS0922				
Date of Visit:		15/04/2019			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	itive?			Y N	
Site Details			_					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	2	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species .	LPV							
Age group	2019							
No Fish	31							
Mean Fish Wt	40g							
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	No plan.		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	19/04/19		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records		r inspection?						Υ
2. Date of last inspec		inspection:					11/12/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				11/12/2010	Y
4. Are movement red		•						Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	uctions (outv	vith GB) availa	ıble?				Y
Transport Records							·	
1. Are any movemen		by (or on be	half) of the bu	siness (not us	ing a STB)?			N/A
If yes, is there a syst		• •	•	•	_			N/A
Mortality Records	•						'	
Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)		
	Biogas plant							
3. Mortality records of			ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			: 77 (61%), w/ (43%) across		0 (19%), w/k	25/03/19: 32	(40%), w/b:
5. Evidence of recen	t increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility/	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	•	• .						Y
If yes, detail:				naximum of 52 monia to incre	•	•	•	
7. Have increased (u		mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection		
3. Are records complete and correctly enter	ea?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
o. Are medicines stored appropriately:		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortali	•	
3. Has the manner and period in which the	•	ary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the sit	e been included?	Y
4 . I loo the continue that will be talked in the con-		
Has the action that will be taken in the even is detected been included and how and who		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture anin	nals being stocked on the farm site been o	overed (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity mea	sures implemented between each epidem	iological unit to minimise
transmission of disease been covered (mov	ement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or	dead fish etc.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the	measures in place to maintain the physical	l containment of Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	I	V
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been ad If no, detail:	equately implemented on site?	Y
ii iio, uetali.		
Results of Surveillance		

11/12/18 - 15/04/19

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0184 Site No: SS0922 Date of Visit 15/04/2019 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 0 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 0 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 10 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 5 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 3 Areas 0 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 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2019-0184	Site N	No:	SS0922					
Sea Lice Inspection	(Seawater Sites Only)								
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?									
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?									
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?									
•	5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
	6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected		ow the suggested criteria for treatment in t	he Co	oGP during the period	l that				
8. Have average adult records are inspected	· ·	nonis) numbers per fish been at a level of	3 or a	above during the perio	od that				
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish I	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see commer	nt.						
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which	s considered to cause significant welfare p	proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)				
		tered or other actions taken when <i>L. salm</i> congatus is considered to have welfare imp							
11. Has any other acti	on been taken (where a	oplicable)?							
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the action	taken had a significant impact upon the li	ice le	vels recorded?					
13. Are treatments, wh	nere conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating fa	arms?	•					
sea lice?		where fewer populations or part population							
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?									
16. Do the sea lice lev	rels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please de	etail re	easons.					
Containment Inspect	tion								
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment dama	e due to predators in the current or previo	us pro	oduction cycles?	N				
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against	ne predation experienced on site? (Detail b	pelow)	Υ				
Site inside									
If other, detail below	r:								
					N				
•	·	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site sin	ce the	e last FHI Inspection?	N				
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip ported to Scottish Minis	•							
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB fo	thwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.3)	7, 5.4	.17)					
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO an	local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they	/ exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)				
7. Were methods (if a	ny) used to recover esc	pees? If yes give detail							
8. If gill nets were den	loved was this action a	reed with local wild fish interests and was	perm	ission given by Scotti	sh				
Ministers? (Legal, Co		The state of the s	p 311111						
9. What action was tal	ken to prevent and min	nise the risk of further escapes? (Not cove	ered ir	n code but could					
be considered unde	er satisfactory measu	es of the Act)							
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with r	gards to containment? If no, please detail	reaso	on(s)	Υ				

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0184			Date of visit:	15/04/2010			
Case No.	2019-0104			Date of visit.	13/04/2019			
Site No:	SS0922			Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	1							
Report Summary	_			1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	18/04/2019		2 11150					





Great British Prawns Ltd Farm 1 Claylands Balfron G63 0RR

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoSB0542Date of Visit15/04/2019Site NoSS0922Site NameBalfron HatcheryInspectorCase No20190184

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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



Signed: Date: 18/04/2019

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